

BRIEFING PACKET STATE RELEASE

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND (NCLB)

Adequate Yearly Progress Report
2008



Public Release
August 5, 2008
8:00 am EDT

KENTUCKY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Jon E. Draud, Commissioner



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction.....	3
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).....	3
Identification of NCLB Improvement Schools - NCLB Consequences.....	3
Timing of NCLB Reports.....	4
District Accountability.....	4
2008 Observations for Schools.....	4
2008 Observations for School Districts.....	5
2008 Observations for the State.....	6
State Adequate Yearly Progress Summary.....	7
School Results For 2008.....	8
Table 1: Schools That Did Not Make AYP by Subpopulation	
Table 2: Schools That Did Not Make AYP by School Type	
Table 3: Percent of Target Goals That Were Met by School Type	
District Results For 2008.....	9
Table 4: Districts That Did Not Make AYP by Subpopulation	
Table 5: Districts That Did Not Make AYP by District Type	
Table 6: Percent of Target Goals That Were Met by District Type	
Tier Results for Title I Schools and Districts for 2007.....	10
Table 7: Title I Schools in Each Tier by School Type	
Table 8: Title I Districts in Each Tier by School Type	
Attachment A.....	11
Federal and State School/District Two Dimensional Accountability Model	
Attachment B.....	13
Definitions for Implementation of NCLB for Districts and Schools, 2007– 2008	
Attachment C.....	18
Details Regarding the Three Components of AYP and How Schools and Districts are Able to Make AYP (NCLB Reporting Kentucky 2008 Fact Sheet)	
Attachment D.....	20
NCLB Consequences and the Timing of Consequences Tiers	
Attachment E.....	24
Annual Measurable Objectives in Reading and Mathematics by School Year and School Configuration	
Attachment F.....	26
School and District Results For 2007	
Attachment G.....	30
School and District Results For 2006	

Introduction

The 2001 re-authorization of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was signed into law on January 8, 2002. Characterized in the statute as, "An Act to close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind," it carries the short title, "No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001."

Accountability measures required by the act are, in many respects, comparable to those comprising Kentucky's school accountability and testing system. For example, Kentucky set goals for proficient student performance and established a support system for schools in assistance via the Kentucky Education Reform Act of 1990 and 1998's House Bill 58.

Kentucky, like many states, has modified and/or supplemented its student assessments to comply with the federal statute and now uses assessment results to make both federal and state accountability decisions. Kentucky has retained its accountability system, while complying with the federal mandate. It accomplishes this through a two-dimensional system in which state and federal requirements are complementary. The federal and state school/district two-dimensional accountability model is summarized in Attachment A.

In addition to having implemented a system of assessments, Kentucky has already met other federal requirements by establishing school recognition and consequences, requiring school improvement plans, conducting scholastic audits and assigning highly skilled educators to support schools in assistance. Further, Kentucky has published student assessment results disaggregated by subpopulation and has implemented a unified data collection and reporting system. These are some of the many examples of how Kentucky's system of public education has been a national model for the last 17 years.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) is the term used in NCLB to refer to the minimum improvement required of each school and district over the course of one year. It is measured at the school and district levels by:

- measuring growth in the percentage of students scoring proficient or above in reading and mathematics.
- assessing improvement on the "other academic indicator."
- testing at least 95% of enrolled students and student subpopulations of sufficient size.

Details regarding these three components of AYP, and how schools and districts are able to make AYP, can be found in Attachment C.

Identification of NCLB Improvement Schools - NCLB Consequences

If a Title I school fails to make AYP in the *same content area for two consecutive years*, the school becomes a NCLB Improvement School. A series of consequences is outlined in NCLB for an Improvement School. Note that these consequences do *not* apply when a school misses its Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) in reading one year (but makes

AYP in mathematics) and misses its AMO in mathematics the next year (but makes AYP in reading). AYP must be missed in the same content area (for whatever reason) for two consecutive years for consequences to apply. *It is important to note that if a school or district does not meet the requirement of the Other Academic Indicator or Participation Rate, the school is considered to have missed its AYP in both reading and mathematics.* If that school or district misses its AMO in reading or mathematics the following year, the school/district will be considered as not making AYP in the same content area for two consecutive years.

The NCLB consequences are listed below:

1. PARENT NOTIFICATION (notification to parents in a school identified for NCLB improvement)
2. SCHOOL CHOICE (parents' option to transfer student)
3. Write or revise COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
4. Offer SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES
5. CORRECTIVE ACTION
6. RESTRUCTURING

Attachment D provides more detail regarding each consequence and the timing of consequences, called NCLB Tiers. (**Consequences only apply to Title I schools and districts.**)

Timing of NCLB Reports

NCLB requires that assessment results be made available and AYP determinations be made prior to the start of the next school year. The September AYP determinations are final and are based on the complete reading and mathematics assessment scores, including open-response items. For example, if the September AYP decision results in NCLB consequences at the school or district level (for example, the requirement to offer school choice), then parents must be given the option of school choice.

District Accountability

NCLB requires district-level accountability to be based on an aggregate of students' scores from all schools in the district. District accountability for subpopulations, based on aggregated scores, also is required. Current regulation (703 KAR 5:130) establishes both state and federal dimensions of district accountability. The federal dimension is based on aggregate student data and mirrors federal school accountability calculations and procedures.

2008 Observations for Schools

- 820 schools met 100% of their No Child Left Behind (NCLB) AYP goals. That's 70.9% of all schools in Kentucky.

- 89.0% of elementary schools, 44.4% of middle schools and 33.3% of high schools met all their NCLB goals.
- Of the 337 schools (29.1%) that did not make AYP, 212 of these schools made 80% or more of their goals (122 of these schools met at least 90% or more of their goals). Overall, 1,032 schools in the state (89.2%) met 80% or more of their goals.
- 53 schools (4.6% overall) did not make AYP on the Other Academic Indicator. For elementary and middle schools, the Other Academic Indicator is the CATS accountability classification. For high schools, the graduation rate is the Other Academic Indicator (20 schools did not make AYP because of graduation rate).
- On the performance of the African-American subpopulation, 72 schools did not make AYP in reading, and 59 schools did not make AYP in mathematics.
- On the performance of the free/reduced lunch subpopulation, 94 schools did not make AYP in reading, and 128 schools did not make AYP in mathematics.
- On the performance of the students with disabilities subpopulation, 158 schools did not make AYP in reading, and 115 schools did not make AYP in mathematics.

2008 Observations for School Districts

- 103 of 175 school districts (58.9%) met 100% of their No Child Left Behind (NCLB) AYP goals.
- Of the 72 school districts (41.1%) that did not make AYP, 65 of these districts made 80% or more of their goals (41 of these school districts met at least 90% or more of their goals). Overall, 168 of 175 school districts (96.0%) in the state met 80% or more of their goals.
- 24 school districts (13.7% overall) did not make AYP on the Other Academic Indicator. The Other Academic Indicator is the CATS Accountability Classification (for elementary and middle grades) *and* the graduation rate (for high school grades).
- On the performance of the African-American subpopulation, 5 school districts did not make AYP in reading, and 5 school districts did not make AYP in mathematics.
- On the performance of the free/reduced lunch subpopulation, 3 school districts did not make AYP in reading, and 1 school district did not make AYP in mathematics.
- On the performance of the students with disabilities subpopulation, 56 school districts did not make AYP in reading, and 29 school districts did not make AYP in mathematics.

2008 Observations for the State

- 20 of 25 target goals (80%) were met at the state level. All student subpopulations met the requirements for Participation Rate.
- Statewide, 32 Title I schools are in Tier 1 consequences; 24 Title I schools are in Tier 2 consequences; 19 Title I schools are in Tier 3 consequences; 9 Title I schools are in Tier 4 consequences; 32 Title I schools are in first year Tier 5 consequences; 1 Title I school is in second year Tier 5 consequences; and 2 Title I schools are in third year Tier 5 consequences. There are 3 Title I districts in Tier 1 consequences; 13 Title I districts in Tier 2 consequences; 18 Title I districts in Tier 3 first year consequences; 16 Title I districts in Tier 3 second year consequences; and 17 Title I districts in Tier 3 third year consequences.



NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS REPORT - 2008

July 30, 2008

State

Grades: PRIMARY-12
Code: 999

Met 20 out of 25 target goals (80.0 percent)

Title I: Yes
Made Overall AYP: No

Under the federal No Child Left Behind Act a school/district must make 100 percent of its target goals in order to qualify as having made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

Student Group*	Met Annual Measurable Objective		Met Participation Rate	Other Academic Indicator**
	Reading	Mathematics		
All Students	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
White (Non-Hispanic)	Yes	Yes	Yes	
African-American	NO	NO	Yes	
Hispanic	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Asian	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Limited English Proficiency	NO	Yes	Yes	
Free/Reduced Lunch	Yes	Yes	Yes	
With Disability	NO	NO	Yes	

For other measures of school progress see Commonwealth Accountability Testing System (CATS) results at: <http://www.education.ky.gov/>

* If a student group is listed as n/a in the chart, it means there were not enough students in that group at this school to get a valid score for AYP purposes. Each student is included in the "All Students" group.

**For elementary and middle schools, the "Other Academic Indicator" is the overall CATS 2007 midpoint Classification, which covers the other content areas as well as reading and mathematics. For high schools the Other Academic Indicator is the Graduation Rate. The Other Academic Indicator for schools with middle and high school grades is both the CATS 2007 midpoint Classification and the Graduation Rate.

***If a subpopulation doesn't meet its Annual Measurable Objective, it can still be in "Safe Harbor" and considered to have made AYP if:

- The school reduced by at least 10% the number of students in the subpopulation who are not proficient, and
- That subpopulation meets the criteria for demonstrating improvement on the Academic Index.



School Results For 2008

Table 1: Schools That Did Not Make AYP by Subpopulation: 337 of 1157 (29.13%)

Student Group*	Reading AMO	Mathematics AMO	Participation Rate	Other Academic Indicator
All Students	41 (3.54%)	64 (5.53%)	0 (0.00%)	53 (4.58%)
White (Non-Hispanic)	12 (1.04%)	46 (3.98%)	0 (0.00%)	
African-American	72 (6.22%)	59 (5.10%)	0 (0.00%)	
Hispanic	1 (0.09%)	2 (0.17%)	0 (0.00%)	
Asian	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
Limited English Proficient	1 (0.09%)	1 (0.09%)	0 (0.00%)	
Free/Reduce Lunch	94 (8.12%)	128 (11.06%)	0 (0.00%)	
With Disability	158 (13.66%)	115 (9.94%)	0 (0.00%)	

Table 2: Schools That Did Not Make AYP by School Type

	Overall AYP	Other Academic Indicator	Reading AMO	Mathematics AMO	Participation Rate
Elementary (3-5)	69 (20.47%)	8 (2.37%)	62 (18.40%)	12 (3.56%)	0 (0.00%)
Middle (6-8)	120 (35.61%)	17 (5.04%)	114 (33.83%)	65 (19.29%)	0 (0.00%)
E,M (3-8)	4 (1.19%)	1 (0.30%)	3 (0.89%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
High (10-12)	134 (39.76%)	19 (5.64%)	41 (12.17%)	126 (37.39%)	0 (0.00%)
M,H (6-12)	7 (2.08%)	5 (1.48%)	2 (0.59%)	5 (1.48%)	0 (0.00%)
E, M, H (3-12)	3 (0.89%)	3 (0.89%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
Total	337 (100.00%)	53 (15.73%)	222 (65.88%)	208 (61.72%)	0 (0.00%)

E=Elementary School, M=Middle School, H=High School

Table 3: Percent of Target Goals That Were Met by School Type

	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-99%	100%	Total
Elementary (3-5)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.09%)	3 (0.26%)	14 (1.21%)	16 (1.38%)	35 (3.03%)	560 (48.40%)	629 (54.36%)
Middle (6-8)	3 (0.26%)	2 (0.17%)	5 (0.43%)	7 (0.61%)	20 (1.73%)	41 (3.54%)	42 (3.63%)	96 (8.30%)	216 (18.67%)
E,M (3-8)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.09%)	3 (0.26%)	77 (6.66%)	81 (7.00%)
High (10-12)	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.09%)	5 (0.43%)	18 (1.56%)	42 (3.63%)	29 (2.51%)	39 (3.37%)	67 (5.79%)	201 (17.37%)
M,H (6-12)	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.09%)	1 (0.09%)	1 (0.09%)	1 (0.09%)	1 (0.09%)	2 (0.17%)	11 (0.95%)	18 (1.56%)
E, M, H (3-12)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (0.17%)	1 (0.09%)	9 (0.78%)	12 (1.04%)
Total	3 (0.26%)	4 (0.35%)	12 (1.04%)	29 (2.51%)	77 (6.66%)	90 (7.78%)	122 (10.54%)	820 (70.87%)	1157 (100.00%)

E=Elementary School, M=Middle School, H=High School

Note: Table 1 is based on the 1157 accountable schools. The percentages are not mutually exclusive. For example, a school may not have made AYP in both reading and math.

*Demographic data is self-reported.

School District Results For 2008

Table 4: Districts That Did Not Make AYP by Subpopulation: 72 of 175 (41.14%)

Student Group*	Reading AMO	Mathematics AMO	Participation Rate	Other Academic Indicator
All Students	1 (0.57%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	24 (13.71%)
White (Non-Hispanic)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
African-American	5 (2.86%)	5 (2.86%)	0 (0.00%)	
Hispanic	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
Asian	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
Limited English Proficient	1 (0.57%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
Free/Reduce Lunch	3 (1.71%)	1 (0.57%)	0 (0.00%)	
With Disability	56 (32.00%)	29 (16.57%)	0 (0.00%)	

Table 5: Districts That Did Not Make AYP by District Type: 72 of 175 (41.14%)

	Overall AYP	Other Academic Indicator	Reading AMO	Mathematics AMO	Participation Rate
E,M (3-8)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
E, M, H (3-12)	72 (100.00%)	24 (33.33%)	56 (77.78%)	30 (41.67%)	0 (0.00%)
Total	72 (100.00%)	24 (33.33%)	56 (77.78%)	30 (41.67%)	0 (0.00%)

E=Elementary School, M=Middle School, H=High School

Table 6: Percent of Target Goals That Were Met by District Type

	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-99%	100%	Total
E,M (3-8)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	5 (2.86%)	5 (2.86%)
E, M, H (3-12)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.57%)	6 (3.43%)	24 (13.71%)	41 (23.43%)	98 (56.00%)	170 (97.14%)
Total	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.57%)	6 (3.43%)	24 (13.71%)	41 (23.43%)	103 (58.86%)	175 (100.00%)

E=Elementary School, M=Middle School, H=High School

Note: The percentages are not mutually exclusive. For example, a district may not have made AYP in both reading and math.

*Demographic data is self-reported

Results for Schools For 2008

Table 7: Title I Schools in Each Tier by School Type

	Tier							Total
	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Tier 4	Tier 5	Tier 5 - 2 nd Year	Tier 5 - 3 rd Year	
Elementary (3-5)	15	8	4	0	4	1	1	33
Middle (6-8)	13	10	10	6	17	0	1	57
E,M (3-8)	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
High (10-12)	4	4	3	1	11	0	0	23
M,H (6-12)	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	3
E, M, H (3-12)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	32	24	19	9	32	1	2	119

E=Elementary School, M=Middle School, H=High School

Table 8: Title I Districts in Each Tier by School Type

	Tier					Total
	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Tier 3 - 2 nd Year	Tier 3 - 3 rd Year	
E,M (3-8)	0	0	0	0	0	0
E, M, H (3-12)	3	13	18	16	17	67
Total	3	13	18	16	17	67

E=Elementary School, M=Middle School, H=High School

ATTACHMENT A

Federal and State School/District Two Dimensional Accountability Model

Federal and State School/District Two Dimensional Accountability Model

FEDERAL DIMENSION

STATE DIMENSION

	MAKE AYP	DID NOT MAKE AYP
MEET GOAL	NCLB:AYP STATE: Rewards	STATE: Rewards NCLB: Consequences
MEET GOAL AND DID NOT MEET DROPOUT OR NOVICE REDUCTION	NCLB:AYP STATE: No Rewards	NCLB: Consequences STATE: No Rewards
PROGRESSING	NCLB:AYP STATE: Rewards	STATE: Rewards NCLB: Consequences
PROGRESSING AND DID NOT MEET DROPOUT OR NOVICE REDUCTION OR SCHOOL DECLINE	NCLB:AYP STATE: No Rewards	NCLB: Consequences STATE: No Rewards
ASSISTANCE LEVEL 1	NCLB:AYP STATE: Assistance	NCLB: Consequences STATE: Assistance
ASSISTANCE LEVEL 2	NCLB:AYP STATE: Assistance	NCLB: Consequences STATE: Assistance
ASSISTANCE LEVEL 3	NCLB:AYP STATE: Assistance	NCLB: Consequences STATE: Assistance

ATTACHMENT B

Definitions for Implementation of NCLB for Districts and Schools, 2007 – 2008

Definitions for Implementation of NCLB for Districts and Schools, 2007 - 2008		
Issue	2007- 2008	Comments
Full Academic Year 703 KAR 5:001 Sec. 1 (21), (22)	One hundred (100) <i>instructional</i> days (not necessarily consecutive) of enrollment in a school, from the first day of school to the first day of testing window.	No change since 2003-2004
Sufficient Size for Participation Rate 703 KAR 5:001 Sec. 1 (35), (36), (52)	Computed only when the school or district has 10 subpopulation students per accountability grade tested per year and 60 subpopulation students overall at the school in the accountability grades tested.	No change since 2006-2007 when additional grades were included. Kentucky regulation permits up to a three year average of data in the calculation of participation rate. In 2008, only two years of data in Kentucky's revised assessment system is available.
Sufficient Size for Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) 703 KAR 5:001 Sec. 1 (52)	Both (1) and (2) below are required. Note that (2) may be accomplished in two ways: (1) 10 subpopulation students tested per grade per year; <u>and</u> (2) (a) 60 subpopulation students school-wide in the KCCT grades; <u>or</u> (b) Subpopulation count comprises 15% of all accountable students in the KCCT grades.	Size based on current year data only. Tests used for 2008 NCLB reporting are: KCCT Reading grades 3-8 & 10 KCCT Mathematics grades 3-8 & 11 KCCT Science grades 4, 7, & 11- administered but not reported on the NCLB report. Reported on the KPR.
Calculation of Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) 703 KAR 5:020 Sec. 10 (3), (9b) 703 KAR 5:130 Sec. 8 (3), (7b)	Calculations for 2008 NCLB reporting of Annual Measurable Objectives are based on current year data. If a school or district does not meet the AMO goal based on current year data, data may be averaged from performance of previous years.	Kentucky regulation permits up to a three year average of data in the calculation of participation rate. In 2008, only two years of data in Kentucky's revised assessment system is available.

Issue	2007- 2008	Comments
<p>Other Academic Indicator</p> <p>703 KAR 5:001 Sec. 1, (11b), (12b), (13b)</p> <p>703 KAR 5:020 Sec. 10, (2b), (5b)</p> <p>703 KAR 5:130 Sec. 8, (2b), (5b)</p>	<p>Use of CATS biennial or mid-point classification for elementary and middle schools from the prior year. This indicator will be considered to be met if a school is classified as progressing (any category), meets goal, or if in assistance has demonstrated growth in the accountability index at or above the state average for the specific grade-level configuration.</p> <p>Use of graduation rate from the prior year for high schools.</p>	<p>No change since 2004-2005.</p>
<p>Graduation Rate</p> <p>703 KAR 5:001</p>	<p>In addition to students who receive four-year diplomas, the following students qualify as graduates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students, who do not graduate in four years, but have an Individual Education Plan (IEP) documenting their need for more than four years of secondary school education to complete their program. 	<p>No change since 2003-2004.</p>
<p>Drop-Out Count</p>	<p>Students in the school drop-out count include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who withdraw from a Kentucky school <i>and</i> do not enroll in another school or district or district-contracted General Educational Diploma (GED) program, or • Students who enroll in a GED program, but do not earn their GED by October of the following year. 	<p>No change since 2004-2005.</p>

Issue	2007- 2008	Comments
Reporting Timeframe	Final reports in August 2008 reflect both multiple-choice and open-response results for KCCT reading and mathematics for students given in Spring 2008.	
Safe Harbor	Safe harbor provides a school/district that has not met the AMO in reading and mathematics a second opportunity to meet AMO by showing improvement in two specific ways. The school/district must have (1) reduced by 10% the percentage scoring below proficient of any group that did not meet the AMO target in reading or mathematics AND (2) demonstrated improvement on the academic index (improve or equal 100 or more) for the same student groups.	Removed in 2006-2007 because of one year of data in the revised KCCT format, added in 2007-2008.

Issue	2007- 2008	Comments
<p>Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students</p> <p>703 KAR 5:070 <i>Inclusion of Special Populations in the State-Required Assessment & Accountability Program</i></p>	<p><u>First Year:</u> New LEP students are counted in participation rate, but need not be included in AYP or CATS accountability. New LEP students ...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must be tested using a state-approved English language proficiency assessment. • Must be tested in mathematics (grades 3-8, 11). • May be tested in reading (grades 3-8, 10). • The English language proficiency test will be used for determining Participation Rate instead of reading. <p><u>Second and Subsequent Years:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must participate in all state-required assessments (except the Writing Portfolio which is not required in the second year). • The test scores of LEP students are included in AYP and the Commonwealth Accountability Testing System (CATS). <p><u>LEP Subpopulation Membership:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students must be retained in the LEP accountability subpopulation for up to 2 years following attainment of English proficiency as reflected on results of the state-approved English language proficiency test. • However, in connection with reporting subpopulation results, LEP students who have attained English proficiency may be excluded from <i>subpopulation size</i> computation. 	<p>No change since 2003-2004.</p>

ATTACHMENT C

No Child Left Behind Reporting
Kentucky 2008 Fact Sheet

How do schools and districts make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?

To make AYP, **all** students and student populations of sufficient size in the school and district must:

- a) Meet annual measurable objectives (AMO), a target expressed as the percentage of students reaching the Proficient performance level, in reading and mathematics;
- b) Show progress on the “Other Academic Indicator”
 - a) *prior year graduation rate at the high school level*
 - b) *prior year classification of any category of meets goal or progressing or if in assistance, growth at or above the state average for the specific grade configuration at the elementary and middle school levels; and*
- c) Test at least 95% of enrolled students and all subpopulations of sufficient size.

What student groups are reported?

All students; Race and Ethnicity: White (Non-Hispanic), African-American, Hispanic, and Asian; Limited English Proficiency; Economically Disadvantaged (Free and Reduced Lunch); and Students with Disabilities

How many students enrolled for a full academic year (100 instructional days) must be in a group each year before the group reaches sufficient size?

For reporting of Annual Measurable Objectives for Reading and Mathematics

- (a) 10 students per grade per year where NCLB assessments are administered; AND
- (b) 60 students when these grades are combined* OR 15% of the accountable students

For reporting of Participation Rate for Reading and Mathematics

- (a) 10 students per grade per year where NCLB assessments are administered; AND
- (b) 60 students per these grades combined

* *The Kentucky Core Content Tests (KCCT) in reading and mathematics are administered annually in grades 3—8 and once in high school—reading at grade 10 and mathematics at grade 11.*

To improve stability of data for student groups that are often small in number, NCLB permits states to use a confidence interval during reporting. Kentucky reports NCLB data with confidence bands.

What is safe harbor?

Safe harbor provides a school/district that has not met the AMO in reading or mathematics a second opportunity to meet AMO by showing improvement in two specific ways. The school/district must have (1) reduced by 10% the percentage scoring below proficient of any group that did not meet the AMO target in reading or mathematics AND (2) demonstrated improvement on the academic index (improve or equal 100 or more) for the same student groups.

How is the graduation rate calculated for the high school “other academic indicator”?

The “other academic indicator” is prior year data. The NCLB 2008 report of graduation rate is based on 2007 graduates. Schools meet this indicator if their graduation rate improved from 2006 or it is equal to or exceeds the state goal. The state goal for graduation rate for the 2008 report is 82.25.

Graduation rate is the quotient =

2007 on-time completers (standard diploma in 4 years & students whose IEPs stipulate they will need more than 4 years to obtain a standard diploma)

divided by

2007 all completers (including standard diploma, certificate of completion, and students taking more than 4 years to complete high school) + 2007 grade 12 dropouts + 2006 grade 11 dropouts + 2005 grade 10 dropouts + 2004 grade 9 dropouts

See the *2008 NCLB Interpretative Guide* that can be found on the Kentucky Department of Education’s Web site at: (<http://www.education.ky.gov>).

ATTACHMENT D

NCLB Consequences and the Timing of Consequences Tiers

NCLB Consequences:

PARENT NOTIFICATION (Notification to parents in a school identified for NCLB improvement)

- What NCLB Improvement School identification means
- Reasons for identification
- What the school is doing to improve
- How parents can become involved
- What district and KDE are doing

SCHOOL CHOICE (Parents' option to transfer student)

- All students in school identified as a NCLB Improvement School may transfer
- Can transfer to another public school in district not identified as a NCLB Improvement School
- Priority given to lowest-achieving children from low-income families
- District pays for transportation

Write or revise COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN to include

- Scientifically-researched instructional strategies
- Practices to improve core academic subjects
- Specifics for 10% of school's Title I allocation for professional development
- Strategies to promote effective parent involvement
- Extended school activities
- Teacher-mentoring program

Offer SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

- Low-income students attending school identified as a NCLB Improvement School
- Tutoring and academic intervention outside of the regular school day
- Provider must be approved by state
- District may become provider as long as District is not a Title I Improvement District

CORRECTIVE ACTION (District must do one of following)

- Replace school staff relevant to improvement
- Institute and implement new curriculum
- Decrease management authority consistent with state law
- Appoint an outside adviser
- Extend school day or year
- Restructure internal organization

RESTRUCTURING (District must prepare alternative governance arrangements by planning to implement one of the following)

- Replace all or most of staff relevant to failure
- Turn operation over to the state consistent with state law
- Determine any other major restructuring that makes fundamental reforms possible
- Implement if school continues not making AYP

The following provides information about the timing of NCLB consequences:

Tier 1 of Consequences (2 years not making AYP)

- Implement School Choice
- Write or Revise School Plan

Tier 2 of Consequences (3 years not making AYP)

- Continue School Choice
- Revise School Plan
- Offer Supplemental Services

Tier 3 of Consequences (4 years not making AYP)

- Continue School Choice
- Revise School Plan
- Continue Supplemental Services
- Institute Corrective Action

Tier 4 of Consequences (5 years not making AYP)

- Continue School Choice
- Revise School Plan
- Continue Supplemental Services
- Continue Corrective Action
- Write a Plan for Alternative Governance consistent with state law

Tier 5 of Consequences (6 years not making AYP)

- Continue School Choice
- Revise School Plan
- Continue Supplemental Services
- Continue Corrective Action
- Implement Alternative Governance consistent with state law

The table on the following page provides examples for determining the status of Title I schools based on AYP results.

Determining Status of Title I Schools Based on Adequate Yearly Progress Results						
Title I School Name	AYP Determination by Year					AYP Status
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	
Moore Elementary	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	OK!!!
ABC Elementary	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Tier 1 of Consequences
Heart Elementary	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Tier 2 of Consequences
David Elementary	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Out of NCLB Improvement
Active Elementary	No	No	No	No	Yes	Tier 3 of Consequences
Sims Middle School	No	No	No	No	No	Tier 4 of Consequences
Hill Middle School	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Tier 2 of Consequences
Jay Middle School	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Out of NCLB Improvement
Oh Boy High School	No	No	Yes	No	No	Tier 3 of Consequences
Hello High School	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Out of NCLB Improvement

The above table provides examples about when consequences are implemented under NCLB. Several additional points include:

- NCLB requires school transfer within the district. However, KDE encourages districts to work with neighboring districts for transfer arrangements, if another school of the same level does not exist in the district. If a child moves, the original district must provide transportation to the new school as long as the original school remains an NCLB Improvement School. If the original school's status changes, the child may continue at the new school but parents can be asked to assume the transportation responsibility.
- The replacement of staff would require the following of due process procedures and would have to be done within the constraints of the appropriate Kentucky Revised Statutes.
- A Highly Skilled Educator (HSE) could be an outside adviser.
- Restructuring has two components: developing the restructuring plan and implementing the plan the next year, if the school fails to make AYP again.

ATTACHMENT E

Annual Measurable Objectives in Reading and Mathematics
by School Year and School Configuration

**Annual Measurable Objectives in Reading and Mathematics
by School Year and School Configuration**

School Configuration												
School	Elementary		Middle		High		Primary – 08		Primary - 12		07 –12	
	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
2001-02	47.27	22.45	45.60	16.49	19.26	19.76	46.44	19.47	37.38	19.57	32.43	18.13
2002-03	47.27	22.45	45.60	16.49	19.26	19.76	46.44	19.47	37.38	19.57	32.43	18.13
2003-04	47.27	22.45	45.60	16.49	19.26	19.76	46.44	19.47	37.38	19.57	32.43	18.13
2004-05	53.86	32.14	52.40	26.93	29.35	29.79	53.14	29.54	45.21	29.62	40.88	28.36
2005-06	53.86	32.14	52.40	26.93	29.35	29.79	53.14	29.54	45.21	29.62	40.88	28.36
2006-07	53.86	32.14	52.40	26.93	29.35	29.79	53.14	29.54	45.21	29.62	40.88	28.36
2007-08	60.45	41.84	59.20	37.37	39.45	39.82	59.83	39.60	53.04	39.68	49.32	38.60
2008-09	67.04	51.53	66.00	47.81	49.54	49.85	66.53	49.67	60.86	49.73	57.77	48.83
2009-10	73.64	61.23	72.80	58.25	59.63	59.88	73.22	59.74	68.69	59.79	66.22	59.07
2010-11	80.23	70.92	79.60	68.68	69.72	69.91	79.92	69.80	76.52	69.84	74.66	69.30
2011-12	86.82	80.61	86.40	79.12	79.82	79.94	86.61	79.87	84.35	79.89	83.11	79.53
2012-13	93.41	90.31	93.20	89.56	89.91	89.97	93.31	89.93	92.17	89.95	91.55	89.77
2013-14	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

ATTACHMENT F

School and District Results For 2007

School Results For 2007

Table 1: Schools That Did Not Make AYP by Subpopulation: 249 of 1167 (21.34%)

Student Group*	Reading AMO	Mathematics AMO	Participation Rate	Other Academic Indicator
All Students	16 (1.37%)	11 (0.94%)	0 (0.00%)	31 (2.66%)
White (Non-Hispanic)	3 (0.26%)	6 (0.51%)	0 (0.00%)	
African-American	36 (3.08%)	31 (2.66%)	0 (0.00%)	
Hispanic	2 (0.17%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
Asian	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
Limited English Proficient	3 (0.26%)	1 (0.09%)	0 (0.00%)	
Free/Reduce Lunch	39 (3.34%)	45 (3.86%)	0 (0.00%)	
With Disability	154 (13.20%)	134 (11.48%)	0 (0.00%)	

Table 2: Schools That Did Not Make AYP by School Type

	Overall AYP	Other Academic Indicator	Reading AMO	Mathematics AMO	Participation Rate
Elementary (3-5)	40 (16.06%)	5 (2.01%)	32 (12.85%)	11 (4.42%)	0 (0.00%)
Middle (6-8)	113 (45.38%)	7 (2.81%)	110 (44.18%)	65 (26.10%)	0 (0.00%)
E,M (3-8)	2 (0.80%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (0.76%)	2 (0.76%)	0 (0.00%)
High (10-12)	91 (36.55%)	18 (7.23%)	26 (10.44%)	85 (34.14%)	0 (0.00%)
M,H (6-12)	3 (1.20%)	1 (0.40%)	2 (0.80%)	2 (0.80%)	0 (0.00%)
E, M, H (3-12)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
Total	249 (100.00%)	31 (12.45%)	172 (69.08%)	164 (65.86%)	0 (0.00%)

E=Elementary School, M=Middle School, H=High School

Table 3: Percent of Target Goals That Were Met by School Type

	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-99%	100%	Total
Elementary (3-5)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (0.26%)	5 (0.43%)	10 (0.86%)	22 (1.89%)	600 (51.41%)	640 (54.84%)
Middle (6-8)	1 (0.09%)	1 (0.09%)	1 (0.09%)	6 (0.51%)	10 (0.86%)	49 (4.20%)	45 (3.86%)	104 (8.91%)	217 (18.59%)
E,M (3-8)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.09%)	1 (0.09%)	77 (6.60%)	79 (6.77%)
High (10-12)	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.09%)	0 (0.00%)	4 (0.34%)	12 (1.03%)	28 (2.40%)	46 (3.94%)	112 (9.60%)	203 (17.40%)
M,H (6-12)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.09%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.09%)	1 (0.09%)	14 (1.20%)	17 (1.46%)
E, M, H (3-12)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	11 (0.94%)	11 (0.94%)
Total	1 (0.09%)	2 (0.17%)	2 (0.17%)	13 (1.11%)	27 (2.31%)	89 (7.63%)	115 (9.85%)	918 (78.66%)	1167 (100.00%)

E=Elementary School, M=Middle School, H=High School

Note: Table 1 is based on the 1167 accountable schools. The percentages are not mutually exclusive. For example, a school may not have made AYP in both reading and math.

*Demographic data is self-reported.

School District Results For 2007

Table 4: Districts That Did Not Make AYP by Subpopulation: 50 of 175 (28.57%)

Student Group*	Reading AMO	Mathematics AMO	Participation Rate	Other Academic Indicator
All Students	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	18 (10.29%)
White (Non-Hispanic)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
African-American	2 (1.14%)	2 (1.14%)	0 (0.00%)	
Hispanic	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
Asian	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
Limited English Proficient	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
Free/Reduce Lunch	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
With Disability	35 (20.00%)	28 (16.00%)	0 (0.00%)	

Table 5: Districts That Did Not Make AYP by District Type: 50 of 175 (28.57%)

	Overall AYP	Other Academic Indicator	Reading AMO	Mathematics AMO	Participation Rate
E,M (3-8)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
E, M, H (3-12)	50 (100.00%)	18 (36.00%)	36 (72.00%)	28 (56.00%)	0 (0.00%)
Total	50 (100.00%)	18 (36.00%)	36 (72.00%)	28 (56.00%)	0 (0.00%)

E=Elementary School, M=Middle School, H=High School

Table 6: Percent of Target Goals That Were Met by District Type

	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-99%	100%	Total
E,M (3-8)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	5 (2.86%)	5 (2.86%)
E, M, H (3-12)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	4 (2.29%)	20 (11.43%)	26 (14.86%)	120 (68.57%)	170 (97.14%)
Total	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	4 (2.29%)	20 (11.43%)	26 (14.86%)	125 (71.43%)	175 (100.00%)

E=Elementary School, M=Middle School, H=High School

Note: The percentages are not mutually exclusive. For example, a district may not have made AYP in both reading and math.

*Demographic data is self-reported

Results for Schools For 2007

Table 7: Title I Schools in Each Tier by School Type

	Tier					
	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Tier 4	Tier 5	Tier 5 - 2 nd Year
Elementary (3-5)	18	9	6	4	0	2
Middle (6-8)	18	14	8	23	1	2
E,M (3-8)	5	1	2	0	0	0
High (10-12)	6	5	1	13	0	0
M,H (6-12)	1	2	2	0	0	0
E, M, H (3-12)	1	0	0	0	0	0
Total	49	31	18	40	1	4

E=Elementary School, M=Middle School, H=High School

Table 8: Title I Districts in Each Tier by School Type

	Tier			
	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Tier 3 - 2 nd Year
E,M (3-8)	0	0	0	0
E, M, H (3-12)	24	20	25	22
Total	24	20	25	22

E=Elementary School, M=Middle School, H=High School

ATTACHMENT G

School and District Results For 2006

Results For 2006

Table 1: Schools That Did Not Make AYP by Subpopulation: 393 of 1164 (33.76%)

Student Group*	Reading AMO	Mathematics AMO	Participation Rate	Other Academic Indicator
All Students	45 (3.87%)	57 (4.90%)	0 (0.00%)	52 (4.47%)
White (Non-Hispanic)	18 (1.55%)	41 (3.52%)	0 (0.00%)	
African-American	61 (5.24%)	84 (7.22%)	0 (0.00%)	
Hispanic	7 (0.60%)	7 (0.60%)	0 (0.00%)	
Asian	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
Limited English Proficient	3 (0.26%)	3 (0.26%)	0 (0.00%)	
Free/Reduce Lunch	115 (9.88%)	180 (15.46%)	0 (0.00%)	
With Disability	234 (20.10%)	188 (16.15%)	0 (0.00%)	

Table 2: Schools That Did Not Make AYP by School Type

	Overall AYP	Other Academic Indicator	Reading AMO	Mathematics AMO	Participation Rate
Elementary (4-5)	68 (17.30%)	20 (5.09%)	43 (10.94%)	30 (7.63%)	0 (0.00%)
Middle (7-8)	140 (35.62%)	10 (2.54%)	116 (29.52%)	113 (28.75%)	0 (0.00%)
E,M (4-8)	17 (4.33%)	4 (1.02%)	8 (2.04%)	14 (3.56%)	0 (0.00%)
High (10-12)	157 (39.95%)	12 (3.05%)	125 (31.81%)	131 (32.33%)	0 (0.00%)
M,H (7-12)	10 (2.54%)	5 (1.27%)	5 (1.27%)	9 (2.29%)	0 (0.00%)
E, M, H (4-12)	1 (0.25%)	1 (0.25%)	1 (0.25%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
Total	393 (100.00%)	52 (13.23%)	298 (75.83%)	297 (75.57%)	0 (0.00%)

E=Elementary School, M=Middle School, H=High School

Table 3: Percent of Target Goals That Were Met by School Type

	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-99%	100%
Elementary (4-5)	0 (0.00%)	2 (0.32%)	1 (0.16%)	7 (1.11%)	7 (1.11%)	15 (2.38%)	36 (5.72%)	561 (89.19%)
Middle (7-8)	2 (0.95%)	4 (1.90%)	5 (2.38%)	19 (9.05%)	27 (12.86%)	42 (20.00%)	41 (19.52%)	70 (33.33%)
E,M (4-8)	0 (0.00%)	1 (1.08%)	0 (0.00%)	5 (5.38%)	3 (3.23%)	3 (3.23%)	4 (4.30%)	76 (81.72%)
High (10-12)	0 (0.00%)	2 (0.99%)	11 (5.42%)	23 (11.33%)	31 (15.27%)	49 (24.14%)	41 (20.20%)	46 (22.66%)
M,H (7-12)	3 (15.79%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (5.26%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (10.53%)	1 (5.26%)	3 (15.79%)	9 (47.37%)
E, M, H (4-12)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (10.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	9 (90.00%)
Total	5 (0.43%)	9 (0.77%)	19 (1.63%)	54 (4.64%)	70 (6.01%)	110 (9.45%)	125 (10.74%)	771 (66.24%)

E=Elementary School, M=Middle School, H=High School

Note: Table 1 is based on the 1164 accountable schools. The percentages are not mutually exclusive. For example, a school may not have made AYP in both reading and math.

*Demographic data is self-reported.

School District Results For 2006

Table 4: Districts That Did Not Make AYP by Subpopulation: 98 of 176 (55.68%)

Student Group*	Reading AMO	Mathematics AMO	Participation Rate	Other Academic Indicator
All Students	4 (2.27%)	6 (3.41%)	0 (0.00%)	12 (6.82%)
White (Non-Hispanic)	4 (2.27%)	6 (3.41%)	0 (0.00%)	
African-American	10 (5.68%)	17 (9.66%)	0 (0.00%)	
Hispanic	2 (1.14%)	2 (1.14%)	0 (0.00%)	
Asian	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
Limited English Proficient	1 (0.57%)	1 (0.57%)	0 (0.00%)	
Free/Reduce Lunch	22 (12.50%)	42 (23.86)	0 (0.00%)	
With Disability	65 (36.93%)	59 (33.52%)	0 (0.00%)	

Table 5: Districts That Did Not Make AYP by District Type: 96 of 176 (54.55%)

	Overall AYP	Other Academic Indicator	Reading AMO	Mathematics AMO	Participation Rate
E,M (4-8)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
E, M, H (4-12)	98 (100.00%)	12 (12.24%)	75 (76.53%)	82 (83.67%)	0 (0.00%)
Total	98 (100.00%)	12 (12.24%)	75 (76.53%)	82 (83.67%)	0 (0.00%)

E=Elementary School, M=Middle School, H=High School

Table 6: Percent of Target Goals That Were Met by District Type

	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-99%	100%
E,M (4-8)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	5 (100.00%)
E, M, H (4-12)	1 (0.58%)	2 (1.17%)	5 (2.92%)	7 (4.09%)	18 (10.53%)	34 (19.88%)	31 (18.13%)	73 (42.69%)
Total	1 (0.57%)	2 (1.14%)	5 (2.84%)	7 (3.98%)	18 (10.23%)	34 (19.32%)	31 (17.61%)	78 (44.32%)

E=Elementary School, M=Middle School, H=High School

Note: The percentages are not mutually exclusive. For example, a district may not have made AYP in both reading and math.

*Demographic data is self-reported

Results for Schools For 2006

Table 7: Title I Schools in Each Tier by School Type

	Tier				
	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Tier 4	Tier 5
Elementary (4-5)	22	10	11	0	2
Middle (7-8)	18	10	30	0	3
E,M (4-8)	7	1	1	0	0
High (10-12)	16	3	13	1	0
M,H (7-12)	3	2	1	0	0
E, M, H (4-12)	1	0	0	0	0
Total	67	26	56	1	5

E=Elementary School, M=Middle School, H=High School

Table 8: Title I Districts in Each Tier by School Type

	Tier				
	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Tier 4	Tier 5
E,M (4-8)	0	0	0	0	0
E, M, H (4-12)	38	10	44	0	0
Total	38	10	44	0	0

E=Elementary School, M=Middle School, H=High School