

Kentucky's 41 Priority Schools: What the Data Tells Us



January 13, 2014

**Office of Next Generation Schools & Districts
Kentucky Department of Education**



Kentucky's 41 Priority Schools: What the Data Tells Us

CONTENTS

Title	Page
What questions are we trying to answer with the data?	1
What does the data tell us?	1
What does the data not tell us?	1
What are the causes for celebration?	2
What are the opportunities for improvement?	10
Summary/Implications	15
The 2013 Annual Evaluation Report for School Improvement Grant from the University of Kentucky Human Development Institute.....	17
From the Kentucky TELL Survey in 2013 Findings	18
What are our next Steps?	18
Growth Baseline Year	20
College and Career Readiness (CCR).....	21
Graduation Rate by Cohort and AFGR.....	22
ACT	23
Kentucky Priority Middle School EXPLORE Subtest Means 2010-13	32
Priority Schools Proficiency Level and Percentile Rank 2012-13	34
Gap Data.....	36



What questions are we trying to answer with the data?

- What kind of academic progress are the 41 Priority Schools making?
- What are the levels, trends and comparisons that will help the schools improve?

What does the data tell us?

- Overall score of the schools using the Unbridled Learning data
- Recognition category of Needs Improvement, Proficient or Distinguished
- Percentile rank of student performance
- Cohort Graduation rate and performance on AFGR targets College and Career Readiness (CCR) gains
- ACT and Explore : percentage of increase of students making Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) benchmarks in English
- ACT and Explore: percentage of increase of students making CPE benchmarks in math
- ACT and Explore: percentage of increase of students making CPE benchmarks in reading
- Gap closing proficiency rate
- Growth scores and gains
- A TELL KY survey on teaching conditions in Priority Schools
- A School Improvement Grant (SIG) evaluation for impact conducted by the University of Kentucky

What does the data not tell us?

- What interventions are in place in the schools
- The role that leadership has played in implementing or resisting transformational change in schools
- Which interventions work
- Why schools have or have not made the progress expected
- The degree to which quality systemic processes have been deployed in the schools and thus the impact of education recovery on the schools (30, 60, 90 day planning, classroom interventions through Classroom Assessment for Student Learning (CASL), use of Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System (CIITS), aligned lessons, formative assessments, monitoring of processes, use of plus/delta, PDSA (plan, do, study and act), systems thinking, including all elements of the transformation or re-staffing model, vertical alignment with feeder schools, data use, how far data ownership has cascaded in the system)
- How long it takes to hardwire systems for continuous improvement
- The context of the school in terms of composition of student assignment plan in Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS) Should we keep? Yes
- Staff assignments in turnaround re-staffing model impacts on schools
- Principal turnover
- Impact of union contracts as it relates to teacher absences, planning time, scope of work, professional learning

- Transient rate of many Persistently Lowest Achieving (PLA) school students
- The significance of the year the schools were identified – after the first year, it is not clear if the 2nd and 3rd cohorts learned from the earlier cohorts regarding status, accepted assistance more readily, got to work sooner or had fewer barriers to overcome
- The role the district plays/played in the improvements and focus in the school and whether it was/is helpful, a barrier or neutral
- Years of experience of teaching staff
- If initiatives and improvements can be sustained
- What professional learning experiences schools and Education Recovery (ER) teams have had
- Whether schools are a part of Professional Growth Evaluation System (PGES) Pilot or where they are in the process
- The impact of how the school is organized, including scheduling
- Expectations of staff
- Instructional programs that are implemented
- Perceptions of staff and students
- How far each school had to go to improve
- Relationship of schools to Area Technical Centers to help ensure students are career ready

What are the causes for celebration?

A. GROWTH

Level (current level of performance)

- 66.4% of the students at Metcalfe County High School showed growth in reading and math
- 66.1% of the students at Hopkins Central High School showed growth in reading and math
- 64.9% of students at Pulaski County High School showed growth in reading and math
- 64.4% of students at Lincoln County High School showed growth in reading and math
- 63.9% of students at Franklin Simpson High School showed growth in reading and math
- 63.3% of students at Trimble County High School showed growth in reading and math
- 62.2% of students at Livingston Central High School showed growth in reading and math
- Twenty-five of the forty-one schools showed growth for 50% or more of the students: Carter County, Christian County, Dayton Ind., Bryan Station, Fleming County, Greenup County, Hopkins County, Fern Creek, Knox Central, Lawrence County, Lee County, Leslie County, Lincoln County, Livingston Central, Metcalfe County, Monticello Ind. (now merged), Perry Central, Pulaski County, Franklin-Simpson, and Trimble County High Schools; and Western, Stuart, Thomas Jefferson, Westport (Jefferson County) and Dayton Independent middle schools.

Trend (the rate of performance improvement or the sustainability of good performance; the breadth of the performance results)

- Fourteen (14) of thirty-two (32) high schools increased their growth rates from 2011-12 to 2012-13. These were Christian County, Fleming County, Hopkins Central, Western (Jefferson County), Knox Central, Lawrence County, Leslie County, Lincoln County, Livingston Central, Metcalfe County, Monticello Ind., Perry Central, Pulaski County, and Franklin-Simpson High Schools.
- Four (4) of nine (9) middle schools increased their growth rates from 2011-12 to 2012-13. These were Western, Stuart, Thomas Jefferson, and Westport Middle schools in Jefferson County.

Comparison (performance relative to appropriate comparisons, such as competitor or organizations similar to yours; performance relative to benchmarks)

- Twelve (12) of thirty-two (32) high schools had student performance growth above the state average in reading and math. These were Christian County, Dayton Ind., Fleming County, Hopkins Central, Fern Creek, Lawrence County, Lincoln County, Livingston County, Metcalfe County, Pulaski County, Franklin-Simpson, and Trimble County high schools.
- One middle school of the nine, Western (Jefferson County) had student performance growth above the state average in reading and math.

Integration (results measures address important customer, product, market, process and action plan performance requirements identified in the organization; valid indicators of future performance; harmonized across processes and work units to support organization-wide goals)

- This is only the second year of implementation of the Kentucky Core Assessment Standards (KCAS), and both Common Core implementation and the new assessment are still in relatively early stages of deployment. We currently have baseline data from 2011-12 combined with assessment data from 2012-13. While this provides some data for comparison, an additional year of data will provide more valid and reliable trend information.

B. COLLEGE AND CAREER READINESS

Level (current level of performance)

- CCR rate increased by 44.7% at East Carter High schools from 2010-11 to 2012-13 (a 3 year period)
- CCR rate increased by 44.2% at Franklin-Simpson High over the three year period
- CCR rate increased by 39.2% at Hopkins Central High over the three year period
- CCR rate increased by 38% at Leslie County High over the three year period
- CCR rate increased by 35.5% at Caverna High over the three year period
- CCR rate increased by 33.5% at Lincoln County High over the three year period
- CCR rate increased by 32.9% at Fleming County High over the three year period
- CCR rate increased by 31.7% at Western High (Jefferson) over the three year period
- CCR rate increased by 31.3% at Pulaski County High over the three year period
- Twenty-one schools showed gains in excess of twenty percent (20%) in their percentage of students graduating college and/or career ready over the last three year period. These schools are Caverna, Fern Creek, Lawrence County, Leslie County, Western (Jefferson), East Carter,

Christian County, Greenup County, Iroquois (Jefferson), Sheldon Clark, Newport, Southern (Jefferson), Dayton, Fleming County, Franklin-Simpson, Hopkins Central, Lee County, Lincoln County, Perry Central, Pulaski County, and Trimble County High Schools.

Trend (the rate of performance improvement or the sustainability of good performance; the breadth of the performance results)

- Twenty-eight (28) high schools have increased their trajectory every year over the three year period. The schools are Caverna, Fern Creek, Lawrence County, Metcalfe County, Valley (Jefferson), Western (Jefferson), East Carter, Christian County, Doss, Fairdale (Jefferson), Greenup County, Iroquois (Jefferson), Sheldon Clark, Newport, Seneca, Southern, Waggener (Jefferson), Dayton, Fleming County, Franklin Simpson, Hopkins Central, Knox Central, Lee County, Lincoln County, Livingston County, Monticello Ind., Pulaski County and Bryan Station.
- College and Career Readiness data has only been collected on middle schools for the last two years. In those two years, two schools - Western and Dayton have seen double digit gains. Four middle schools, Frost, Myers, Stuart, and Thomas Jefferson (Jefferson) have had their scores decrease from the previous year.
- Twenty-one of the thirty-two high schools met their college and career readiness targets for the year. While CCR data is collected at the middle school level, performance targets are not set.

Comparison (performance relative to appropriate comparisons, such as competitor or organizations similar to yours; performance relative to benchmarks)

- Eight high schools out of the forty-one schools had 2013 CCR rates above the state average of 60.7. These are Leslie County, East Carter, Fleming County, Franklin Simpson, Hopkins Central, Lee County, Pulaski County and Trimble County High Schools
- Leslie County High School had 74.4% of students CCR, which is highest compared to all Priority Schools

Integration (results measures address important customer, product, market, process and action plan performance requirements identified in the organization; valid indicators of future performance; harmonized across processes and work units to support organization-wide goals)

- Improving CCR data in PLA schools assisted the state in moving beyond its trajectory for improvement in the 2012-13 school year I checked and we did meet the trajectory
- Improving CCR data connects to successful implementation of common core in many of the PLA schools
- Improving CCR data connects to use of the Progress to Graduation tool in PLA schools
- Improving CCR career data indicates integration in a few of the PLA schools with the Career and Technical Education and regional centers to support career readiness for students

C. ACT

Level (current level of performance)

- Pulaski County High School had the highest percentage of students meeting ACT English benchmark – 59.5%
- Ten high schools had 50% or above of their students meeting ACT English benchmark: East Carter, Christian County, Hopkins Central, Lee County, Lincoln County, Livingston Central, Metcalfe County, Pulaski County, Franklin Simpson, Trimble County High Schools.
- Metcalfe County High School had the highest percentage of students meeting ACT math benchmark - 50.9% and was the only school to score above 50%.

- Three schools, Livingston Central, Pulaski County and Franklin-Simpson High Schools, had 40% or more of their students meeting the ACT Math benchmark.
- Trimble County High School had the highest percentage of students meeting the ACT benchmark in reading - 58.0%
- Seven high schools had 40% or above of their students meeting the ACT reading benchmark: Hopkins Central, Lincoln County, Livingston Central, Metcalfe County, Pulaski County, Franklin-Simpson, and Trimble County High schools.

Trend (the rate of performance improvement or the sustainability of good performance; the breadth of the performance results)

- Lee County High School had the greatest gain in the percent of students meeting ACT English benchmark from 2010-2013 with a 21.7 gain.
- Ten schools showed double-digit gains in the percentage of students meeting ACT English benchmark from 2010-2013: Dayton Independent, Hopkins Central, Southern, Western (Jefferson), Lee County, Lincoln County, Monticello Independent, Pulaski County, Franklin-Simpson, and Trimble County High Schools.
- Metcalfe County had the largest gain in the percentage of students meeting ACT Math benchmark from 2010-2013 with a 22.9 gain.
- Four schools had double digit gains in the percentage of students meeting ACT Math benchmark from 2010-2013: Dayton Independent, Hopkins Central, Lee County, Metcalfe County, and Franklin-Simpson High Schools.
- Dayton and Franklin-Simpson High Schools had the greatest gain in the percent of students meeting ACT Reading benchmark from 2010-2013 with a 17.1 gain.
- Eight schools showed double-digit gains in the percentage of students meeting ACT Reading benchmarks: Dayton High, Hopkins Central, Lee County, Lincoln County, Livingston Central, Monticello Ind., Franklin-Simpson, and Trimble County High Schools

Comparison (performance relative to appropriate comparisons, such as competitor or organizations similar to yours; performance relative to benchmarks)

- Two schools scored above state averages of students meeting benchmark in three ACT categories: English, Math and Reading – Pulaski and Franklin-Simpson High Schools
- Six schools scored at or above the state average of students meeting benchmark in English – Hopkins County, Lincoln County, Livingston Central, Pulaski County, Franklin-Simpson, and Trimble County High Schools.
- Four schools scored at or above the state average of students meeting benchmark in Math – Livingston Central, Metcalfe County, Pulaski County, and Franklin-Simpson High Schools.
- Six schools scored at or above the state average of students meeting benchmark in Reading – Hopkins Central, Lincoln County, Livingston Central, Pulaski County, Franklin-Simpson and Trimble County High Schools.
- Three schools met or exceeded state means in all three areas - ACT English, math, and Reading: Lincoln County, Pulaski County, and Franklin-Simpson. Two schools met or exceeded state means in two ACT areas: Livingston County and Trimble County
- Five schools scored above the state mean of 18.4 in ACT English: Lincoln County, Livingston County, Pulaski County, Franklin-Simpson and Trimble County.
- Four schools scored above the state mean of 18.9 in ACT Math: Lincoln County, Metcalfe County, Pulaski County and Franklin-Simpson High Schools

- Six schools scored above the state mean of 19.4 in ACT Reading: Hopkins Central, Lincoln County, Livingston County, Pulaski County, Franklin-Simpson, and Trimble County

Integration (results measures address important customer, product, market, process and action plan performance requirements identified in the organization; valid indicators of future performance; harmonized across processes and work units to support organization-wide goals)

- Improvement in ACT scores impacts state performance on college readiness
- ACT scores are an indicator of possible successful implementation of Common Core in assessed grade levels with additional alignment encouraged by the Instructional Leadership Networks
- Improvement in ACT scores impacts the number of remedial courses that must be taken by entering freshmen at the university and, thus, impacts dollars necessary for these courses

D. EXPLORE

Level (current level of performance)

- Dayton Ind. was the only middle school scoring at or above the state benchmark (66.0) in Explore English with a score of 70.4%.
- Western Middle had 49.5% and Westport Middle had 42.9% of their students scoring at or above state benchmark in Explore English, which were the next highest scores.
- No middle schools met state benchmark (33.9) on Explore Math; however, Dayton Middle had the largest percentage of students meeting state benchmark in Explore Math at 23.9%.

No middle schools met state benchmark (41.6) on Explore Reading; however, Dayton Middle had the largest percentage of students meeting state benchmark in Explore Reading at 33.8%. **Trend** (the rate of performance improvement or the sustainability of good performance; the breadth of the performance results)

- Western and Dayton Middle Schools have made the greatest gains in percentages of students meeting benchmark in Explore English with Western having a 35.2% gain and Dayton having a 33.7% gain
- Western Middle had the largest gain in the percentage of students meeting benchmark in Explore Math with a 1.6 % gain.
- Western Middle had the largest gain in the percentage of students making benchmark in Explore Reading with a 10.6% gain.

Comparison (performance relative to appropriate comparisons, such as competitor or organizations similar to yours; performance relative to benchmarks)

- The only Explore score that exceeded a state benchmark was Dayton Middle's score of 70.4% in Explore English. The state benchmark was 66.0%.

Integration (results measures address important customer, product, market, process and action plan performance requirements identified in the organization; valid indicators of future performance; harmonized across processes and work units to support organization-wide goals)

- No overall data points show level or trend or comparison with Explore that assist the organization in meeting the goals around college and career readiness

E. GRADUATION RATE

Level (current level of performance)

- This is the baseline year for use of the Cohort Graduation Rate, and the last year that the Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate (AFGR) will be used.
- The highest graduation rate among the Priority Schools is the Leslie County High School with 99.2.
- Eleven (11) schools had graduation rates above 90%: Lawrence County, Leslie County, Metcalfe County, East Carter, Sheldon Clark, Fleming County, Franklin-Simpson, Knox County, Lincoln County, Livingston County, and Pulaski County high schools.

Trend (the rate of performance improvement or the sustainability of good performance; the breadth of the performance results)

- Because of the change in the method of calculating graduation rate, we are unable to compare the two sets of data to establish trends.

Comparison (performance relative to appropriate comparisons, such as competitor or organizations similar to yours; performance relative to benchmarks)

- Fifteen of thirty-two (32) high schools indicate cohort graduation rates above state average: Lawrence County, Leslie County, Metcalfe County, East Carter, Christian County, Fairdale, Greenup County, Sheldon Clark, Fleming County, Franklin-Simpson, Knox Central, Lee County, Lincoln County, Livingston County and Pulaski County High Schools.
- Fourteen of thirty-two (32) high schools met their AFGR Goal: Fern Creek, Lawrence County, Academy at Shawnee, Valley, Doss, Iroquois, Sheldon Clark, Newport, Seneca, Southern, Waggener, Lee County, Livingston County, and Monticello high schools.

Integration (results measures address important customer, product, market, process and action plan performance requirements identified in the organization; valid indicators of future performance; harmonized across processes and work units to support organization-wide goals)

- Because of the change in the measure used to calculate graduation rate, this year only provides baseline data for the Cohort Graduation rate. AFGR will be discontinued after this year.

F. PROFICIENCY and PERCENTILE RANK

Level (current level of performance)

- Six of forty-one (41) schools are distinguished: Leslie County, East Carter, Metcalfe County, Hopkins Central, and Pulaski County High Schools and Franklin-Simpson High Schools
- Eight (8) of forty-one (41) schools are proficient: Lawrence County, Greenup County, Sheldon Clark, Fleming County, Lee County, Livingston Central, Lincoln County, and Trimble County High Schools
- In Cohort 1, six of ten (10) schools have proficiency levels of 50% or better: Caverna, Fern Creek, Lawrence County, Leslie County, and Metcalfe County High Schools and Western Middle School in Jefferson County.
- In Cohort 2, seven of twelve (12) schools have proficiency levels of 50% or better: East Carter, Christian County, Fairdale High, Greenup County, Sheldon Clark, Newport and Seneca High Schools

- In Cohort 3, thirteen (13) of 19 schools have proficiency levels of 50% or better: Dayton Middle and High Schools, Fleming County, Franklin-Simpson, Hopkins Central, Knox Central, Lee County, Lincoln County, Livingston County, Perry Central, Pulaski County, Trimble County and Bryan Station High Schools
- Seventeen (17) of the schools are above the 50th percentile rank: Fern Creek, Lawrence County, **Leslie County, Metcalfe County, East Carter**, Christian County, Greenup County, Sheldon Clark, Dayton High, Fleming County, **Franklin-Simpson, Hopkins Central**, Lee County, Lincoln County, Perry County, **Pulaski County**, and Trimble County High Schools. **Bold schools are at or above the 90th percentile rank.**

Trend (the rate of performance improvement or the sustainability of good performance; the breadth of the performance results)

- Thirty-six (36) of the forty-one (41) schools had increases in their overall score from 2012-2013. Nine (9) schools had double-digit increases in their overall score: Caverna , Lawrence County, Leslie County, Western Middle, Dayton High, Franklin Simpson, Hopkins Central, Perry Central and Trimble County High Schools
- Thirty-four (34) of the forty-one (41) schools identified because they were in the bottom 5% of schools had increases in their percentile ranking from 2012 to 2013. Twenty-nine (29) of those schools had double-digit increases in their percentile ranking.

Comparison (performance relative to appropriate comparisons, such as competitor or organizations similar to yours; performance relative to benchmarks)

- Highest proficiency rate is Franklin-Simpson High School with an overall score of 71.8%
- Above state level proficiency are fourteen (14) schools: Lawrence County, Leslie County, Metcalfe County, East Carter, Greenup County, Sheldon Clark, Fleming County, Franklin-Simpson, Hopkins Central, Lee County, Lincoln County, Livingston Central, Pulaski County, and Trimble County High Schools.
- Above the state average percentile are thirteen (13) schools: Lawrence County, Metcalfe County, Leslie County, East Carter, Greenup County, Sheldon Clark, Franklin-Simpson, Fleming County, Hopkins Central, Lee County, Lincoln County, Pulaski County, and Trimble County High Schools.

Integration (results measures address important customer, product, market, process and action plan performance requirements identified in the organization; valid indicators of future performance; harmonized across processes and work units to support organization-wide goals)

- Proficiency levels above state average assist the Next Generation Learners Delivery Plan trajectory for improvement to be met
- Proficiency levels above state average assist the Next Generation Learners Delivery Plan in closing gaps between and among subgroups
- Ideally, what is learned about how these schools accomplish getting out of the bottom 5% should inform all schools and their processes, and can be captured as best practices in the Continuous Improvement strategy of the Next Generation Support Systems Delivery Plan for use in the development of comprehensive school and improvement district plans.

G. GAP

Level (current level of performance)

- In Cohort 1, Caverna High has a gap proficiency rate of 51.4% (FR)
- In Cohort 1, Metcalfe County High has a gap proficiency rate of 48.6% (FR)

- In Cohort 2, East Carter High has a gap proficiency rate of 45.7% (AA/FR/SWD)
- In Cohort 2, Sheldon Clark High has a gap proficiency rate of 40% (AA/HIS/LEP/FR/SWD)
- In Cohort 3, Hopkins Central High has a gap proficiency rate of 51.9% (AA/FR/SWD)
- In Cohort 3, Franklin-Simpson High has a gap proficiency rate of 50.8% (AA/FR/SWD)
- Nine schools met their gap reduction target: Caverna Ind., Leslie County, Western MS, Dayton MS, Franklin-Simpson, Hopkins Central, East Carter, Sheldon Clark, and Perry Central.
- Performance levels for nineteen (19) of the forty-one (41) schools are within 5 % of all student groups in those schools: Caverna High, Frost Middle, Valley High, Academy @ Shawnee, Western Middle, Western High, Doss High, Fairdale High, Iroquois High, Knight Middle, Seneca High, Southern High, Dayton Middle, Olmstead Academy North, Knox Central High, Myers Middle, Stuart Middle, Thomas Jefferson Middle, and Westport Middle

Trend (the rate of performance improvement or the sustainability of good performance; the breadth of the performance results)

- In Cohort 1, five of the ten schools have shown improvement in closing subgroup gaps for two years: Fern Creek High, Frost Middle, Lawrence County High, Academy @ Shawnee, and Western High
- In Cohort 2, six of the twelve (12) schools have shown improvement in closing subgroup gaps for two years: East Carter High, Christian County High, Greenup County High, Knight Middle, Seneca High, and Southern High.
- In Cohort 3, eleven (11) of the eighteen (18) schools have shown improvement in closing subgroup gaps over two years: Fleming County, Franklin Simpson, Lee County High, Livingston Central High, Myers Middle, Perry Central, Pulaski County, Stuart Middle, Thomas Jefferson Middle, Trimble County High and Bryan Station High.

Comparison (performance relative to appropriate comparisons, such as competitor or organizations similar to yours; performance relative to benchmarks)

- Of the forty-one (41) Priority Schools, nine (9) schools met or exceeded state average for proficiency of the non-duplicated subgroup in math and reading: Dayton Middle, Franklin-Simpson High, Hopkins Central, Pulaski County, Caverna High, Metcalfe County, Western Middle, East Carter High, and Sheldon Clark High

Integration (results measures address important customer, product, market, process and action plan performance requirements identified in the organization; valid indicators of future performance; harmonized across processes and work units to support organization-wide goals)

- With the contributions of the Priority Schools in closing gaps between the Gap Group scores and the All Students scores, , the state is more likely to meet its proficiency, college and career readiness and graduation goals and meet trajectory targets in the Next Generation Learners and Next Generation Support Systems Delivery Plans.

What are the Opportunities for Improvement?

A. GROWTH

Level (current level of performance)

- Less than 50% of the students made growth at 16 of the 41 Priority Schools: Caverna, Academy@ Shawnee, Doss, Fairdale, Iroquois, Seneca, Southern, Valley, Waggener, Western, Sheldon Clark, and Newport Independent High Schools; Frost, Knight, Olmstead, and Myers Middle Schools
- Least growth at the high school level was 34% at the Academy @ Shawnee followed by Valley High at 40.4% and Caverna High at 44.6%
- Least growth at the middle school level was 44.6% at Frost Middle followed by Myers Middle with 46.2%

Trend (the rate of performance improvement or the sustainability of good performance; the breadth of the performance results)

- Twenty-three (23) schools had a decrease in growth from 2012 to 2013: Caverna, Carter County, Dayton, Bryan Station, Greenup County, Academy @ Shawnee, Doss, Fairdale, Fern Creek, Iroquois, Seneca, Southern, Valley, Waggener, Lee County, Sheldon Clark, Newport, and Trimble County high schools; and Frost, Knight, Olmstead, Myers, and Dayton middle schools.
- Five schools had double-digit decreases in growth scores: Seneca, Caverna, Newport, Lee County, and Fairdale High schools
- The largest growth score decrease by a middle school was Knight Middle with a -5.5.

Comparison (performance relative to appropriate comparisons, such as competitor or organizations similar to yours; performance relative to benchmarks)

- Twenty (20) of thirty-two (32) high schools performed below the state percentage for growth: Caverna, East Carter, Bryan Station, Greenup County, Academy @ Shawnee, Doss, Fairdale, Iroquois, Seneca, Southern, Valley, Waggener, Western, Knox Central, Lee County, Leslie County, Sheldon Clark, Monticello, Newport, and Perry Central
- Eight (8) of the nine (9) middle schools performed below the state percentage for growth: Frost, Knight, Dayton, Stuart, Westport, Myers, Olmstead Academy North, and Thomas Jefferson

Integration (results measures address important customer, product, market, process and action plan performance requirements identified in the organization; valid indicators of future performance; harmonized across processes and work units to support organization-wide goals)

- Students not making growth may impact the timeline for achieving college and career readiness , impact need for additional resources for interventions for an extended period of time and make it difficult to close gaps

B. COLLEGE AND CAREER READINESS

Level (current level of performance)

- Five schools showed zero or negative gain in CCR from 2011-12 to 2012-13: Frost, Knight, Myers, Stuart, and Thomas Jefferson middle schools (only two years of data exist for middle schools)

- Four schools showed single digit gains in CCR from 2010-11 to 2012-13: Academy @ Shawnee, Olmstead North Academy, and Westport middle schools (only two years of data exist for middle schools), and Bryan Station High School
- Eleven (11) of thirty-two (32) high schools failed to meet their CCR targets, (middle schools do not have target data): Caverna, Academy @ Shawnee, Valley, Doss, Fairdale, Iroquois, Southern, Waggener, Knox Central, Monticello, Bryan Station high schools

Trend (the rate of performance improvement or the sustainability of good performance; the breadth of the performance results)

- While most schools' CCR scores are moving steadily upward, several of the nine schools with negative or single digit gains also have relatively low CCR scores.

Comparison (performance relative to appropriate comparisons, such as competitor or organizations similar to yours; performance relative to benchmarks)

- Only eight (8) of thirty-two (32) high schools performed at or above state average in CCR in the 2012-13 school year.

Integration (results measures address important customer, product, market, process and action plan performance requirements identified in the organization; valid indicators of future performance; harmonized across processes and work units to support organization-wide goals)

- Single digit gains in CCR in many Priority Schools may make it difficult for the Kentucky Board of Education to reach its trajectory for CCR moving forward and negatively impact graduation rate in those schools requiring resources for intervention and impact the college-going rate of Kentucky students

C. ACT

Level (current level of performance)

- Overall levels of performance are below state mean on all three subtests with the exceptions of 4-6 schools that exceed the mean

Trend (the rate of performance improvement or the sustainability of good performance; the breadth of the performance results)

- Several schools have lowered scores from 2010 to 2013 on 1) percentage of students meeting benchmark or 2) meeting state average mean score.

Comparison (performance relative to appropriate comparisons, such as competitor or organizations similar to yours; performance relative to benchmark)

- Only two schools scored above state averages of students meeting benchmark in three ACT categories: English, Math and Reading – Pulaski and Franklin-Simpson High Schools
- All but six schools scored below the state average of students meeting benchmark in ACT English (Hopkins County, Lincoln County, Livingston Central, Pulaski County, Franklin-Simpson, and Trimble County High Schools)
- All but four schools scored below the state average of students meeting benchmark in ACT Math (Livingston Central, Metcalfe County, Pulaski County, and Franklin-Simpson High Schools)
- All but six schools scored below the state average of students meeting benchmark in ACT Reading (Hopkins Central, Lincoln County, Livingston Central, Pulaski County, Franklin-Simpson and Trimble County High Schools)

Integration (results measures address important customer, product, market, process and action plan performance requirements identified in the organization; valid indicators of future performance; harmonized across processes and work units to support organization-wide goals)

- Critical data points for CCR, for students meeting their goals and for Kentucky meeting Senate Bill 1 requirements - progress is being made, but is not significant at this point to the overall state goal

D. EXPLORE

Level (current level of performance)

- The percentage of students meeting benchmark in Explore English ranges from 32.1% to 70.4%.
- Six of the nine middle schools had 40% or less students meeting Explore English benchmarks: Frost, Thomas Jefferson, Stuart Middle, Myers Middle, Knight Middle and Olmstead Academy North
- The percentage of students meeting benchmark in Explore Math ranges from 6.0% to 23.9%
- Four of the nine middle schools had 10% or fewer students reaching math benchmarks: Frost, Stuart, Myers and Western Middle schools
- The percentage of students meeting benchmark in Explore Reading ranges from 4.8% to 33.8%
- Six of the nine middle schools had 20% or less of students meeting Explore Reading benchmarks: Frost, Thomas Jefferson, Stuart, Myers, Knight, and Olmstead Academy North

Trend (the rate of performance improvement or the sustainability of good performance; the breadth of the performance results)

- The Explore English mean across three years is flat or declining at four of nine schools: Frost, Thomas Jefferson, Stuart and Myers Middle Schools
- The Explore Math mean across three years indicates a decline at two of nine schools: Thomas Jefferson and Myers Middle Schools
- The Explore Reading mean across three years indicates a decline at four of nine schools: Frost, Knight, Thomas Jefferson and Myers Middle Schools

Comparison (performance relative to appropriate comparisons, such as competitor or organizations similar to yours; performance relative to benchmarks)

- One priority middle school met or exceeded the state % of students meeting English benchmark 66.0% - Dayton at 70.4%. The next closest were Western Middle at 49.5% and Westport Middle at 42.9%.
- No priority middle school met or exceeded the state % of students meeting math benchmark 33.9% - the closest was Dayton at 23.9%. the next closest were Westport Middle at 22.1% and Western Middle at 22.0%. No priority middle school met or exceeded the state % of students meeting reading benchmark of 41.6% - the closest was Dayton at 33.8%

Integration (results measures address important customer, product, market, process and action plan performance requirements identified in the organization; valid indicators of future performance; harmonized across processes and work units to support organization-wide goals)

This is a critical data point for college and career readiness and meeting the Next Generation Learners Delivery Plan trajectory - at this point, priority middle school data does not advance meeting the goals

E. GRADUATION RATE

Level (current level of performance)

- This is the baseline year for use of the Cohort Graduation Rate, and the last year that the Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate (AFGR) will be used.
- The lowest graduation rate among the Priority Schools is the Academy @ Shawnee with 69.4%.
- Six schools had graduation rates below 80%: Valley, Western, Iroquois, Dayton Ind., Monticello Ind. and Trimble County high schools.

Trend (the rate of performance improvement or the sustainability of good performance; the breadth of the performance results)

- Because of the change in the method of calculating graduation rate, we are unable to compare the two sets of data to establish trends.

Comparison (performance relative to appropriate comparisons, such as competitor or organizations similar to yours; performance relative to benchmarks)

- Sixteen (16) of thirty-two (32) high schools indicate cohort graduation rates below state average of 86.1: Caverna, Fern Creek, Academy @ Shawnee, Valley, Western, Doss, Iroquois, Newport Ind., Seneca, Southern, Waggener, Dayton Ind., Monticello Ind., Perry Central, Trimble, and Bryan Station high schools
- Eighteen of thirty-two (32) high schools failed to meet their AFGR Goal: Caverna, Leslie County, Metcalfe County, Western, East Carter, Christian County, Fairdale, Greenup County, Dayton Ind., Fleming County, Franklin-Simpson, Hopkins Central, Knox Central, Lincoln County, Perry Central, Pulaski County, Trimble County, and Bryan Station high schools

Integration (results measures address important customer, product, market, process and action plan performance requirements identified in the organization; valid indicators of future performance; harmonized across processes and work units to support organization-wide goals)

- Inconsistency in graduation rate may indicate that there is not a consistent intervention system in place to ensure student success - graduation rate impacts and informs all delivery plans.

F. PROFICIENCY and PERCENTILE

Level (current level of performance)

- Range of percentile rank is from 1st to the 97th percentile
- Nine (9) schools remain at 5th percentile or below: Frost Middle, Academy @ Shawnee, Valley, Iroquois, Knight Middle, Olmstead Academy North, Myers, Stuart, and Thomas Jefferson Middle Schools
- Overall scores range from 27.9% to 71.8%
- Fifteen (15) schools remain below 50% in overall score: Frost Middle, Academy @ Shawnee, Valley, Western, Doss, Iroquois, Knight Middle, Southern, Waggener, Olmstead Academy North, Monticello Ind.; Myers, Stuart, Thomas Jefferson, and Westport Middle schools
- Fifteen (15) schools are in the Needs Improvement/Progressing category, indicating their scores are trending upward: Fern Creek, Valley, Shawnee, Western Middle, Newport High, Doss, Seneca, Waggener, Iroquois, Southern, Knight Middle, Dayton Middle, Olmstead North, Stuart Middle, Westport Middle

- Twelve (12) schools are in the Needs Improvement Category: Caverna, Western High, Frost Middle, Knox Central, Christian County, Fairdale, Perry Central, Bryan Station, Monticello High, Dayton High, Myers Middle, Thomas Jefferson Middle.

Trend (the rate of performance improvement or the sustainability of good performance; the breadth of the performance results)

- Five schools Overall Scores were flat or declined from 2012 to 2013: Frost Middle, Olmstead Academy North, Knight Middle, Monticello Ind., and Myers Middle schools
- Seven schools' percentile ranks were flat or declined from 2012 to 2013: Frost Middle, Academy @ Shawnee, Knight Middle. Olmstead Academy North, Monticello Ind., Myers and Thomas Jefferson Middle Schools

Comparison (performance relative to appropriate comparisons, such as competitor or organizations similar to yours; performance relative to benchmarks)

- Twenty-seven (27) schools did not meet state benchmark of 57.4% Overall Score (see chart)
- Twenty-four (24) schools did not meet state benchmark of 50th percentile rank (see chart)

Integration (results measures address important customer, product, market, process and action plan performance requirements identified in the organization; valid indicators of future performance; harmonized across processes and work units to support organization-wide goals)

- This is a key indicator for ability to turnaround schools since percentile rank is one of the criteria for entering and exiting priority status

G. GAP

Level (current level of performance)

- Gap group performance in combined reading and math percentage proficient/distinguished ranges from 11.7 to 51.9. The all student group performance ranges from 11.9 to 61.3
- Twenty-four (24) schools have gap group performance below 30%: Fern Creek, Academy @ Shawnee, Valley, Western High, Christian County, Doss, Greenup County, Iroquois, Newport, Southern, Waggener, Dayton, Knox County, Lee County, Livingston Central, Monticello, and Trimble County High Schools; Frost, Knight, Olmstead Academy North, Myers, Stuart, Thomas Jefferson, and Westport Middle Schools

Trend (the rate of performance improvement or the sustainability of good performance; the breadth of the performance results)

- Two-year trend for closing gaps indicates that in eighteen (18) schools, gaps between the gap group and all students in the combined reading and math percentage of students proficient and distinguished has widened between 2011-12 and 2012-13 (see chart)
- All but nine schools failed to meet their Gap targets (see chart)

Comparison (performance relative to appropriate comparisons, such as competitor or organizations similar to yours; performance relative to benchmarks)

- Thirty-two schools have gap group performance below the state average for gap groups (see chart)
- Twenty (20) schools have larger than 5% points difference between gap group and all student performance: Fern Creek, Lawrence County, Leslie County, Metcalfe County, East Carter, Christian County, Greenup County, Sheldon Clark, Newport Ind., Waggener, Dayton High, Fleming County, Franklin-Simpson, Hopkins Central, Lee County, Livingston Central, Perry County Central, Pulaski County, Trimble County, and Bryan Station High Schools

- Even in schools where gaps are small, in many instances the overall proficiency is low for all students and subgroups

Integration (results measures address important customer, product, market, process and action plan performance requirements identified in the organization; valid indicators of future performance; harmonized across processes and work units to support organization-wide goals)

- Closing gaps is essential for proficiency measures and determines where interventions are required and where funding must be directed

Summary/Implications

A. GROWTH

- There is an increase in the numbers of schools achieving state averages in growth over a two year period (ten schools in 2012 to thirteen (13) schools in 2013), but there remains a greater number of schools that have seen decreases in growth scores (23 schools) than have seen increases (18 schools) over the same period.
- Middle schools have been less successful at meeting state averages over both years of the two year period, with no middle schools meeting average in 2012 and one school meeting average in 2013, as opposed to ten high schools in 2012 and 12 high schools in 2013.
- The growth scores reflected in this report align with the first two years of implementation of the Kentucky Core Assessment Standards (KCAS). Both Common Core implementation and the new assessment are still in relatively early stages of deployment, so it is expected that growth scores will increase as teachers become more familiar with their use.
- With only two years of data (baseline in 2012 and data from 2013), it is difficult to draw meaningful conclusions about positive or negative trends in growth data.

B. COLLEGE AND CAREER READINESS

- Most high schools are making double-digit gains in their percentages of students that are college and career ready, but the percentages of students that are college and career ready range from 9.9% to 74.4%.
- Many of the lower rates of gain are at middle schools, where only two years of data have been collected (three years of data are collected at the high schools), giving them less opportunity to achieve gains.
- Many of the lower percentages of students college and career ready are at the middle school level.
- Twenty one high schools met their college and career readiness targets, while only eleven failed to make them. Targets are not set for middle schools

C. ACT

- Overall high school performance levels on each of the three subtests of the ACT are below state mean with the exception of five of thirty-two (32) schools meeting English state mean, four of thirty-two (32) schools meeting Math state mean, and six of thirty-two (32) schools meeting Reading state mean.

- Overall, school performance against state benchmarks shows school scores on each of the three subtests of the ACT are below the benchmark with the exception of six of thirty-two (32) schools meeting English state benchmark, four of thirty-two (32) schools meeting Math state benchmark, and six of thirty-two (32) schools meeting Reading state benchmark.
- There is a group of approximately 5 – 7 schools that are “high-flyers” that are meeting benchmark and scoring above mean in several, if not all subtests.

D. EXPLORE

- The highest percentages of students meeting state benchmark are on the English subtest. The percentages of students meeting benchmarks on the Math and Reading subtests are substantially lower, with many schools having 20% or fewer students meeting benchmark.
- English, Math or Reading mean scores are declining in several schools.
- Only one of nine schools in one of the three subtests exceeded the state average percentage of students meeting benchmark.

E. GRADUATION RATE

- **The state moved** this past year from the previous graduation measure, the Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate (AFGR) to the new Cohort Graduation Rate required by the US Department of Education, which will allow for national comparisons of graduation rates.
- Fourteen (14) of thirty-two (32) high schools met their targets on the AFGR this year.
- Fourteen (14) of thirty-two (32) high schools scored above the state average Cohort graduation rate of 86.1.
- Additional Cohort graduation data will be available next year to begin comparisons.

F. PROFICIENCY AND PERCENTILE

- Six Priority Schools scored in the Distinguished Range (top 90%), Eight scored in the Proficient range (top 70%), fifteen (15) scored in the Needs Improvement/Progressing range and twelve (12) scored in the Needs Improvement range (below 70%). All of these schools had initially been within the bottom 5% of schools statewide.
- The range of percentile rank for Priority Schools is from 1% to 97%.
- Nine of the 41 schools remain in the bottom 5% of percentile rank (6 of 9 middle schools, 3 of 32 high schools), which is an improvement from sixteen (16) schools last year.
- Twenty-seven schools did not meet the state benchmark of 57.4 for their Overall Score
- Twenty-four (24) schools did not meet the state benchmark of 50% for their percentile rank.

G. GAP

- The achievement gap between the Gap Students Group and the All Students Group in terms of the percentage of students Proficient or Distinguished in Reading and Math widened in 18 schools from 2011-12 to 2012-13

- In twenty (20) schools, there was a less than 5 point difference in the performance of the Gap Students and the All Students groups; however, even in some of those schools, the percentages of students proficient and distinguished in reading and math were quite low.
- Nine schools met their Gap targets for both the Gap Group and the All Students group.
- Thirty-two (32) of forty-one (41) schools scored below state averages of 34.3% for middle schools and 34.9% for high schools in Gap Group percentages of students proficient or distinguished in Reading and Math.

There is a set of “high-flying” Priority Schools that are determined to turn around their school’s performance across the board. These schools have scored consistently high across multiple categories and can compete favorably with high-performing non-Priority schools. Some of these schools may have lower performance in some categories than in previous years but this may be attributed to their maintenance of high levels of performance overall. These schools come from all three Cohorts, so some have been receiving services over the past three years while others have only received services in the previous year. They have also received different amounts of funding and support based on the amount and availability of federal and state funds to provide to their Cohort. These schools are proof that persistently low-achieving schools can overcome the many barriers that contributed to their classification as a Priority School and achieve and maintain high levels of student performance. They can provide examples of best practices than can be of benefit to all schools

Middle School performance across multiple categories is, with some exception, quite low. A number of schools reflecting the lowest scores are clustered at the middle school level. These schools come from all three Cohorts, and many have remained low-scoring over time with uneven levels of improvement that may or may not be sustainable over time. The factors contributing to each school’s identification are multiple, individual and complex, and cannot be reduced to a few variables. However, it may be helpful to remember that the changes in student maturity, scheduling, and the additional responsibilities and self-direction that are required for students to succeed may be contributors to some of the performance issues at this level. The larger numbers of different elementary schools that feed middle schools and the different levels of preparation of students from each may also provide a challenge for educators. Additional attention to these schools and the issues they present is imperative.

The 2013 Annual Evaluation Report for School Improvement Grant from the University of Kentucky Human Development Institute

- This evaluation is to examine the impact of the SIG on instructional and leadership climates in the schools and the impact of SIG on student outcomes.
- The themes from interviews and teacher survey data are:
 - Educational Recovery Staff
 - Data driven processes and systems
 - Status of Professional Learning Communities
 - Professional development tailored to emerging and individual needs
 - Student engagement and involvement in learning

- Internal and External barriers
- In general, the work of Education Recovery in all three regions of Kentucky centers on the above mentioned themes. The work of the Educational Recovery Team is tailored to meet the needs of the individual schools. Recommendations:
 - Periodic reflection of data processes and systems to ensure deployment with fidelity
 - Continue to support the work of Professional Learning Communities and other professional development needs based on student data
 - Continue to develop actions plan for sustainability
 Continue to work with leadership to remove internal and external barriers.

From the Kentucky TELL Survey in 2013 Findings:

- More District 180 Cohort 1 and 2 educators responded in 2013 as compared to 2011. The findings provide affirmation that the Kentucky Department of Education's efforts in assisting District 180 schools are showing positive results. District 180 Priority schools teachers report that their teaching conditions have improved considerably between survey administrations and the change is greater for these schools compared to non-District 180 schools.
- District 180 schools made substantial progress in the areas of Community Support and Involvement and Managing Student Conduct compared to 2011.
- The results of the 2013 TELL Kentucky Survey in the District 180 Priority Schools showed marked improvement in the rates of agreement on the survey.

What are our next steps?

1. Share summary report with Commissioner and Board of Education
2. Share report with Education Recovery Directors, who will use it as a data resource guide for conversations with the schools and the districts for analysis and needed changes in their setting
 - a. Schools will review 30, 60, 90 day action steps to ensure data is being addressed.
 - Build formative evaluation for professional learning experiences to ensure ER team is meeting the needs of staff
 - Review data processes to ensure data turns in to valuable instructional practices
3. Cohort 1, 2 and 3 schools will review current sustainability plans for the next three years and make adjustments based on student data results and resources for the next year. Districts will review supports for sustainability as education recovery staff exits the cohorts. Focus on Cohort 1, 2 and 3 schools still in lowest 5th percentile. ER staff will continue to work with Districts which have schools not making acceptable progress. Share report with Centers for Learning Excellence (CLE), who have provided support over the three-year period.
4. Share report with partners as appropriate
5. At the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) level, the Office of Next Generation Schools and Districts will:
 - a. Continue to collaborate with The National Institute for School Leadership/CPE/JCPS/District 180 staff to build a leadership development cadre for turnaround that will be launched during the summer of 2014. The leadership Development training will be called LEAD Kentucky and will be offered regionally across the state in order to grow successful leaders that can strategically deal with low performing schools.

- b. With partners, continue development of statewide sustainability plan for use of available funds to provide support for Priority Schools moving forward.
- c. Continue to develop and support the process for key hub schools across the state to serve as incubators for innovation to support the regional schools and model systems for continuous improvement. Continue to review data quarterly and monitor the progress of Priority Schools through District 180.
- d. Continue to collaborate with Priority Schools and Districts in the rollout of PGES. Continue collaboration with AdvancEd for diagnostic review process and internal review process.

Growth 2012 and 2013 School Years

DISTRICT	High School	2012 Growth Reading & Math	2013 Growth Reading & Math	Gain/Loss	Middle School	2012 Growth Reading & Math	2013 Growth Reading & Math	Gain/Loss
Caverna Ind.	Caverna HS	59.6	44.6	-15.0				
Carter County	East Carter HS	57.2	52.3	-4.9				
Christian County	Christian County HS	55.9	57.9	2.0				
Dayton Ind.	Dayton Ind. HS	65.8	58.4	-7.4				
Fayette County	Bryan Station HS	57	56.2	-0.8				
Fleming County	Fleming County HS	54.2	58.2	4.0				
Greenup County	Greenup County HS	57.9	54.2	-3.7				
Hopkins County	Hopkins County Central HS	57.9	66.1	8.2				
Jefferson County	Academy @ Shawnee	42.4	34	-8.4	Frost MS	46.1	44.6	-1.5
Jefferson County	Doss HS	48.8	45.3	-3.5	Western MS	58.1	65.4	7.3
Jefferson County	Fairdale HS	59.3	48.6	-10.7	Knight MS	52	46.5	-5.5
Jefferson County	Fern Creek Traditional HS	59.5	58	-1.5	Dayton MS	55.5	54.8	-0.7
Jefferson County	Iroquois HS	47	45.1	-1.9	Olmstead Academy N.	50	47	-3.0
Jefferson County	Seneca HS	61.8	49.5	-12.3	Myers MS	46.6	46.2	-0.4
Jefferson County	Southern HS	51.5	48.8	-2.7	Stuart MS	42.5	51.2	8.7
Jefferson County	Valley Traditional HS	46.4	40.4	-6	Thomas Jefferson MS	53.2	54.9	1.7
Jefferson County	Waggener Traditional HS	55.8	45.9	-9.9	Westport MS	49.1	52.1	3.0
Jefferson County	Western HS	47.8	48	0.2				
Knox County	Knox Central HS	46.9	51.2	4.3				
Lawrence County	Lawrence County HS	52.4	59.4	7				
Lee County	Lee County HS	62.8	50	-12.8				
Leslie County	Leslie County HS	52.6	53.3	0.7				
Lincoln County	Lincoln County HS	56.8	64.4	7.6				
Livingston County	Livingston Central HS	51.6	62.2	10.6				
Martin County	Sheldon Clark HS	49.3	48.9	-0.4				
Metcalfe County	Metcalfe County HS	66	66.4	0.4				
Monticello Ind.	Monticello HS	46.3	55.4	9.1				
Newport Ind.	Newport HS	62.5	49	-13.5				
Perry County	Perry County Central HS	39.9	50.6	10.7				
Pulaski County	Pulaski County HS	62.9	64.9	2.0				
Simpson County	Franklin-Simpson County HS	55.2	63.9	8.7				
Trimble County	Trimble County HS	64	63.3	-0.7				

State HS	2012 - 58.5
State HS	2013 - 57.2
State MS	2012 - 60.4
State MS	2013 - 59.9
Gain	

CCR						
Cohort 1 District	School	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	Met CCR Target (High School only)	Gain/Loss
Caverna Ind.	Caverna HS	2	17.4	37.5	No (39.5)	35.5
Jefferson	Fern Creek HS	26	37.5	49.2	Yes (43.3)	23.2
Jefferson	Frost MS		15.4	14.3		-1.1
Lawrence	Lawrence Co. HS	28	28	50.0	Yes (44.7)	22
Leslie	Leslie Co. HS	36	50	74.4	Yes (40.5)	38
Metcalfe	Metcalfe Co. HS	33	51	50.0	Yes (46.8)	17
Jefferson	Academy @ Shawnee	6	14.9	9.9	No (32.8)	3.9
Jefferson	Valley HS	4	10.9	22.8	No (32.8)	18.8
Jefferson	Western MS		10.8	23.7		12.9
Jefferson	Western HS	11	17.4	42.7	Yes (32.8)	31.7
Cohort 2 District	School	2010-11 (identified)	2011-12	2012-13	Met CCR Target (High School)	Gain/Loss
Carter	East Carter HS	24	57.0	68.7	Yes (49.6)	44.7
Christian	Christian Co. HS	24	46.0	52.7	Yes (47.5)	28.7
Jefferson	Doss HS	8	12.9	20.5	No (37.7)	12.5
Jefferson	Fairdale HS	20	22.8	34.7	No (36.3)	14.7
Greenup	Greenup HS	31	46.0	58.1	Yes (48.2)	27.1
Jefferson	Iroquois HS	9	24.8	32.0	No (37.0)	23.0
Jefferson	Knight MS		20.2	20.2		0.0
Martin	Sheldon Clark HS	27	51.0	56.3	Yes (43.3)	29.3
Newport Ind.	Newport HS	21	36.0	48.4	Yes (45.4)	27.4
Jefferson	Seneca HS	31	33.6	45.2	Yes (43.3)	14.2
Jefferson	Southern HS	13	24.9	33.6	No (37.7)	20.6
Jefferson	Waggener HS	18	27.9	32.8	No (39.1)	14.8
Cohort 3 District	School	2010-11	2011-12 (identified)	2012-2013	Met CCR Target (High School)	Gain/Loss
Dayton Ind.	Dayton HS	21	31.0	50.0	Yes (39.8)	29.0
Dayton Ind.	Dayton MS		32.6	45.6		13.0
Fleming	Fleming Co. HS	32	57.0	64.9	Yes (56.6)	32.9
Simpson	Franklin Simpson HS	25	31.0	69.2	Yes (55.2)	44.2
Jefferson	Olmstead Academy		15.1	17.4		2.3
Hopkins	Hopkins Central HS	30	44.0	69.2	Yes (52.4)	39.2
Knox	Knox Central HS	29	30.3	41.8	No (43.3)	12.8
Lee	Lee Co. HS	26	51.0	62.7	Yes (49.6)	36.7
Lincoln	Lincoln Co. HS	23	43.0	56.5	Yes (48.9)	33.5
Livingston	Livingston Co. HS	32.0	35.0	51.1	Yes (45.4)	19.1
Monticello	Monticello HS	27.0	35.0	41.8	No (43.3)	14.8
Jefferson	Myers MS		23.9	19.3		-4.6
Perry	Perry Co. Central HS	23.0	22.6	45.8	Yes (42.6)	22.8
Pulaski	Pulaski Co. HS	36.0	61.2	67.3	Yes (50.3)	31.3
Jefferson	Stuart MS		21.4	20.4		-1.0
Jefferson	Thomas Jefferson MS		24.0	20.6		-3.4
Trimble	Trimble Co. HS	44.0	31.0	68.2	Yes (46.1)	24.2
Jefferson	Westport MS		18.4	24.0		6.4
Fayette	Bryan Station HS	28.0	34.2	38.0	No (46.8)	6.2
State	2012 HS - 51.9, 2012 MS - 44.2, 2013 HS - 60.7, 2013 MS - 47.2					

Graduation Rate by Cohort and AFGR

Graduation Rate - Cohort (2103 baseline)			AFGR	
Cohort 1 District	School	2013	2013 AFGR	Met AFGR (Goal)
Caverna Ind.	Caverna HS	82.8	67.2	No (71.2)
Jefferson	Fern Creek HS	81.9	78.5	Yes (70.2)
Jefferson	Frost MS	N/A		
Lawrence	Lawrence Co. HS	95	73.1	Yes (71.8)
Leslie	Leslie Co. HS	99.2	65.2	No (69.4)
Metcalfe	Metcalfe Co. HS	91.2	70.1	No (78.3)
Jefferson	Academy @ Shawnee	69.4	58.9	Yes (47.4)
Jefferson	Valley HS	70.5	69.7	Yes (56.5)
Jefferson	Western MS	N/A		
Jefferson	Western HS	75.5	66.9	No (71.0)
Cohort 2 District	School	2013	2013 AFGR	Met AFGR (Goal)
Carter	East Carter HS	98.3	77.6	No (88.3)
Christian	Christian Co. HS	88.9	75.0	No (78.9)
Jefferson	Doss HS	82.9	70.0	Yes (63.0)
Jefferson	Fairdale HS	88.5	71.9	No (78.5)
Greenup	Greenup HS	88.2	82.2	No (82.6)
Jefferson	Iroquois HS	70	46.8	Yes (45.4)
Jefferson	Knight MS	N/A		
Martin	Sheldon Clark HS	91.9	80.0	Yes (72.6)
Newport Ind.	Newport HS	84	68.1	Yes (67.2)
Jefferson	Seneca HS	82.5	66.8	Yes (63.2)
Jefferson	Southern HS	80.9	68.8	Yes (64.6)
Jefferson	Waggener HS	81.9	73.5	Yes (62.6)
Cohort 3 District	School	2013	2013 AFGR	Met AFGR (Goal)
Dayton Ind.	Dayton HS	79.7	57.8	No (66.4)
Dayton Ind.	Dayton MS	N/A		
Fleming	Fleming Co. HS	94.2	35.3	No (41.1)
Simpson	Franklin Simpson HS	94.8	81.5	No (83.4)
Jefferson	Olmstead Academy	N/A		
Hopkins	Hopkins Central HS	87	76.3	No (86.8)
Knox	Knox Central HS	90.4	69.7	No (72.0)
Lee	Lee Co. HS	89.2	82.7	Yes (71.3)
Lincoln	Lincoln Co. HS	90.9	80.0	No (89.5)
Livingston	Livingston Co. HS	94.9	99.1	Yes (83.2)
Monticello	Monticello HS	78.9	100.0	Yes (96.0)
Jefferson	Myers MS	N/A		
Perry	Perry Co. Central HS	81.7	76.2	No (79.3)
Pulaski	Pulaski Co. HS	92.8	76.5	No (78.4)
Jefferson	Stuart MS	N/A		
Jefferson	Thomas Jefferson MS	N/A		
Trimble	Trimble Co. HS	73.9	63.0	No (68.8)
Jefferson	Westport MS	N/A		
Fayette	Bryan Station HS	82.9	71.1	No (77.3)
State		86.1	78.9	No (79.6)

Above State Avg.

Met AFGR Goal

ACT

Year	Code	School	Title I	Cohort	Number	Transform/Restaff	Mean English	% English Bench	Mean Math	% Math Bench	Mean Reading	% Reading Bench
2010	105120	East Carter Co HS		2	202	Transform	16.8	43.6%	16.7	24.8%	18.0	37.1%
2011	105120	East Carter Co HS			193		17.1	44.6%	17.5	26.4%	18.0	32.6%
2012	105120	East Carter Co HS			184		17.3	45.7%	17.5	27.2%	18.6	42.9%
2013	105120	East Carter Co HS		2	189		17.8	51.8	17.4	21.7	18.8	39.40%
		Three-Year Change*					1	8.20%	0.7	-3.10%	0.8	2.30%
		Three-Year Effect Size					0.17		0.17		0.15	
2010	113030	Caverna HS		1	52	Transform	14.6	21.2%	16.0	5.8%	16.8	23.1%
2011	113030	Caverna HS			49		14.6	24.5%	16.1	10.2%	16.5	18.4%
2012	113030	Caverna HS			53		15.2	28.3%	16.8	17.0%	16.7	28.3%
2013	113030	Caverna HS			36		15.7	25%	16.8	13.9	17.8	21.60%
		Three-Year Change					1.1	3.80%	0.8	8.10%	1	-1.50%
		Three-Year Effect Size					0.2		0.20		0.18	
2010	115030	Christian Co HS		2	304	Transform	16.4	42.8%	17.2	27.3%	18.0	35.2%
2011	115030	Christian Co HS			283		16.2	36.0%	17.1	20.1%	17.2	24.4%
2012	115030	Christian Co HS			273		16.1	38.5%	17.5	25.6%	17.2	27.8%
2013	115030	Christian Co HS			284		17.4	50.00%	18	33.8	18.5	37.10%
		Three-Year Change					1	7.20%	0.8	6.50%	0.5	1.90%
		Three-Year Effect Size					0.17		0.2		0.09	
2010	147010	Dayton HS	Yes	3	49	Transform	14.8	28.6%	15.7	14.3%	16.4	20.4%
2011	147010	Dayton HS	Yes		59		15.7	33.9%	16.6	15.3%	16.5	23.7%
2012	147010	Dayton HS	Yes		60		17.5	46.7%	17.7	30.0%	17.6	31.7%
2013	147010	Dayton HS	Yes		39		17.2	46.10%	17.6	25.60%	17.6	37.50%

ACT Eng > 50%

ACT Math > 40%

ACT Reading > 40%

Gain

Greatest Gain

Negative scores

*Above state average benchmark/ mean

ACT

Year	Code	School	Title I	Cohort	Number	Transform/Restaff	Mean English	% English Bench	Mean Math	% Math Bench	Mean Reading	% Reading Bench
		Three-Year Change					2.4	17.50%	1.9	11.30%	1.2	17.10%
		Three-Year Effect Size					0.42		0.47		0.22	
2010	165170	Bryan Station HS	Yes	3	396	Transform	16.3	35.9%	17.0	24.2%	17.5	30.3%
2011	165170	Bryan Station HS	Yes		390		16.5	37.4%	17.6	28.2%	18.2	32.1%
2012	165170	Bryan Station HS	Yes		430		16.2	34.0%	17.8	29.8%	17.2	30.0%
2013	165170	Bryan Station HS	Yes		386		16.8	42.70%	17.9	31.30%	18.2	35.90%
		Three-Year Change					0.5	6.60%	0.9	7.10%	0.7	5.60%
		Three-Year Effect Size					0.09		0.22		0.13	
2010	171035	Fleming Co HS		3	186	Transform	16.2	34.9%	17.7	30.1%	17.0	28.0%
2011	171035	Fleming Co HS			166		16.4	40.4%	17.5	26.5%	17.7	30.1%
2012	171035	Fleming Co HS			182		16.4	38.5%	17.5	26.4%	17.7	33.0%
2013	171035	Fleming Co HS			158		16.7	41.10%	18.6	36.7	18.4	32.70%
		Three-Year Change					0.5	6.20%	0.9	6.60%	1.4	4.70%
		Three-Year Effect Size					0.1		0.22		0.26	
2010	221027	Greenup Co HS		2	208	Transform	16.3	37.5%	17.3	26.4%	17.7	31.3%
2011	221027	Greenup Co HS			226		17.1	45.6%	17.5	31.4%	18.4	35.4%
2012	221027	Greenup Co HS			186		17.6	48.4%	18.1	30.1%	18.7	38.7%
2013	221027	Greenup Co HS			181		16.7	42.50%	17.6	24.30%	18	35.80%
		Three-Year Change					0.40	5.00	0.30	-2.10	0.30	4.50
		Three-Year Effect Size					0.07		0.07		0.05	
2010	265130	Hopkins Co Central HS		3	218	Transform	16.8	43.6%	17.1	26.6%	18.5	36.2%

ACT Eng > 50%

ACT Math > 40%

ACT Reading > 40%

Gain

Greatest Gain

Negative scores

*Above state average benchmark/ mean

ACT

Year	Code	School	Title I	Cohort	Number	Transform/Restaff	Mean English	% English Bench	Mean Math	% Math Bench	Mean Reading	% Reading Bench
2011	265130	Hopkins Co Central HS			219		17.1	46.6%	17.6	25.6%	18.6	37.0%
2012	265130	Hopkins Co Central HS			183		18.1	51.9%	18.4	38.8%	18.9	37.2%
2013	265130	Hopkins Co Central HS			203		18.2	*55.2%	18.2	38.40%	*19.5	*47.4%
		Three-Year Change					1.40	11.60%	1.10	11.80%	1.00	11.20%
		Three-Year Effect Size					0.24		0.27		0.18	
2010	275012	Fern Creek Traditional HS		1	293	ReStaff	17.0	44.7%	17.3	29.0%	18.2	36.5%
2011	275012	Fern Creek Traditional HS			295		15.9	34.6%	17.6	30.8%	17.4	27.1%
2012	275012	Fern Creek Traditional HS			321		16.6	40.2%	17.8	31.2%	18.0	32.4%
2013	275012	Fern Creek Traditional HS			344		17.1	47.70%	17.7	31.10%	17.8	31.50%
		Three-Year Change					0.10	3.0.%	0.40	2.10%	-0.40	-5.80%
		Three-Year Effect Size					0.02		0.10		-0.07	
2010	275031	Southern HS	Yes	2	250	ReStaff	14.2	21.2%	16.1	17.2%	16.0	20.8%
2011	275031	Southern HS	Yes		256		13.9	18.4%	16.6	20.7%	15.9	19.5%
2012	275031	Southern HS	Yes		276		15.0	27.2%	17.2	25.4%	15.9	19.2%
2013	275031	Southern HS	Yes		263		15.4	31.20%	17.4	25.50%	17	29.30%
		Three-Year Change					1.20	10.00%	1.30	8.30%	1.00	8.50%
		Three-Year Effect Size					0.21		0.32		0.18	
2010	275033	Valley HS	Yes	1	191	Transform	13.0	15.7%	15.1	6.3%	14.8	10.5%
2011	275033	Valley HS	Yes		185		14.3	22.7%	15.6	8.6%	15.8	17.3%
2012	275033	Valley HS	Yes		177		13.8	20.9%	15.7	9.0%	15.4	18.1%
2013	275033	Valley HS	Yes	1	219		13.4	18.30%	15.9	12.80%	15.40%	18.70%
		Three-Year Change					0.40	2.60%	0.80	6.50%	0.60	8.20%
		Three-Year Effect Size					0.07		0.20		0.11	

ACT Eng > 50%

ACT Math > 40%

ACT Reading > 40%

Gain

Greatest Gain

Negative scores

*Above state average benchmark/ mean

ACT

Year	Code	School	Title I	Cohort	Number	Transfor m/Restaff	Mean English	% English Bench	Mean Math	% Math Bench	Mean Reading	% Reading Bench
2010	275051	Waggener HS	Yes	2	195	ReStaff	14.9	31.3%	16.5	20.5%	16.7	28.7%
2011	275051	Waggener HS	Yes		184		14.6	27.2%	17.1	25.5%	16.4	21.2%
2012	275051	Waggener HS	Yes		176		14.9	31.3%	16.9	22.2%	16.2	23.9%
2013	275051	Waggener HS	Yes		116		14.5	29.30%	17	23.30%	16.2	22.90%
		Three-Year Change					-0.40	-2.00%	0.50	2.80%	-0.50	-5.80%
		Three-Year Effect Size					-0.07		0.12		-0.09	
2010	275057	Fairdale HS Mca	Yes	2	203	ReStaff	14.5	27.1%	16.7	21.2%	16.4	23.6%
2011	275057	Fairdale HS Mca	Yes		195		14.8	25.1%	17.0	23.1%	17.0	24.6%
2012	275057	Fairdale HS Mca	Yes		234		14.1	23.5%	16.8	20.1%	15.7	15.8%
2013	275057	Fairdale HS Mca	Yes		230		14.7	30.40%	16.9	23.50%	16.5	25.60%
		Three-Year Change					0.20	3.30%	0.20	2.30%	0.10	2.00%
		Three-Year Effect Size					0.03		0.05		0.02	
2010	275073	Seneca High	Yes	2	324	ReStaff	16.7	40.7%	17.4	30.6%	18.0	34.9%
2011	275073	Seneca High	Yes		291		15.3	35.1%	17.0	19.9%	17.5	30.6%
2012	275073	Seneca High	Yes		324		16.2	35.8%	17.5	25.9%	17.0	25.3%
2013	275073	Seneca High	Yes		360		15.3	34.20%	16.6	15.80%	16.4	22.60%
		Three-Year Change					-1.40	-6.50%	-0.80	-14.80%	-1.60	-12.30%
		Three-Year Effect Size					-0.24		-0.20		-0.29	
2010	275084	Western HS	Yes	1	205	ReStaff	12.7	10.2%	15.3	7.8%	14.7	12.2%
2011	275084	Western HS	Yes		160		12.4	11.9%	15.7	10.0%	14.7	10.6%
2012	275084	Western HS	Yes		174		14.4	22.4%	16.1	13.8%	14.9	11.5%
2013	275084	Western HS	Yes		166		14.5	24.70%	15.9	9%	15.3	13.80%
		Three-Year Change					1.80	14.50%	0.60	1.20%	0.60	1.60%

ACT Eng > 50%

ACT Math > 40%

ACT Reading > 40%

Gain

Greatest Gain

Negative scores

*Above state average benchmark/ mean

ACT

Year	Code	School	Title I	Cohort	Number	Transform/Restaff	Mean English	% English Bench	Mean Math	% Math Bench	Mean Reading	% Reading Bench
		Three-Year Effect Size					0.31		0.15		0.11	
2010	275100	Doss High	Yes	2	191	ReStaff	14.3	20.9%	16.0	14.7%	15.9	18.3%
2011	275100	Doss High	Yes		190		13.8	20.5%	16.3	17.9%	15.4	14.2%
2012	275100	Doss High	Yes		202		13.7	18.3%	16.1	13.9%	15.4	14.9%
2013	275100	Doss High	Yes		188		13.6	22.80%	15.9	12.20%	15.6	19.10%
		Three-Year Change					-0.70	1.90%	-0.10	-2.50%	-0.30	0.80%
		Three-Year Effect Size					-0.12		-0.02		-0.05	
2010	275335	Iroquois HS	Yes	2	207	ReStaff	13.0	18.4%	15.5	11.1%	14.9	15.0%
2011	275335	Iroquois HS	Yes		218		13.4	18.3%	16.2	13.3%	15.4	16.1%
2012	275335	Iroquois HS	Yes		228		12.9	13.6%	15.9	11.0%	14.6	12.7%
2013	275335	Iroquois HS	Yes		223		13.3	17.90%	16.2	14.80%	15	13.20%
		Three-Year Change					0.30	-0.50%	0.70	3.70%	0.10	-1.80%
		Three-Year Effect Size					0.05		0.17		0.02	
2010	275590	Academy @ Shawnee	Yes	1	72	ReStaff	12.7	15.3%	14.8	5.6%	14.3	9.7%
2011	275590	Academy @ Shawnee	Yes		83		12.5	9.6%	15.8	13.3%	14.2	6.0%
2012	275590	Academy @ Shawnee	Yes		102		13.7	21.6%	15.6	7.8%	14.7	9.8%
2013	275590	Academy @ Shawnee	Yes		90		14.2	20.00%	16	11.1	14.9	16.70%
		Three-Year Change					1.50	4.70%	1.20	5.50%	0.60	7.00%
		Three-Year Effect Size					0.26		0.29		0.11	
2010	301410	Knox Central HS	Yes	3	238	Transform	16.6	41.6%	17.4	29.0%	17.3	31.1%
2011	301410	Knox Central HS	Yes		194		15.3	31.4%	17.1	23.2%	17.1	25.3%
2012	301410	Knox Central HS	Yes		218		17.0	42.7%	17.3	25.7%	17.4	29.8%
2013	301410	Knox Central HS	Yes		168		17.6	44.00%	17.60%	31.00%	17.80%	30.80%

ACT Eng > 50%

ACT Math > 40%

ACT Reading > 40%

Gain

Greatest Gain

Negative scores

*Above state average benchmark/ mean

ACT

Year	Code	School	Title I	Cohort	Number	Transform/Restaff	Mean English	% English Bench	Mean Math	% Math Bench	Mean Reading	% Reading Bench
		Three-Year Change					1.00	2.40%	0.20	2.00%	0.50	-0.30%
		Three-Year Effect Size					0.17		0.05		0.09	
2010	315260	Lawrence Co HS	Yes	1	205	Transform	16.3	38.5%	16.6	20.0%	18.1	35.1%
2011	315260	Lawrence Co HS	yes		168		16.5	36.9%	16.3	11.9%	18.1	28.6%
2012	315260	Lawrence Co HS	yes		144		17.5	43.1%	16.8	23.6%	18.7	41.0%
2013	315260	Lawrence Co HS	Yes		135		17	45.90%	17.6	27.40%	19	38.10%
		Three-Year Change					0.70	7.40%	1.00	7.40%	0.90	3.00%
		Three-Year Effect Size					0.12		0.25		0.16	
2010	321050	Lee Co HS	Yes	3	53	Transform	15.9	30.2%	16.3	9.4%	17.0	18.9%
2011	321050	Lee Co HS	Yes		84		15.7	29.8%	16.9	20.2%	16.8	23.8%
2012	321050	Lee Co HS	Yes		80		17.4	45.0%	17.8	33.8%	18.4	37.5%
2013	321050	Lee Co HS	Yes		79		17.4	51.90%	17.9	22.90%	17.9	31.30%
		Three-Year Change					1.50	21.70%	1.60	13.50%	0.90	12.40%
		Three-Year Effect Size					0.26		0.39		0.16	
2010	325350	Leslie Co HS		1	135	Transform	15.8	35.6%	16.9	21.5%	17.7	32.6%
2011	325350	Leslie Co HS			114		16.2	36.0%	17.2	27.2%	17.6	29.8%
2012	325350	Leslie Co HS			125		18.0	53.6%	17.7	25.6%	18.9	42.4%
2013	325350	Leslie Co HS			112		15.90	35.70%	17.10	25.00%	17.70	35.10%
		Three-Year Change					0.10	0.10	0.20	3.50	0.00	2.50
		Three-Year Effect Size					0.02		0.05		0.00	
2010	341095	Lincoln Co HS		3	249	Transform	16.6	39.4%	17.6	31.3%	18.3	36.1%
2011	341095	Lincoln Co HS			245		16.7	39.2%	17.1	22.0%	18.5	34.7%
2012	341095	Lincoln Co HS			236		18.7	56.8%	18.4	37.3%	19.5	47.9%

ACT Eng > 50%

ACT Math > 40%

ACT Reading > 40%

Gain

Greatest Gain

Negative scores

*Above state average benchmark/ mean

ACT

Year	Code	School	Title I	Cohort	Number	Transform/Restaff	Mean English	% English Bench	Mean Math	% Math Bench	Mean Reading	% Reading Bench
2013	341095	Lincoln Co HS			230		*18.6	*58.7%	*19	39.10%	*19.8	*50.4%
		Three-Year Change					2.00	17.40%	1.40	6.00%	1.50	14.30%
		Three-Year Effect Size					0.35		0.34		0.27	
2010	345050	Livingston Central HS		3	77	Transform	17.8	50.6%	18.0	37.7%	19.2	42.9%
2011	345050	Livingston Central HS			88		18.3	50.0%	17.2	20.5%	18.4	36.4%
2012	345050	Livingston Central HS			104		18.2	53.8%	17.8	30.8%	18.5	41.3%
2013	345050	Livingston Central HS			64		*19	*53.1%	18.8	*40.6%	*20	*52.9%
		Three-Year Change					1.20	2.50%	0.80	2.90%	0.80	10.00%
		Three-Year Effect Size					0.21		0.2		0.15	
2010	385250	Sheldon Clark HS		2	143	Transform	15.7	32.2%	16.2	16.8%	18.0	36.4%
2011	385250	Sheldon Clark HS			143		15.1	30.1%	16.1	11.9%	17.4	30.8%
2012	385250	Sheldon Clark HS			163		14.6	27.0%	16.2	16.0%	16.8	27.6%
2013	385250	Sheldon Clark HS			129		15.2	36.40%	16.8	19.40%	17.1	29.70%
		Three-Year Change					-0.50	4.20%	0.60	2.60%	-0.90	6.70%
		Three-Year Effect Size					-0.09		0.15	-0.16	-0.16	
2010	425050	Metcalfe Co HS		1	118	Transform	17.9	53.4%	17.1	28.0%	18.5	38.1%
2011	425050	Metcalfe Co HS			105		17.9	46.7%	19.3	46.7%	19.4	42.9%
2012	425050	Metcalfe Co HS			97		16.3	34.0%	19.5	52.6%	17.6	32.0%
2013	425050	Metcalfe Co HS			108		17	50.90%	*19	*50.9%	19.3	42.70%
		Three-Year Change					-0.90	-2.50%	1.90	22.90%	0.80	4.60%
		Three-Year Effect Size					-0.16		0.47		0.15	
2010	436010	Monticello HS	Yes	3	59	Transform	15.9	30.5%	16.8	25.4%	16.7	23.7%
2011	436010	Monticello HS	Yes		71		15.5	31.0%	17.3	21.1%	17.5	29.6%

ACT Eng > 50%

ACT Math > 40%

ACT Reading > 40%

Gain

Greatest Gain

Negative scores

*Above state average benchmark/ mean

ACT

Year	Code	School	Title I	Cohort	Number	Transform/Restaff	Mean English	% English Bench	Mean Math	% Math Bench	Mean Reading	% Reading Bench
2012	436010	Monticello HS	Yes		50		14.8	24.0%	16.0	14.0%	16.2	26.0%
2013	436010	Monticello HS	Yes		58		17.4	43.10%	17.6	27.60%	18.4	38.60%
		Three-Year Change					1.50	12.60%	0.80	2.20%	1.70	14.90%
		Three-Year Effect Size					0.26		0.2		0.31	
2010	452070	Newport HS		2	127	Transform	15.2	27.6%	16.7	25.2%	16.9	25.2%
2011	452070	Newport HS			112		16.0	35.7%	17.1	24.1%	17.5	29.5%
2012	452070	Newport HS			100		16.6	35.0%	17.7	28.0%	17.0	25.0%
2013	452070	Newport HS			94		16.1	25.50%	17.5	23.40%	17	23.10%
		Three-Year Change					0.90	-2.10%	0.80	-1.80%	0.10	2.10%
		Three-Year Effect Size					0.16		0.20		0.02	
2010	485250	Perry Co Central HS		3	219	Transform	8.8	25.1%	8.9	16.9%	9.5	24.2%
2011	485250	Perry Co Central HS			214		15.6	32.7%	16.4	17.8%	17.3	27.1%
2012	485250	Perry Co Central HS			208		17.1	47.6%	17.0	21.6%	17.8	36.5%
2013	485250	Perry Co Central HS			187		16.1	38.50%	17.2	22.40%	18.1	33.30%
		Three-Year Change										
		Three-Year Effect Size										
2010	501380	Pulaski Co HS		3	267	Transform	17.9	49.1%	18.6	39.7%	19.2	45.7%
2011	501380	Pulaski Co HS			265		17.7	48.7%	17.9	30.9%	19.5	46.8%
2012	501380	Pulaski Co HS			248		18.4	56.0%	18.5	37.9%	19.0	43.1%
2013	501380	Pulaski Co HS			220		*19.1	*59.5%	*19.1	*46.8%	*20.1	*47.5%
		Three-Year Change					1.20	10.40%	0.50	7.10%	0.90	1.80%
		Three-Year Effect Size					0.21		0.12		0.16	
2010	535040	Franklin-Simpson HS	Yes	3	226	Transform	16.6	39.4%	17.5	26.1%	17.6	31.9%

ACT Eng > 50%

ACT Math > 40%

ACT Reading > 40%

Gain

Greatest Gain

Negative scores

*Above state average benchmark/ mean

ACT

Year	Code	School	Title I	Cohort	Number	Transform/Restaff	Mean English	% English Bench	Mean Math	% Math Bench	Mean Reading	% Reading Bench
2011	535040	Franklin-Simpson HS	Yes		226		16.8	38.1%	17.7	25.7%	17.7	27.9%
2012	535040	Franklin-Simpson HS	Yes		219		17.7	49.8%	18.3	32.0%	18.6	37.4%
2013	535040	Franklin-Simpson HS	Yes		203		*18.9	*57.1%	*19.1	*44.8%	*20.1	*49%
		Three-Year Change					1.10	17.10%	1.60	18.70%	2.50	17.10%
		Three-Year Effect Size					0.19		0.39		0.46	
2010	561030	Trimble Co HS		3	104	Transform	17.2	45.2%	17.9	36.5%	18.5	44.2%
2011	561030	Trimble Co HS			89		18.6	50.6%	17.9	24.7%	19.5	41.6%
2012	561030	Trimble Co HS			89		20.9	70.8%	19.8	46.1%	20.7	57.3%
2013	561030	Trimble Co HS			78		*19.2	*57.7%	18.6	35.90%	*20.5	*58%
		Three-Year Change					2.00	12.50%	0.70	-0.60%	2.00	13.80%
		Three-Year Effect Size					35.00		0.17		0.37	
State Benchmark							18.4	53.1	18.9	39.6	19.4	44.2

ACT Eng > 50%

ACT Math > 40%

ACT Reading > 40%

Gain

Greatest Gain

Negative scores

*Above state average benchmark/ mean

Kentucky Priority Middle School EXPLORE Subtest Means 2010-13

Year	Code	School	Title I	Cohort	Transform/ Restaff	Number	Mean English	% English Bench	Mean Math	% Math Bench	Mean Reading	% Reading Bench
2010	147010	Dayton High School	Yes	3	Transform	60	12.00	36.7%	14.10	23.3%	12.90	31.7%
2011	147010	Dayton High School	Yes			67	12.60	40.3%	13.20	7.5%	12.60	22.4%
2012	147010	Dayton High School	Yes			43	13.10	48.8%	14.00	11.6%	13.50	37.2%
2013	147010	Dayton High School	Yes			69	14.40	70.4%	14.60	23.9%	13.80	33.8%
		Three-Year Change					2.40	33.7%	0.50	0.6%	0.90	2.1%
2010	275077	Westport Middle School	Yes	3	Transform	220	12.40	41.8%	13.20	23.6%	12.30	26.8%
2011	275077	Westport Middle School	Yes			240	12.00	36.3%	13.50	13.8%	12.30	18.8%
2012	275077	Westport Middle School	Yes			266	11.80	30.8%	13.20	8.6%	12.20	17.7%
2013	275077	Westport Middle School	Yes			271	12.80	42.9%	13.70	13.9%	12.70	22.1%
		Three-Year Change					0.40	1.1%	0.50	-9.7%	0.40	-4.7%
2010	275085	Robert Frost Middle	Yes	1	ReStaff	151	11.50	27.8%	11.80	7.9%	11.90	14.6%
2011	275085	Robert Frost Middle	Yes			156	10.80	25.6%	11.90	3.8%	11.00	9.0%
2012	275085	Robert Frost Middle	Yes			130	11.10	25.4%	12.50	4.6%	11.80	13.1%
2013	275085	Robert Frost Middle	Yes			167	11.50	32.3%	12.90	6.0%	11.40	4.8%
		Three-Year Change					0.00	4.5%	1.10	-1.9%	-0.50	-9.8%
2010	275090	Thomas Jefferson Middle	Yes	3	ReStaff	263	12.50	44.1%	13.30	16.7%	12.60	25.9%
2011	275090	Thomas Jefferson Middle	Yes			321	11.40	34.3%	13.10	10.0%	12.10	15.9%
2012	275090	Thomas Jefferson Middle	Yes			326	12.30	40.8%	13.60	12.6%	12.80	19.9%
2013	275090	Thomas Jefferson Middle	Yes			296	11.70	33.9%	13.10	13.6%	12.10	15.3%
		Three-Year Change					-0.80	-10.2%	-0.20	-3.1%	-0.50	-10.6%
2010	275144	Stuart Middle	Yes	3	Transform	334	11.90	35.6%	12.40	15.3%	12.00	17.4%
2011	275144	Stuart Middle	Yes			338	11.90	35.8%	12.80	13.9%	12.30	18.3%
2012	275144	Stuart Middle	Yes			311	12.00	37.0%	13.30	10.0%	12.30	19.0%
2013	275144	Stuart Middle	Yes			341	11.90	37.0%	13.00	10.0%	12.10	15.5%
		Three-Year Change					0.00	1.4%	0.60	-5.3%	0.10	-1.9%

Above state benchmark

Gain

Negative score

Highest percentages meeting benchmark

Kentucky Priority Middle School EXPLORE Subtest Means 2010-13

Year	Code	School	Title I	Cohort	Transform/ Restaff	Number	Mean English	% English Bench	Mean Math	% Math Bench	Mean Reading	% Reading Bench
2010	275159	Myers Middle School	Yes		Transform	286	12.20	39.2%	13.60	26.6%	12.70	24.5%
2011	275159	Myers Middle School	Yes			238	11.50	31.9%	13.10	15.1%	12.00	16.0%
2012	275159	Myers Middle School	Yes			257	12.00	37.0%	13.40	14.4%	12.60	23.0%
2013	275159	Myers Middle School	Yes			228	11.60	32.8%	13.10	9.2%	11.90	12.2%
		Three-Year Change					-0.60	-6.4%	-0.50	-17.4%	-0.80	-12.3%
2010	275163	Knight Middle School	Yes	2	ReStaff	167	11.50	27.5%	12.50	11.4%	12.30	22.2%
2011	275163	Knight Middle School	Yes			201	11.30	31.8%	12.60	8.0%	11.50	11.9%
2012	275163	Knight Middle School	Yes			143	11.90	35.7%	13.00	8.4%	12.30	16.1%
2013	275163	Knight Middle School	Yes			142	11.90	36.4%	13.10	11.2%	12.20	14.7%
		Three-Year Change					0.40	8.9%	0.60	-0.2%	-0.10	-7.5%
2010	275620	Olmsted Academy North	Yes	3	Transform	230	10.70	20.9%	12.00	12.2%	11.40	10.9%
2011	275620	Olmsted Academy North	Yes			219	10.80	25.1%	12.50	9.6%	11.50	12.8%
2012	275620	Olmsted Academy North	Yes			295	11.00	25.4%	12.30	8.5%	11.40	12.5%
2013	275620	Olmsted Academy North	Yes			221	11.60	32.1%	13.40	13.1%	11.50	10.9%
		Three-Year Change					0.90	11.2%	1.40	0.9%	0.10	0.0%
2010	275710	Western Middle School	Yes	1	Restaff	140	10.50	14.3%	11.50	5.0%	11.30	11.4%
2011	275710	Western Middle School	Yes			122	10.20	17.2%	12.00	3.3%	11.10	3.3%
2012	275710	Western Middle School	Yes			87	10.60	18.4%	12.00	9.2%	11.40	5.7%
2013	275710	Western Middle School	Yes			87	12.70	49.5%	13.30	6.6%	12.90	22.0%
		Three-Year Change					2.20	35.2%	1.80	1.6%	1.60	10.6%
Statewide								66.0%		33.9%		41.6%

Above state benchmark

Gain

Negative score

Highest percentages meeting benchmark

Priority Schools Proficiency Level and Percentile Rank 2012-2013

Priority School	District	Model	Overall Score 2012	Overall Score 2013	OS Gain or loss 2012-2013	2012 Percentile (started below 5 th)	2013 Percentile (started below 5 th %)	% Gain or loss 2012-2013
Caverna HS	Caverna Ind.	Transformation	40.6	50.9	10.3	3	29	26
Fern Creek HS +	Jefferson	Re-Staff	50.4	56.1	5.7	26	**60	34
Robert Frost MS	Jefferson	Re-staff	29.3	27.9	-1.4	1	1	0
Lawrence County HS +	Lawrence	Transformation	46.5	*60.6 - Prof.	14.1	15	**78	63
Leslie County HS	Leslie	Transformation	51.1	*65.1 - Dist.	14	32	**90	58
Metcalfe County HS	Metcalfe	Transformation	60.6 Prof.	*64.4 - Dist.	3.8	78	**90	12
Academy at Shawnee +	Jefferson	Re-staff	27.9	32.7	4.8	1	1	0
Valley HS +	Jefferson	Re-staff	31	39.1	8.1	1	3	2
Western MS +	Jefferson	Re-staff	37	51	14	4	38	34
Western HS	Jefferson	Re-staff	40.3	48	7.7	3	19	16
East Carter HS	Carter	Transformation	58 Prof.	*67.3 - Dist.	9.3	71	**94	23
Christian County HS	Christian	Transformation	51.1	56.2	5.1	32	**61	29
Doss HS +	Jefferson	Re-staff	35.8	42.8	7	2	8	6
Fairdale HS	Jefferson	Re-staff	46	52	6	13	36	23
Greenup County HS	Greenup	Transformation	53.2	*58.3 - Prof.	5.1	42	**71	29
Iroquois HS +	Jefferson	Re-staff	34.4	40.5	6.1	1	3	2
Knight MS +	Jefferson	Re-staff	35.9	33.9	-2	3	2	-1
Sheldon Clark HS +	Martin	Transformation	50.6	*58.4 - Prof.	7.8	27	**72	45
Newport HS +	Newport Ind.	Transformation	48.1	51.8	3.7	19	35	16
Seneca HS +	Jefferson	Re-staff	45.7	53.2	7.5	12	42	30
Southern HS +	Jefferson	Re-staff	41.2	48.7	7.5	4	20	16
Waggener HS +	Jefferson	Re-staff	41.7	47.3	5.6	6	17	11
Dayton HS	Dayton Ind.	Transformation	46.2	56.3	10.1	13	**61	48
Dayton MS +	Dayton Ind.	transformation	46.5	50.4	3.9	19	35	16
Fleming County HS	Fleming	Transformation	58.3 - Prof.	*63.1 - Prof.	4.8	71	**87	16

Yellow: Cohort 1, 2009

Green: Cohort 2, 2010

Blue: Cohort 3, 2011

All now PRIORITY SCHOOLS

High School

Distinguished 90% or 64.4

Proficient 70% or 58.0

Needs Improv. <70% or 58.0

Middle School

Distinguished 90% or 64.9

Proficient 70% or 58.7

Needs Improv. <70% or 58.7

*Above St. Bench OS

**Above 50% rank

Progressing+

Priority Schools Proficiency Level and Percentile Rank 2012-2013

Priority School	District	Model	Overall Score 2012	Overall Score 2013	OS Gain or loss 2012-2013	2012 Percentile (started below 5 th	2013 Percentile (started below 5 th %)	% Gain or loss 2012-2013
Franklin-Simpson HS	Simpson	Transformation	53.7	*71.8 - Dist.	18.1	45	**97	52
Olmstead Academy N. +	Jefferson	Transformation	33.8	33.8	0	2	2	0
Central HS	Hopkins	Transformation	56.6	*69.2 - Dist.	12.6	62	**96	34
Knox Central HS	Knox	Transformation	46.8	52.5	5.7	16	39	23
Lee County HS +	Lee	Transformation	55.4	*61.2 - Prof.	5.8	57	**80	23
Lincoln County HS	Lincoln	Transformation	57.6	*61.7 - Prof.	4.1	67	**83	16
Livingston County HS +	Livingston	Transformation	49.5	*59.3- Prof.	9.8	23	49	26
Monticello HS	Monticello	Transformation	51.5	47.8	-3.7	32	18	-14
Myers MS	Jefferson	Transformation	35.5	32.3	-3.2	3	1	-2
Perry County Central	Perry	Transformation	41.3	55.3	14	5	**55	50
Pulaski County HS	Pulaski	Transformation	61.6 Prof.	*70.2 - Dist.	8.6	82	**97	15
Stuart MS +	Jefferson	Transformation	31.8	36.3	4.5	1	4	3
Thomas Jefferson MS	Jefferson	Re-staff	36.4	37.3	0.9	4	4	0
Trimble County HS	Trimble	Transformation	48.7	*61.9 - Prof	13.2	20	**84	64
Westport MS +	Jefferson	Transformation	35.5	40	4.5	3	8	5
Bryan Station HS	Fayette	Transformation	47.7	52.9	5.2	17	41	24
State				57.4			**65	

Yellow: Cohort 1, 2009

Green: Cohort 2, 2010

Blue: Cohort 3, 2011

All now PRIORITY SCHOOLS

High School

Distinguished 90% or 64.4

Proficient 70% or 58.0

Needs Improv. <70% or 58.0

Middle School

Distinguished 90% or 64.9

Proficient 70% or 58.7

Needs Improv. <70% or 58.7

*Above St. Bench OS

**Above 50% rank

Progressing +

Gap Data

Cohort 1 District	School	Subgroups in School	Gap Group % Prof/Dis 2011-12	Gap Group % Prof/Dis 2012-13	Gap Group Met Target 2012-13	All Students % Prof/Dis 2011-12	All Students % Prof/Dis 2012-2013	All Students % Met Target 2012-13	% GAP Between Group/All 2011-12	% GAP Between Group/All 2012-13	Gap Closure from 2011-12 to 2012-13	<5 Gap Between Groups 2012-13
Caverna Ind.	Caverna HS	FR	27.3	51.4	Y (34.6)	30.5	56.2	Y (37.5)	3.2	4.8	-1.6	x
Jefferson	Fern Creek HS	AA/HS/FR/SWD/AS/LEP	36.1	29.5	N (42.5)	45.1	36.2	N (50.6)	9.0	6.7	2.3	
Jefferson	Frost MS	AA/FR/SWD	12.2	11.7	N (21.0)	12.6	11.9	N (21.3)	0.4	0.2	0.2	x
Lawrence	Lawrence Co. HS	FR/SWD	23.9	30.8	N (31.5)	37.9	37.5	N (44.1)	14.0	6.7	7.3	
Leslie	Leslie Co. HS	FR/SWD	24.3	32.2	Y (31.9)	27.6	37.9	Y (34.8)	3.3	5.7	-2.4	
Metcalfe	Metcalfe Co. HS	FR	45.2	48.6	N (50.7)	51.4	56.1	N (56.3)	6.2	7.5	-1.3	
Jefferson	Academy @ Shawnee	AA/FR/SWD	11.4	17.5	N (20.3)	15.8	17.8	N (24.2)	4.4	0.3	4.1	x
Jefferson	Valley HS	AA/FR/SWD	17.2	18.6	N (25.5)	18.4	20.9	N (26.6)	1.2	2.3	-1.1	x
Jefferson	Western MS	AA/HS/LEP/FR/SWD	23.8	35.6	Y (31.4)	25.6	37.9	Y (33.0)	1.8	2.3	-0.5	x
Jefferson	Western HS	AA/FR/SWD	30.2	22	N (37.2)	31.8	22.4	N (38.6)	1.6	0.4	1.2	x
Cohort 2 District	School	Subgroups in School	Gap Group % Prof/Dis 2011-2012	Gap Group % Prof/Dis 2012-13	Gap Group Met Target 2012-13	All Students % Prof/Dis 2011-12	All Students % Prof/Dis 2012-2013	All Students % Met Target 2012-13	% GAP Between Group/All 2011-12	% GAP Between Group/All 2012-13	Gap Closure from 2011-12 to 2012-13	<5 Gap Between Groups 2012-13
Carter	E. Carter HS	FR/SWD	28.4	45.7	Y (35.6)	38.0	53.3	Y (44.2)	9.6	7.6	2	
Christian	Christian Co. HS	AA/FR/SWD	41.8	27	N (47.6)	49.6	32.7	N (54.6)	7.8	5.7	2.1	
Jefferson	Doss HS	AA/FR/SWD	25.8	19	N (33.2)	28.4	21.7	N (35.6)	2.6	2.7	-0.1	x
Jefferson	Fairdale HS	AA/HS/FR/SWD/LEP	34.1	31.9	N (40.7)	36.2	35.4	N (42.6)	2.1	3.5	-1.4	x
Greenup	Greenup HS	FR	26.1	23.6	N (33.5)	38.7	29.1	N (44.8)	12.6	5.5	7.1	
Jefferson	Iroquois HS	AA/HS/AS/LEP/FR/SWD	27.6	17.8	N (34.8)	27.7	18.2	N (34.9)	0.1	0.4	-0.3	x
Jefferson	Knight MS	AA/HS/FR/SWD/LEP	12.9	17.2	N (21.6)	15.4	19.6	N (23.9)	2.5	2.4	0.1	x
Martin	Sheldon Clark HS	FR	30.5	40	Y (37.5)	32.5	45.4	Y (39.3)	2.0	5.4	-3.4	
Newport Ind.	Newport HS	AA/FR	25.1	27.5	N (32.6)	25.0	32.8	Y (32.5)	-0.1	5.3	-5.2	
Jefferson	Seneca HS	AA/HS/FR/SWD/LEP	31.1	31.2	N (38.0)	39.9	36	N (45.9)	8.8	4.8	4	x
Jefferson	Southern HS	AA/His/FR/SWD	33.0	29.9	N (39.7)	36.5	31.3	N (42.9)	3.5	1.4	2.1	x
Jefferson	Waggener HS	AA/HS/FR/SWD	29.4	30	N (36.5)	33.2	35.6	N (39.9)	3.8	5.6	-1.8	

Above State Average	Met Target	Gap Widened	Gap Less than 5
AA: African American	LEP: Limited English Proficient		
AS: Asian	SWD Students with Disabilities		
FR: Fre/Reduced Meals	HIS: Hispanic		

Gap Data

Cohort 3 District	School	Subgroups in School	Gap Group % Prof/Dis 2011-2012	Gap Group % Prof/Dis 2012-13	Gap Group Met Target 2012-13	All Students % Prof/Dis 2011-12	All Students % Prof/Dis 2012-2013	All Students % Met Target 2012-13	% GAP Between Group/All 2011-12	% GAP Between Group/All 2012-13	Gap Closure from 2011 12 to 2012- 13	<5 Gap Between Groups 2012- 2013
Dayton Ind.	Dayton HS (R 22.9)			26.2			28.7			2.5		
Dayton Ind.	Dayton MS	FR/SWD	21.8	35	Y (29.6)	25.0	39.2	Y (32.5)	3.2	4.2	-1	x
Fleming	Fleming Co. HS	FR/SWD	34.6	33.8	N (41.1)	42.9	40.4	N (48.6)	8.3	6.6	1.7	
Simpson	Franklin Simpson HS	AA/FR/SWD	42.7	50.8	Y (48.9)	53.5	61.3	Y (58.2)	10.8	10.5	0.3	
Jefferson	Olmstead Academy	AA/HS/AS/LEP/FR/SWD	14.3	15.4	N (22.9)	14.8	16.2	N (23.3)	0.5	0.8	-0.3	x
Hopkins	Hopkins Central HS	AA/FR/SWD	42.8	51.9	Y (48.5)	48.2	58	Y (53.4)	5.4	6.1	-0.7	
Knox	Knox Central HS	FR/SWD	35.1	24.6	N (41.6)	37.3	27.1	N (44.3)	2.2	2.5	-0.3	x
Lee	Lee Co. HS	FR	34.9	29.5	N (41.4)	41.9	36.2	N (47.7)	7	6.7	0.3	
Lincoln	Lincoln Co. HS	FR/SWD	42.1	33.2	N (47.9)	49.8	41.4	N (54.8)	7.7	8.2	-0.5	
Livingston	Livingston Co. HS	FR	27.2	24.7	N (34.5)	38.1	30.8	N (44.3)	10.9	6.1	4.8	
Monticello	Monticello HS	FR	26.8	24.4	N (34.1)	29.7	31.2	N (36.7)	2.9	6.8	-3.9	
Jefferson	Myers MS	AA/HS/AS/LEP/FR/SWD	17.3	14.8	N (25.6)	20.0	16.8	N (28.0)	2.7	2	0.7	x
Perry	Perry Co. Central HS	FR	23.9	33.7	Y (31.5)	30.9	40	Y (37.8)	7	6.3	0.7	
Pulaski	Pulaski Co. HS	FR/SWD	42.6	43.2	N (48.3)	52.6	50.8	N (57.3)	10	7.6	2.4	
Jefferson	Stuart MS	AA/HS/AS/FR/SWD/LEP	17.3	18.5	N (23.6)	20.0	21.0	N (24.6)	2.7	2.5	0.2	x
Jefferson	Thomas Jefferson MS	AA/HS/AS/LEP/FR/SWD	15.1	20	N (23.6)	17.6	21.5	N (25.8)	2.5	1.5	1	x
Trimble	Trimble Co. HS	FR	22.9	29.1	N (30.6)	35.7	38.7	N (42.1)	12.8	9.6	3.2	
Jefferson	Westport MS	AA/HS/AS/LEP/FR/SWD	17.2	22.3	N (25.5)	20.1	26.9	N (28.1)	2.9	4.6	-1.7	x
Fayette	Bryan Station HS	AA/HS/FR/SWD/LEP	27.5	32.6	N(34.8)	35.3	39.2	N (41.9)	7.8	5.6	2.2	
State	Middle School	All	31.8	34.3	N(38.6)	43.7	45.9	N (49.3)	11.9	11.6	0.3	
State	High School	All	33.2	34.9	N (39.9)	46.1	45.9	N (51.5)	12.9	11	1.9	

Above State Average	Met Target	Gap Widened	Gap Less than 5
AA: African American	LEP: Limited English Proficient		
AS: Asian	SWD Students with Disabilities		
FR: Fre/Reduced Meals	HIS: Hispanic		