

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:  
Part II**

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

**For reporting on  
School Year 2018-19**

**Kentucky**



**PART II DUE THURSDAY, MAY 28, 2020**

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

## INTRODUCTION

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) is the required annual reporting tool for each State, the Bureau of Indian Education, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico as authorized under Section 8303<sup>1</sup> of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015(ESSA)<sup>2</sup>.

### Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0724. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 35.00 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain a benefit under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202.

---

<sup>1</sup> SEC.8303. Consolidated Reporting – (a) In general: In order to simplify reporting requirements and reduce reporting burdens, the Secretary shall establish procedures and criteria under which a State educational agency, in consultation with the Governor of the State, may submit a consolidated State annual report. (b) Contents: The report shall contain information about the programs included in the report, including the performance of the State under those programs, and other matters as the Secretary determines are necessary, such as monitoring activities. (c) Replacement: The report shall replace separate individual annual reports for the programs included in the consolidated State annual report.

<sup>2</sup> All citations to the ESEA in this document are to the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA.

OMB Number: 1810-0724
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

Consolidated State Performance Report  
For  
State Formula Grant Programs  
under the  
Elementary And Secondary Education Act  
as amended in 2001

**Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:**

Part I, 2018-19     Part II, 2018-19

**Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:**

Kentucky Department of Education

**Address:**

**Person to contact about this report:**

**Name:**

Jennifer Fraker

**Telephone:**

(502) 564-9850

**Fax:**

(502) 564-5680

**e-mail:**

Jennifer.Fraker@education.ky.gov

**Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):**

Kevin C. Brown

**Submitted Date and Time:**

06/25/20 1:05:11 PM

## 2.1 ACCOUNTABILITY

### 2.1.1 School Performance on Accountability Indicators

The following indicators are collected through ESS and compiled in the EDEN036 report via the ED*Facts* Reporting System (ERS) and will be posted as an accompanying report for every State:

- LEA Name
- NCES LEA ID
- State LEA ID
- School Name
- NCES School ID
- State School ID
- Title I School Status - DG 22 (FS129)
- Academic achievement indicator status – DG 835 (FS200)
- Other academic indicator status DG 836 (FS201)
- Graduation rate indicator status – DG 834 (FS199)
- Progress achieving English language proficiency indicator status - DG 837 (FS205)
- School quality or student success indicator status – DG 838 (FS202)

The ED*Facts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report. Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR DOCX.

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

**2.1.2 Schools Identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement**

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, overall and by reason identified.

	Number of Schools	Number of Title I Schools	Number of non-Title I Schools
Lowest performing five percent of Title I schools	49		
High schools failing to graduate one third or more of their students	3	3	0
Title I schools that have received additional targeted support under Section 1111(d)(2)(C) of the <i>ESEA</i> and that have not exited that status after a State-determined number of years			
Total Identified	52		

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

**2.1.3 Schools Implementing Targeted Support and Improvement Plans**

In the table below, provide the number of schools implementing targeted support and improvement plans.

	Number of Schools	Number of Title I Schools	Number of non- Title I Schools
Schools with One or More Consistently Underperforming Subgroups of Students			
Schools in which any Subgroup of Students, on its own, would lead to Identification Under <i>ESEA</i> Section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) (i.e., Schools Receiving Additional Targeted Support)	9	2	7

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

**2.1.4 Section 1003 of the ESEA School Improvement Funds**

In the tables below, provide the amount of Section 1003 funds of the *ESEA* allocated to each district and school.

**2.1.4.1 Section 1003 of the ESEA Allocations to LEAs**

For each LEA receiving a 1003(a) allocation, list the amount of the allocation. The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003 Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS).

- Name of LEA with One or More Schools Provided Assistance through Section 1003(a) of the *ESEA* Funds in SY 2018-19
- NCES LEA ID
- Amount of LEA's Section 1003(a) of the *ESEA* Allocation

The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report. Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN012 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR DOCX.

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

**2.1.4.2 Section 1003 of the ESEA Allocations to Schools**

For each school receiving a Section 1003(a) allocation of the *ESEA*, list the amount of the allocation. The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003 Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS).

- Name of School Provided Assistance through Section 1003(a) of the *ESEA* Funds in SY 2018-19
- NCES School ID
- Amount of School's Section1003(a) of the *ESEA* Allocation

The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report. Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN012 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR DOCX.

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



## 2.2 GRADUATION RATES AND POSTSECONDARY ENROLLMENT

This section collects data on graduation rates and rates of postsecondary enrollment.

### 2.2.1 Four Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the state's four year adjusted cohort graduation rates for the current reporting period.

Student Group	# Students in Cohort	# of Graduates	Graduation Rate
All students	50,059	S	90.6%
American Indian or Alaska Native	60	S	>=90%
Asian or Pacific Islander	993	S	94%
<i>Asian</i>	926	S	94%
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	67	S	88%
Black or African American	5,629	S	83.2%
Hispanic or Latino	2,953	S	84%
White	39,092	S	92.1%
Two or more races	1,332	S	89%
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	4,656	S	75.5%
English Learners	1,404	S	74%
Economically disadvantaged students	26,225	S	87.8%
Children in foster care			
Children who are homeless	245	S	16%

#### Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) on graduation rates:

*What is the adjusted cohort graduation rate?* The adjusted cohort graduation rate is described in sections 8101(23) and 8101(25) of the ESEA.

**Comments:** The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**2.2.2 Postsecondary Enrollment**

In the table below, provide counts of students who enrolled in programs of postsecondary education during the current reporting period. If data are missing or incomplete, please explain in the comments.

	# Enrolled in an IHE	# Not enrolled in an IHE	# for which data are unavailable	Total
All students	23,824	20,981		S
American Indian or Alaska Native	47	31		S
Asian or Pacific Islander	414	267		S
<i>Asian</i>	393	247		S
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	21	20		S
Black or African American	2,078	2,406		S
Hispanic or Latino	1,172	1,102		S
White	19,131	16,880		S
Two or more races	982	295		S
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	626	2,491		S
English Learners	168	355		S
Economically disadvantaged students	10,003	13,206		S

**Comments:** The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

**2.3 TITLE I, PART A PROGRAM PARTICIPATION**

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

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

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

<b>Special Services or Programs</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	80,923
English learners	22,256
Homeless students	18,246
Migrant students	2,675

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

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

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

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

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
American Indian or Alaska Native	567
Asian	6,127
Black or African American	52,996
Hispanic or Latino	36,165
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	738
White	346,336
Two or more races	20,173
Total	463,102

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

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

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

<b>Age /Grade</b>	<b>Public TAS</b>	<b>Public SWP</b>	<b>Private</b>	<b>Local Neglected</b>	<b>Total</b>
Age Birth through 2	0	1,988	34	0	2,022
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	19	22,258	45	0	22,322
K	14	44,239	329	3	44,585
1	94	40,725	378	7	41,204
2	96	43,020	329	10	43,455
3	78	42,973	344	35	43,430
4	118	45,092	351	28	45,589
5	60	45,560	354	33	46,007
6	29	36,792	269	52	37,142
7	27	33,339	198	79	33,643
8	20	32,243	204	96	32,563
9	3	20,178	109	144	20,434
10	23	19,144	96	156	19,419
11	11	17,663	64	102	17,840
12	14	17,106	58	57	17,235
Ungraded	0	176	0	19	195
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>462,496</b>	<b>3,162</b>	<b>821</b>	<b>467,085</b>

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

## 2.4 EDUCATION OF MIGRATORY CHILDREN

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (MEP) (Title I, Part C) for the performance period of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019. This section is composed of the following subsections:

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

Report a child in the age/grade category in which the child spent the *majority of their time* while residing in the State during the performance period.

There are two exceptions to this rule:

1. A child who turns 3 during the performance period is reported as "Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)," **only if the child's residency in the state was verified after the child turned 3.**
2. A child who turns 22 years of age during the performance is reported at the appropriate age/grade category for the performance period.

### 2.4.1 Migratory Child Counts

This section collects the Title I, Part C, MEP child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the performance period of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, reliable, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each State Education Agency (SEA) should have implemented sufficient procedures and internal controls to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migratory children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must disclose known data limitations to the Department, and explain how and when it will resolve data quality issues through corrective actions in the box below, which precedes Section 2.4.1.1 *Category 1 Child Count*.

**Note:** In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the State has taken action to ensure that the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false Statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §1001.

#### FAQs on Child Count:

*a. How is "out-of-school" defined?* Out-of-school means children up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This term could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a high school equivalency diploma (HSED) outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It would not include children in preschool, nor does it include temporary absences (e.g., summer/intersession, suspension or illness). Enrollment in school is not a condition affecting eligibility for the MEP. Therefore, out-of-school youth who meet the definition of a "migratory child" are eligible for the MEP.

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

*c. How is reporting a child "in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State" defined?* A State must report a child in **only one** age/grade category in which the child spent the majority of his/her time **while residing in the State**. For example, a migratory child resided in State A for three months and in State B for nine months in SY2018-19. While in State A, the child enrolled in ninth grade for two months and in tenth grade for one month. Therefore, State A will report the child in the age/grade category of ninth grade, because the child spent the majority of his/her time in ninth grade in State A. In State B, the child enrolled in eighth grade for one month and in ninth grade for eight months. Therefore, State B will report the child in the age/grade category of ninth grade, because the child spent the majority of his/her time in ninth grade in State B.

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based and how and when these concerns will be resolved.

**Comments:** The response is limited to 8,000 characters.  
There are no concerns with this data.

**2.4.1.1 Category 1 Child Count (Eligible Migratory Children)**

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migratory children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019. This figure includes all eligible migratory children who may or may not have received MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State, during the performance period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include children age birth through 2 years.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Eligible Migratory Children</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	776
K	413
1	398
2	356
3	376
4	383
5	356
6	357
7	320
8	277
9	396
10	222
11	190
12	137
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	850
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,807</b>

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

**2.4.1.2 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

**Comments:** The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

KDE had an increase in category child count 1, this can be attributed to making recruiting a priority in our state. Since the implementation ESSA, we have implemented a variety of strategies to improve our recruiting strategies. Some LEAs have doubled their numbers from previous years because they have recruited more refugee students that have moved "soon after," or within 60 days of the move and engaged in qualifying work.



**2.4.1.3 Birth through Two Child Count**

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migratory children from birth through age 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Eligible Migratory Children</b>
Age Birth through 2	314

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

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

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migratory children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were **served** for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State, during the performance period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).

Age/Grade	Eligible Migratory Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	528
K	268
1	266
2	244
3	265
4	271
5	257
6	251
7	221
8	200
9	259
10	146
11	119
12	14
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	306
Total	3,615

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

**2.4.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

**Comments:** The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

This data is populated from the MIS2000 migrant state database. Since there was an increase in students overall, KY likewise increased our summer numbers and summer services. Kentucky was able to serve 588 more students this year than in years past. The KYMEP has worked extra hard to serve students according to our SDP and ensure that the migrant students do not have a summer slide. Migrant staff have exhausted every avenue to ensure all the migrant students, including those identified as priority for service are being provided services.

**2.4.2.2 Birth through Two Eligible Migratory Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term**

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migratory children from age birth through 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migratory Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	72

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

### 2.4.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

#### 2.4.3.1 Methods Used to Count Children

In the space below, please describe the procedures and processes at the State level used to ensure all eligible children, ages 3-21 are reported. In particular, describe how the State includes and counts only:

- The unduplicated count of eligible migratory children, ages 3-21. Only include children two years of age whose residency in the state has been verified after turning three.
- Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a qualifying move, engaged or had parents engage in migratory agricultural or fishing work, and were entitled to a free public education through grade 12 in the State, or preschool children below the age and grade level at which the agency provides free public education). Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31).
- Children who graduated from high school or attained a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) *during the performance period* and ensures that these children are not counted in the subsequent performance period's child count.
- Children who—in the case of Category 2—were serviced for one or more days in a MEP- funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods.
- Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.
- Children who had an SEA approved Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and were entered in the State's migratory student database.

**Comments:** The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Kentucky generates the CAT1 and CAT2 reports for CSPR using MIS2000. Once a query is run, the database can filter out any child who did not meet specified criteria during the child count period. The CAT1 report uses the start and end dates of 9/1/18 through 8/31/19 to determine the number of eligible students that has an approved Certificate of Eligibility (COE) in our database. The report asks that the QAD be within three years of the start date; the 3rd birthday is less than the withdraw and end date; the 22nd birthday is greater than the funding and end date; and the termination, funding, withdrawal, residency and QAD dates are between the start and ending dates. If a student graduated from high school or attained a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) during the performance period, these students would not be counted in the subsequent performance period's child count. Students who turn three during the performance period are counted in the under 3 category unless they have a MEP-provided service recorded during the performance period after their third birthday, have a verification date, residency date, or enrollment date after their third birthday. Only then are they counted in the 3to5 NotK category. We also enlisted a new policy in Kentucky that once a student turns three that the advocate completes an individual withdrawal form and indicates a withdrawal date and a verification date that the child was seen in the district after their third birthdate.

In the case of Category 2, using a MIS2000 report, the summer/intersession count is generated by using 9/1/18 to 8/31/19 as the start and end dates with the "End of Regular Year" as 6/15/19, indicating a child has attended at least one day of summer school or intersession. The child category 2 count is a subset of the category 1 count. The report asks that the QAD be within three years (36 months) of the start date; the 3rd birthday is less than the withdraw and end date; the 22nd birthday is greater than the funding and end date; and that the termination, funding, withdrawal, residency and QAD dates are between the start and ending dates. As a result, the report is designed to locate all children whose eligibility ended before the start dates of summer or intersession services and these are not included in Category 2. Summer school is indicated by "S" being placed in the enrollment type and intersession is indicated by "I" being placed in the enrollment type. These students are recipients of MEP-funded services. As part of its quality control process, Kentucky's migrant clerks run a report at the end of the summer to ensure that each student received a summer service and remains with an "S" enrollment. For those students that did not receive a summer service, The clerks will mark those students as "R" residency only so they would not be added to our summer counts in CSPR. Then the migrant state director will randomly review summer services to ensure they are being marked correctly in the state database. Kentucky has a quality control procedure to ensure only students with summer funding are added to our state's child category 2 count.

To assure students are counted once per category/age/grade, every child is assigned a unique identification number. Each student receives a unique number every time an electronic Certificate of Eligibility has been created. Then the clerks will check to see if the student has enrolled in a Kentucky school previously. The clerk then determines if the student is already in the database or needs a new identification number. If the duplicate counts are not found during this process, the state director will run a monthly report generated from MIS2000 of possible duplicate students and will merge those students records. We also check MSIX and ensure the two Kentucky IDs are merged in the state database as well. This is explained further below.

To verify that all children resided in the state at least one day during the performance period, a verification signature, or a new COE for children with a QAD during the performance period, is collected on all children included in the CAT1 count. Any students whose residence in the district cannot be verified either directly from the MEP staff or by a reliable source (school personnel, landlord, or employer), their enrollment line is removed from the database. Verification signatures are collected on a verification tab on the electronic certificate of eligibility (eCOE). Then the verification dates are also collected and verified to ensure the child was there during the performance period. If the family still resides within the district during the remaining three years of eligibility, a parent's signature is obtained on the verification tab. The clerks run verification reports to ensure all students have a verification ID prior to December 15 of the current year. The students' names from the COEs along with the parents' signatures are matched with the unduplicated list of students used for the child count to validate residence within Kentucky.

The regional data clerks send current enrollment reports (including birthday and grades) to migrant district personnel to review on a monthly basis. The advocates in the district can also pull the current enrollment reports from our MIS200 web app. If a student on the report has moved, graduated, obtained a GED, or died, the district withdraws the student and documents the graduation, death or moving date. Districts are also

expected to complete a needs assessment within two weeks of a child turning three or starting a new enrollment. Districts receive a monthly report showing students' grade/age and if they have a completed needs assessment. Kentucky ensures that all three year old students have a completed needs assessment and a verified residency date to make sure they were in the district one day after their third birthdate. Once a student has been entered into MIS2000, an on-going procedure is used to eliminate any duplicates. Every records clerk runs a "Potential Duplicate Student" report quarterly and the KDE migrant consultant runs the report monthly. The PDS report looks at matching birthdates, close birthdates, birthdates and last or first name, first name of potentially adopted duplicates and the same student number. If the clerk finds duplicate students, an email is sent to the state consultant for the records to be merged. The student number to be retained is identified (usually the oldest). If the state consultant cannot determine which student number to retain, the local migrant projects are consulted and the determination is made from there. Kentucky is confident that unique identification numbers are assigned for each child. The MIS2000 child counts determine this from selected factors, such as birthplace, parents' names, and student names and the child will be counted one time for funding purposes. MSIX also helps to determine potential duplicate students. We also merge KY IDs that are found in MSIX. We have a similar process in which the data administrator will send the KDE consultant/state director the two IDs and they are merged. The state consultant determines merges for migrant students in MSIX, and if necessary, merges any duplicate students in the MIS2000 database. Kentucky's LEA's use Infinite Campus, state student information system to capture all student level data. Kentucky has generated a list of migrant students from Infinite Campus and added their MIS2000 IDs within the program participation section. Migrant student ID's have been stored in Infinite Campus for a number of years, indicating the year(s) student are served in the migrant program. This has improved the identification of migrant students for state reporting. Quarterly data checks are performed to compare Infinite Campus to MIS2000.

Does the State ensure that the system that transmits migrant data to the Department accurately accounts for all the migratory children in every ED*Facts* data file? See the Office of Migrant Education's CSPR Rating Instrument for the criteria needed to address this question. Please respond in the table below.

<b>Accuracy of ED<i>Facts</i> Data Files</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>
The State deployed a process that ensured that it transmits accurate migrant data to the Department in every required ED <i>Facts</i> data file.	YES
<b>Use of MSIX to Verify Data Quality</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>
Does the State use data in the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) to verify the quality of migrant data?	YES

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

**Comments:** The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

MSIX helps to determine potential duplicate students. The state consultants and regional staff will determine which records should be merged in MSIX, and if necessary, updates to the MIS2000 database are conducted. Kentucky desires to ensure that our migrant child counts are accurate; therefore, when two records are merged from Kentucky in MSIX, we also ensure the records are merged in the MIS2000 database.

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

Recently, Kentucky has used the Child Count Reconciliation reports to help ensure that are migrant counts in CSPR are accurate and being accounted for in MSIX. The state director used this report to compare the students recorded in CSPR and those in MSIX to locate discrepancies.

**2.4.3.2 Quality Control Processes**

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

<b>Results</b>	<b>#</b>
The number of eligibility determinations sampled.	120
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	67
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	67

  

<b>Procedures</b>	<b>SY</b>
What was the most recent year that the MEP conducted independent prospective re-interviews (i.e., interviewers were neither SEA or LEA staff members responsible for administering or operating the MEP, nor any other persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested)? If independent prospective re-interviews were not administered in any of the three performance periods, please provide an explanation in the "Comment" row at the end of this table.	2017-2018

**Comments:** The response is limited to 8,000 characters.  
 Kentucky completed re-interviews after ESEA in May 21-24, 2018 with an independent contractor.

**FAQ on independent prospective re-interviews:**

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

<b>Obtaining Data from Families</b>	<b>Re-interview Method</b>
Select how the re-interviews were conducted: Face-to-face re-interviews Phone Interviews Both	Face-to-face interviews

<b>Obtaining Data from Families</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>
Was there a protocol for verifying all information used in making the original eligibility determination?	YES
Were re-interviewers independent from the original interviewers?	YES

If you did conduct independent re-interviews in this reporting period, describe how you ensured that the process was independent. Only enter a response if your State completed independent re-interviews in SY 2018-19.

**Comments:** The response is limited to 8,000 characters.  
 Not applicable

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

**Comments:** The response is limited to 8,000 characters.  
 The KY MEP 2018-2019 internal re-interview occurred at each of the four regions throughout the performance period of September 1, 2018 to August 31, 2019. A total of 67 re-interviews were conducted from a region-wide sample of randomly selected migrant children. After revising all the completed forms and clarifying information provided by the region, a review panel determined that all 67 children in the sample were eligible. During the review, the panel found a few COE quality control issues. Although these issues did not affect the eligibility of any child in the sample, some documentation has to be corrected to demonstrate what the panel found. The panel and migrant staff provided recommendations for improving quality control to the regional MEP.

**COE Errors**

Child born after the move: This child was not selected for re-interviews, but was on the COE of one of the student's that was selected. We provided information to the district and the region as to why this student would not qualify.

More Recent Qualifying move: We were able to update a COE based upon a more recent move that was not discovered until re-interviews. We instructed the region and district during verification time to be sure to ask the families if they made any additional moves to lengthen eligibility. We provide annual training.

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

	<b>Yes/No</b>
Does the state collect all the required data elements and data sections on the National Certificate of Eligibility (COE)?	YES

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





**2.4.4 Eligible Migratory Children**

**2.4.4.1 Priority for Services**

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	11
K	95
1	81
2	77
3	93
4	88
5	93
6	87
7	98
8	91
9	57
10	29
11	21
12	11
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	932

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

**FAQ on priority for services:**

*Who is classified as having "priority for service?"* Migratory children who have made a qualifying move within the previous 1-year period and who 1) are failing, or most at risk of failing to meet challenging State academic standards, or 2) have dropped out of school.

**2.4.4.2 English Learners (ELs)**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migratory children who are also ELs. The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>ELs During the Performance Period</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	263
K	202
1	223
2	201
3	210
4	187
5	179
6	146
7	134
8	128
9	206
10	89
11	80
12	45
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	2,293

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

**2.4.4.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	49
K	54
1	47
2	45
3	47
4	50
5	36
6	40
7	36
8	21
9	24
10	25
11	10
12	8
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
<b>Total</b>	<b>492</b>

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

**2.4.4.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migratory children whose QAD occurred within 12 months from the last day of the performance period, August 31, 2019 (i.e., QAD during the performance period). The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>QAD During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	187
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	280
K	150
1	149
2	121
3	146
4	128
5	109
6	132
7	107
8	104
9	167
10	48
11	47
12	23
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	449
Total	2,347

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

### 2.4.5 Academic Status

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

#### 2.4.5.1 Dropouts

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

Grade	Dropouts During the Performance Period
7	1
8	1
9	6
10	7
11	6
12	2
Ungraded	
Total	23

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

#### FAQ on Dropouts:

*How is "dropouts" defined?* The term used for students, who, (1) were enrolled in a school for at least one day during the 2018-19 performance period, (2) were not enrolled at the beginning of the current (2018-19) performance period, (3) who have not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program, and (4) who do not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: (a) transfer to another 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. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2018-19 performance period should not be reported in this item.

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

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

<b>Obtain HSED</b>	<b>#</b>
Obtained a HSED in your State During the Performance Period	0

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

KY did not have any migrant population students obtain a High School Equivalency Diploma for 2018-19. We had one student who obtained a GED; however, according to ESSA, a GED isn't recognized as an equivalent diploma for Cohort.

**2.4.6 MEP Services - During the Performance Period**

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

**FAQ on Services:**

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

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Served During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	231
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	740
K	393
1	382
2	348
3	355
4	367
5	346
6	338
7	304
8	265
9	383
10	213
11	178
12	130
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	769
Total	5,742

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

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

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Priority for Services During the Performance Period</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	11
K	90
1	79
2	73
3	87
4	86
5	92
6	79
7	94
8	89
9	55
10	29
11	20
12	11
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>895</b>

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



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

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

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

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

**FAQ on Continuation of Services:**

*What is Continuation of Services?* The “continuation of services” provision found in Section 1304(e) of the ESEA provides that: (1) a child who ceases to be a migratory child during a school term shall be eligible for services until the end of such term; (2) a child who is no longer a migratory child may continue to receive services for one additional school year, but only if comparable services are not available through other programs; and (3) secondary school students who were eligible for services in secondary school may continue to be served through credit accrual programs until graduation.

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

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

Age/Grade	Instructional Service During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	23
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	267
K	190
1	176
2	171
3	174
4	187
5	165
6	146
7	139
8	106
9	138
10	86
11	60
12	26
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	197
Total	2,251

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

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

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Reading Instruction During the Performance Period</b>	<b>Mathematics Instruction During the Performance Period</b>	<b>High School Credit Accrual During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	17	14	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	192	171	
K	183	153	
1	174	154	
2	169	147	
3	167	154	
4	172	162	
5	158	139	
6	142	125	
7	128	116	
8	97	87	
9	100	80	
10	69	54	1
11	54	40	2
12	23	17	1
Ungraded			
Out-of-school	184	63	
Total	2,029	1,676	4

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

**FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:**

*What is "high school credit accrual"?* MEP-funded instruction, funded in whole or in part by MEP funds, in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a teacher for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. High school credit accrual includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher. High school credit accrual may include the age/grade categories of Grade 8 through Grade 12. NOTE: Children receiving a MEP-funded high school credit accrual service should be reported only once, regardless of frequency.

**2.4.6.5 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Services – During the Performance Period**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Support Services During the Performance Period</b>	<b>Breakout of Counseling Services During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	227	145
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	727	605
K	390	362
1	380	350
2	345	315
3	350	333
4	363	342
5	344	331
6	336	312
7	301	285
8	261	244
9	381	359
10	212	201
11	176	170
12	129	125
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	763	354
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,685</b>	<b>4,833</b>

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

**FAQs on Support Services:**

*a. What are support services?* These MEP-funded educationally-related services are provided to students. These services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migratory children; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. Activities related to identification and recruitment, parental involvement, professional development, program evaluation, and the one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.

*b. What are counseling services?* Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counselees, or between students and students in MEP peer-to-peer counseling activities, or between students and MEP-funded staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy. NOTE: Children who receive a MEP-funded counseling service should be reported only once, regardless of frequency.

**2.4.7 School Data during the Regular School Year**

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

**2.4.7.1 Schools and Enrollment – During the Regular School Year**

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

<b>Schools</b>	<b>#</b>
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migratory children	575
Number of eligible migratory children enrolled in those schools	5,093

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

**2.4.7.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in SWPs – During the Regular School Year**

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

Schools	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	
Number of eligible migratory children enrolled in those schools	

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.  
 Zero schools reported consolidating MEP funds in a school-wide program

**2.5 PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, OR AT RISK**

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

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- Use the definitions listed below:
  - **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
  - **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, dependency adjudication, or delinquency adjudication, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice or child welfare system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, are English learners, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
  - **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth that is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non- secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
  - **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
  - **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
  - **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, that receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

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

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

**2.5.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1**

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

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	31	86
Adult corrections	8	82
Other	0	0
Total	39	

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

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

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

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

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

<b>State Program/Facility Type</b>	<b># Reporting Data</b>
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	0
Juvenile corrections	31
Adult corrections	8
Other	0
Total	39

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



**2.5.1.3 Students Served – Subpart 1**

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

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	0	0	1,953	37	0
Total Long Term Students Served	0	0	1,000	26	0

Provide the number of students served by special populations

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	0	0	543	0	0
English Learners (ELs)	0	0	21	0	0

Provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity.

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	3	0	0
Asian	0	0	7	0	0
Black or African American	0	0	461	26	0
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	79	0	0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	1	0	0
White	0	0	1,276	10	0
Two or more races	0	0	126	1	0
Total	0	0	1,953	37	0

Provide the number of students served by gender.

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male	0	0	1,554	37	0
Female	0	0	399	0	0
Total	0	0	1,953	37	0

Provide the number of students served by age.

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	3	0	0
11	0	0	6	0	0
12	0	0	55	0	0
13	0	0	114	0	0
14	0	0	232	0	0
15	0	0	399	0	0
16	0	0	458	0	0
17	0	0	498	0	0
18	0	0	164	0	0

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
19	0	0	20	8	0
20	0	0	4	25	0
21	0	0	0	4	0
Total	0	0	1,953	37	0

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

**Comments:** The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

**FAQ on Unduplicated Count:**

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

**FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2018.

**2.5.1.4 Academic, Career and Technical Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days after Exit**

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

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

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

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

Outcomes (once per student, only after exit)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit	S	S	747	S	S

Outcomes (once per student) - # of Students Who	Neglected Programs - In fac.	Neglected Programs - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Detention - In fac.	Juvenile Detention - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Corrections - In fac.	Juvenile Corrections - 90 days after exit	Adult Corrections - In fac.	Adult Corrections - 90 days after exit	Other Programs - In fac.	Other Programs - 90 days after exit
Earned a GED	S	S	S	S	100	S	7	S	S	S
Obtained high school diploma	S	S	S	S	146	52	S	S	S	S

Outcomes (once per student per time period) - # of Students Who	Neglected Programs - In fac.	Neglected Programs - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Detention - In fac.	Juvenile Detention - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Corrections - In fac.	Juvenile Corrections - 90 days after exit	Adult Corrections - In fac.	Adult Corrections - 90 days after exit	Other Programs - In fac.	Other Programs - 90 days after exit
Earned high school course credits	S	S	S	S	1,304	507	S	S	S	S
Enrolled in a GED program	S	S	S	S	28	11	34	5	S	S
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	S	S	S	S	27	36	S	S	S	S
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	S	S	S	S	96	43	S	S	S	S
Obtained employment	S	S	S	S	149	153	S	S	S	S

In the text box below, please account for any missing or incomplete data after exit.

**Comments:** The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

**2.5.2 Academic Performance – Subpart 1**

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

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

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

Report only information on a student’s most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2018, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	S	S	144	S	S
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S	S	150	8	S
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S	S	240	S	S
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S	S	258	13	S
Total students pre/post- tested	S	S	792	24	S

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

**FAQ on long-term students:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019.

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

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

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2018, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	S	S	156	S	S
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S	S	172	7	S
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S	S	218	S	S
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S	S	246	12	S
Total students pre/post- tested	S	S	792	24	S

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

**FAQ on long-term students:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019.

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

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

**2.5.3.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2**

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

<b>LEA Program/Facility Type</b>	<b># Programs/Facilities</b>	<b>Average Length of Stay in Days</b>
At-risk programs	0	0
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	8	19
Juvenile corrections	18	93
Other	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	

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

**FAQ on average length of stay:**

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

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

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

<b>LEA Program/Facility Type</b>	<b># Reporting Data</b>
At-risk programs	0
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	8
Juvenile corrections	18
Other	0
Total	26

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

**2.5.3.3 Students Served – Subpart 2**

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

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served			2,069	2,170	
Total Long Term Students Served			85	594	

Provide the number of students served by special populations.

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			424	696	
ELs			14	11	

Provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity.

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native			1	0	
Asian			1	3	
Black or African American			586	314	
Hispanic or Latino			100	75	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			0	0	
White			1,258	1,680	
Two or more races			123	98	
Total			2,069	2,170	

Provide the number of students served by sex.

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male			1,425	1,359	
Female			644	811	
Total			2,069	2,170	

Provide the number of students served by age.

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5			0	8	
6			0	31	
7			0	44	
8			1	43	
9			0	66	
10			0	72	
11			0	91	
12			25	143	
13			78	156	
14			199	274	
15			341	396	
16			487	380	
17			640	394	
18			293	66	
19			5	6	



Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
20			0	0	
21			0	0	
Total			2,069	2,170	

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

**Comments:** The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

**FAQ on Unduplicated Count:**

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

**FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019.

**2.5.3.4 Academic, Career and Technical Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days After Exit**

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

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

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

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

Outcomes (once per student, only after exit)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit			1,036	969	

Outcomes (once per student) - # of Students Who	At-Risk Programs - In fac.	At-Risk Programs - 90 days after exit	Neglected Programs - In fac.	Neglected Programs - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Detention - In fac.	Juvenile Detention - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Corrections - In fac.	Juvenile Corrections - 90 days after exit	Other Programs - In fac.	Other Programs - 90 days after exit
Earned a GED					S	S	10	3		
Obtained high school diploma					29	35	69	25		

Outcomes (once per student per time period) - # of Students Who	At-Risk Programs - In fac.	At-Risk Programs - 90 days after exit	Neglected Programs - In fac.	Neglected Programs - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Detention - In fac.	Juvenile Detention - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Corrections - In fac.	Juvenile Corrections - 90 days after exit	Other Programs - In fac.	Other Programs - 90 days after exit
Earned high school course credits					320	510	797	521		
Enrolled in a GED program					S	8	7	6		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post- secondary education					6	3	23	24		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					145	5	S	4		
Obtained employment					9	31	20	52		

In the text box below, please account for any missing or incomplete data after exit.

**Comments:** The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

## 2.5.4 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

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

### 2.5.4.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

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

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2018, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			9	85	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			47	119	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			10	141	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			13	162	
Total students pre/post- tested			79	507	

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

#### FAQ on long-term:

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2018, through June 30, 2019.

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

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

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

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2018, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			10	73	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			14	135	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			39	148	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			16	147	
<b>Total students pre/post- tested</b>			<b>79</b>	<b>503</b>	

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

**FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2018, through June 30, 2019.

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

**2.6 STUDENT SUPPORT AND ACADEMIC ENRICHMENT GRANTS (TITLE IV, PART A)****2.6.1 Funds Spent Under Title IV, Part A**

This section collects data on the amount of funds spent by LEAs on the three content areas under Title IV, Part A of the *ESEA*. The data are reported through the Annual Performance Reporting Tool.

<b>Content Area</b>	<b>Amount of Funds Spent</b>
Well-Rounded	3,418,246.64
Safe and Healthy Students	3,921,452.11
Effective Use of Technology	1,163,510.21

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

**2.6.2 LEAs Who Spent Funds Under Title IV, Part A**

This section collects data on the number of LEAs who spent funds by the content areas under Title IV, Part A of the *ESEA*. For the “Any” category, report the number of LEAs that spent funds in any of the three content areas. An LEA should be included in the count of each content area it spent funds on (i.e. an LEA may be represented in more than one content area in the table below). The data are reported through the Annual Performance Reporting Tool.

<b>Content Area</b>	<b>Number of LEAs Spending Funds</b>
Well-Rounded	141
Safe and Healthy Students	138
Effective Use of Technology	101
Any Content Area	163

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

**2.7 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE V, PART A)****2.7.1 State Transferability of Funds**

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

<b>State Transferability of Funds</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>
Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 5103(a) during SY 2018-19?	NO

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

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

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

<b>LEA Transferability of Funds</b>	<b>#</b>
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 5103(b).	55

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



**2.7.3 LEA Funds Transfers**

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

<b>Program</b>	<b># LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program</b>	<b># LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program</b>
Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)	45	3
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	10	2
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)		0
Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)		0
Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)		0
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Title III, Part A)		0
Rural Education Initiative (Title V, Part B)		0

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2018 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

<b>Program</b>	<b>Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program</b>	<b>Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program</b>
Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)	6,001,747.91	46,052.00
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	424,282.54	15,914.00
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)		6,349,064.45
Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)		0.00
Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)		0.00
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Title III, Part A)		0.00
Rural Education Initiative (Title V, Part B)		15,000.00

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

**2.8 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP)**

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

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

In the table below, provide the number of eligible LEAs that used RLIS funds during SY2018-19 for each of the listed purposes.

<b>Purpose</b>	<b># LEAs</b>
Activities authorized under Part A of Title I	96
Activities authorized under Part A of Title II	43
Activities authorized under Title III	13
Activities authorized under Part A of Title IV	26
Parental involvement activities	14

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

**2.8.2 RLIS Objectives and Outcomes**

In the space below, describe the progress the State has made in meeting the objectives and outcomes for the Rural Low-Income School (RLIS) Program as described in the State's most current Consolidated State Application. If providing quantitative data along with your narrative, please ensure all data is converted to text format.

**Comments:** The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Kentucky is working to make progress on meeting the state plan's objectives by helping rural districts use federal resources effectively to improve instruction and achievement of students. Formula grants are awarded to eligible districts, and the local education agency (LEA) submits an application based on the comprehensive needs assessment to the state education agency. (SEA) This application is a part of a consolidated application that contains multiple federal programs. That application is reviewed by a member of the SEA staff for accuracy and allowable expenses. The SEA has developed and is beginning to implement a technical assistance process to provide guidance to the lowest performing LEAs that receive RLIS funds. The purpose of this effort will be to help guide districts with more effectively targeting RLIS funds.

**2.8.3 RLIS Technical Assistance**

In the space below, describe the progress the State has made in providing technical assistance for RLIS LEA sub-grantees as described in the State's most current Consolidated State Application. If providing quantitative data along with your narrative, please ensure all data is converted to text format.

**Comments:** The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) provides regular technical assistance to local education agencies (LEAs) through phone, e-mail, and face to face assistance. Meetings and trainings are conducted periodically at regional cooperative centers throughout the state. KDE also works with LEAs through the consolidated application to administer this funding to align with other federal, state, and local programs. On site monitoring also occurs during the annual state consolidated monitoring process. Additionally, KDE is in the beginning stages of implementing a process that targets the lowest achieving districts for tiered technical assistance. As data becomes available, KDE will target the lowest performing grantees with technical assistance concerning the best use of Rural Low Income funds. Technical assistance will include cadre style webinars for the targeted districts.

**2.8.4 RLIS Subgrant Award Determination**

Please report the method the SEA used to award grants to eligible LEAs. If the SEA used a competitive process, please describe that process and include a description of the methods and criteria the SEA used to review applications, award funds to LEAs, and how the LEAs were notified of the process. If the SEA used a formula besides one based on the number of students in average daily attendance served by eligible LEAs in the State, please describe that formula, including an explanation of how this alternative formula enables the SEA to allot grant funds in a manner that serves equal or greater concentrations of children from families with incomes below the poverty line, relative to the concentration that would be served if the SEA used a formula based on the number of students in average daily attendance served by eligible LEAs in the State.

**Comments:** The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Kentucky awards formula grants to qualifying districts that meet federal eligibility requirements and is based on average daily attendance.

**2.8.5 RLIS State Administrative Funds**

In the table below, provide information on state administrative funds.

Question	Percentage
What percentage of the RLIS grant funds were retained for State-level administration?	2.00%
What percentage of those funds retained for State-level administration were used specifically for technical assistance?	15.00%

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

**2.8.6 RLIS LEAs Awarded Funds**

Please list the NCES LEA ID and name of each LEA that received RLIS funds and the amount each received. This information will be collected from SEAs outside of the CSPR collection tool.

- NCES LEA ID
- LEA Name
- RLIS Award Amount

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

**2.8.7 Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) Program, Alternative Fund Use Authority (AFUA)**

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
What number and percentage of SRSA- and Dual-eligible LEAs informed their SEA of an intent to utilize SRSA's AFUA, under Section 5211 of the ESEA.		

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.  
10 out of 173 (5.7%) reported LEAs were SRSA- and Dual-eligible.