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## 1. What questions are we trying to answer with the data?

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


## 2. 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
- 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 School Improvement Grant (SIG) evaluation for impact conducted by the University of Kentucky
- TELL Kentucky 2015 report for priority schools


## 3. What does the data not tell us?

- What interventions are in place in the schools, and which interventions work
- The role that leadership has played in implementing or resisting transformational change in schools
- 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)
- The context of the school in terms of composition of student assignment plan in Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS)
- The impact of staff assignments in schools that selected the re-staffing model
- 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 $2^{\text {nd }}$ and $3^{\text {rd }}$ 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
- Effectiveness of the schools' implementation of PGES
- The impact of how the school is organized, including scheduling
- Expectations and perceptions of staff and students
- Instructional programs that are implemented
- Relationship of schools to Area Technical Centers to help ensure students are career ready


## A. GROWTH

## What are the causes for celebration?

- Thirteen of the 36 schools showed growth for 50 percent or more of the students: Bryan Station, The Academy @ Shawnee, Fern Creek, Waggener, Lee, Lincoln, Perry Central, Pulaski, Franklin-Simpson, Trimble County High Schools; and Western, Knight and Dayton Middle Schools.
- Ten of 27 high schools increased their growth rates over the two-year period from 2013-14 to 2014-15. These were Bryan Station, The Academy @ Shawnee, Valley, Western, Knox Central, Lee, Lincoln, Perry Central, Franklin-Simpson and Trimble County High Schools.
- Seven of 27 high schools increased their growth rates over the three-year period from 2012-13 to 2014-15. These were The Academy @ Shawnee, Doss, Fern Creek, Valley, Waggener, Lee, and Perry Central High Schools.
- Three of nine middle schools increased their growth rates from 2013-14 to 2014-15. These were Knight, Myers ( $7^{\text {th }} \& 8^{\text {th }}$ ) and Stuart Middle Schools. Knight Middle School also increased its growth rate over the three-year period from 2012-13 to 2014-15.
- Three of 27 high schools had student performance growth above the state average in reading and math. These were The Academy @ Shawnee, Fern Creek, and Waggener High Schools.
- Two schools met or exceeded the state average for growth for each of the last two years, from 2013-14 to 2014-15: Fern Creek and Waggener High Schools. Fern Creek High School met or exceeded the state average for growth every year, from 2012-13 to 2014-15.


## What are the opportunities for improvement?

- Less than $50 \%$ of the students made growth at 23 of the 36 Priority Schools: Christian, Dayton, Fleming, Greenup, Hopkins Central, Doss, Fairdale, Iroquois, Seneca, Southern, Valley, Western, Knox Central, Lawrence, Livingston Central, Newport, and Metcalfe County High Schools; and Olmsted Academy North, Myers ( $7^{\text {th }} \& 8^{\text {th }}$ ), Stuart, Thomas Jefferson, Valley Prep and Westport Middle Schools.
- Valley Prep had the lowest percentage of students making typical or higher annual growth with 38.1 percent, followed by Iroquois at $39.4 \%$ and Myers ( $7^{\text {th }} \& 8^{\text {th }}$ ) at 41.7 percent.
- Twenty-one schools had a decrease in growth from 2013-14 to 2014-15: Christian, Dayton, Fleming, Greenup, Hopkins Central, Doss, Fairdale, Fern Creek, Iroquois, Seneca, Southern, Waggener, Livingston Central, Metcalfe, Newport, and Pulaski County High Schools; and Western, Dayton, Olmsted Academy North, Thomas Jefferson, and Westport Middle Schools. Lawrence County High School showed no change in growth.
- Twenty-seven schools had a decrease in growth over the three year period from 2012-13 to 2014-15: Christian, Dayton, Bryan Station, Fleming, Greenup, Hopkins Central, Fairdale, Iroquois, Seneca, Southern, Western, Knox Central, Lawrence, Lincoln, Livingston Central, Metcalfe, Newport, Pulaski, Franklin-Simpson, and Trimble County High Schools; and Western, Dayton, Myers ( $7^{\text {th }} \& 8^{\text {th }}$ ), Olmsted Academy North, Stuart, Thomas Jefferson and Westport Middle Schools.
- Twenty-four of 27 high schools performed below the state percentage for growth.
- All nine middle schools performed below the state percentage for growth.

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 fourth year of implementation of the Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS), and both standards implementation and the new assessment are still in relatively early stages of deployment. We currently have baseline data from 2011-12 and assessment data from 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15. While this provides some data for comparison, an additional year of data will provide more valid and reliable trend information.
- Students not making growth may impact the timeline for achieving college- and career-readiness, the need for additional resources for interventions for an extended period of time and may also make it difficult to close gaps.


## B. COLLEGE AND CAREER READINESS

## What are the causes for celebration?

- The highest percentages of CCR students were at Franklin-Simpson (91.6\%), Pulaski, (80.4\%), Lincoln (73.6\%), Lawrence (73.2\%), Fleming (72.9\%), Trimble (72.6\%), Hopkins Central (72.0\%), and Metcalfe (70.9\%) County High Schools.
- Seventeen of 27 high schools met their CCR targets. These schools were Fern Creek, Lawrence, Metcalfe, Fairdale, Greenup, Newport, Southern, Fleming, Franklin-Simpson, Hopkins Central, Knox Central, Lee, Lincoln, Livingston, Perry Central, Pulaski, and Trimble County High Schools. While CCR data is collected at the middle school level, performance targets are not set.
- Over the four-year period from 2012 to 2015, the CCR rate increased by over 30 percentage points at 11 of the high schools: Franklin-Simpson ( +61.1 ), Perry Central ( +47.0 ), Lawrence ( +44.8 ), Trimble ( +41.3 ), Valley ( +40.2 ), Livingston Central ( +35.3 ), Fairdale ( +34.6 ), Knox Central ( +33.4 ), Southern (+32.3), Newport (+31.4), and Lincoln (+30.7) County High Schools.
- Over the four-year period from 2012 to 2015, the CCR rate increased between 20 and 30 percentage points at seven of the high schools: Western (+29.2), The Academy @ Shawnee (+28.9), Fern Creek (+25.7), Dayton (+25.6), Hopkins Central (+24.5), Greenup County (+20.9), and Waggener (+20.1) High Schools.
- Over the four-year period from 2012 to 2015, Dayton and Western Middle Schools have seen double-digit gains.
- Eleven high schools have increased their trajectory every year over the four-year period. The schools are Fern Creek, Lawrence, Valley, Fairdale, Greenup, Newport, Southern, Waggener, Knox Central, Lincoln, and Perry Central High Schools.
- Thirteen of the 27 high schools have 2015 CCR rates at or above the state average of 66.8 . These schools are Lawrence, Metcalfe, Greenup, Newport, Fleming, Franklin-Simpson, Hopkins Central, Lee, Lincoln, Livingston Central, Perry Central, Pulaski, and Trimble County High Schools.


## What are the opportunities for improvement?

- Four middle schools showed a loss in CCR from 2011-12 to 2014-15: Olmsted Academy North, Myers, Stuart, and Thomas Jefferson Middle Schools.
- Ten of twenty-seven high schools failed to meet their CCR targets (middle schools do not have target data): The Academy @ Shawnee, Valley, Western, Christian, Doss, Iroquois, Seneca, Waggener, Dayton and Bryan Station High Schools.
- While most schools' CCR scores are moving steadily upward, the schools with single digit gains or a loss also tend to have relatively low CCR scores compared to the state average.
- CCR scores decreased from 2013-14 to 2014-15 at seven middle schools: Western, Dayton, Olmsted Academy North, Stuart, Thomas Jefferson, Myers ( $7^{\text {th }} \& 8^{\text {th }}$ ), and Westport Middle Schools.
- Only 13 of 27 high schools performed at or above the state average in CCR in the 2014-15 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)

- Improving CCR data in PLA schools assisted the state in moving toward its projected goal.
- Improving CCR data connects to successful implementation of Common Core standards in many of the PLA schools.
- Improving CCR data connects to use of the Persistence to Graduation tool in PLA schools.
- Improving CCR career data indicates integration in a few of the Priority schools with the Career and Technical Education and regional centers to support career readiness for students.
- Priority Schools that do not meet their CCR targets may make it difficult for the Kentucky Board of Education to reach its trajectory for CCR moving forward. Graduation rate could be negatively affected in those schools, requiring resources for intervention and impacting the college-going rate of Kentucky students.
C. ACT


## What are the causes for celebration?

- Pulaski County High School had the highest percentage of students meeting the ACT English benchmark, at 64.3 percent.
- Pulaski County High School had the highest percentage of students meeting the ACT Math benchmark at 44.3 percent.
- Pulaski County High School had the highest percentage of students meeting the ACT benchmark in Reading at 52.9 percent.
- Franklin-Simpson High School had the greatest gain in the percentage of students meeting ACT English benchmark from 2011-2015 with a gain of 21.7 percentage points, and nine additional schools showed double-digit gains in the percentage of students meeting the ACT English benchmark during this time period: Lincoln (+20.2), The Academy @ Shawnee (+18.4), Pulaski (+15.6), Lee (+15.1), Perry Central (+14.5), Lawrence (+12.7), Knox Central (+11.8), Western (+11.5), and Fern Creek (+11.2) High Schools.
- Livingston Central High School had the largest increase in the percentage of students meeting the ACT Math benchmark from 2011-2015 with a gain of 15.4 percentage points. An additional four schools had double digit gains in the percentage of students meeting the ACT math benchmark during this time period: Lincoln (+14.5), Pulaski (+13.4), Franklin-Simpson (+12.7), and Lawrence (+10.9) County High Schools.
- Franklin-Simpson High School had the greatest gain in the percentage of students meeting the ACT Reading benchmark from 2011-2015 with an increase of 20.0 percentage points. Six additional schools showed double-digit gains in the percentage of students meeting ACT Reading benchmarks during this time period: Dayton ( +17.8 ), The Academy @ Shawnee ( +16.6 ), Lincoln ( +13.7 ), Perry Central ( +12.9 ), Lee ( +12.4 ), and Fern Creek ( +10.4 ) High Schools.
- Two schools scored above the state averages of percentages of students meeting benchmarks in three ACT categories (English, Math and Reading): Pulaski and Franklin-Simpson High Schools.
- Four schools scored at or above the state average percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English: Livingston Central, Lincoln, Pulaski, and Franklin-Simpson High Schools.
- Two schools scored at or above the state average percentage of students meeting the benchmark in Math: Pulaski and Franklin-Simpson High Schools.
- Three schools scored at or above the state average percentage of students meeting the benchmark in Reading: Lincoln, Pulaski and Franklin-Simpson High Schools.
- Pulaski County High School met or exceeded state mean scores in all three areas on the ACT (English, Math, and Reading).
- Lincoln County High School met or exceeded state means in two ACT areas.
- Four schools scored at or above the state mean of 19.0 in English: Franklin-Simpson, Pulaski, Lincoln, and Livingston Central High Schools.
- Pulaski County High School scored above the state mean of 18.9 in math.
- Two schools scored above the state mean of 19.8 in Reading: Lincoln and Pulaski County High Schools.


## What are the opportunities for improvement?

- Six schools had less than 25 percent of students meeting the benchmark in ACT English: Doss, Western, Iroquois, Fairdale, Valley, and Southern High Schools.
- Fourteen schools had less than 25 percent of students meeting the benchmark in ACT math: Christian, Dayton, Newport, Southern, Valley, Waggener, Fairdale, Seneca, Western, Doss, Iroquois, The Academy @ Shawnee, Lawrence, and Lee County High Schools.
- Eight schools had less than 25 percent of students meeting the benchmark in ACT reading: Newport, The Academy @ Shawnee, Iroquois, Doss, Western, Fairdale, Valley, and Southern High Schools.
- Thirteen schools have lowered scores from 2011 to 2015 in 1) percentage of students meeting benchmarks or 2) meeting the state average mean score.
- All but four schools scored below the state average percentage of students meeting the benchmark in ACT English.
- All but two schools scored below the state average percentage of students meeting benchmark in ACT Math.
- All but three schools scored below the state average percentage of students meeting benchmark in ACT Reading.
- Although several schools have made large gains, twenty-three schools currently do not meet the state mean score on any of three content areas on the ACT (English, math or reading).

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 level and, thus, impacts dollars necessary for these courses.
- ACT scores are 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

## What are the causes for celebration?

- Dayton had 59.1 percent of students meeting the benchmark in Explore English. The next highest percentages of students meeting the benchmark were at Western ( 42.5 percent) and Westport ( 42.4 percent).
- Dayton Middle School was the only priority middle school that exceeded the state average percentage of students meeting the benchmark on Explore Math.
- No middle schools reached the state average percentage of students meeting the benchmark on Explore Reading ( 39.5 percent); however, Dayton Middle had the largest percentage of students meeting state benchmark in Explore Reading at 33.3 percent.
- Western and Dayton Middle Schools have made the greatest increases in percentages of students meeting the benchmark in Explore English from 2011-15 with Western having a 25.3 point gain and Dayton having an 18.8 point gain.
- Western and Dayton Middle Schools had the largest gains in the percentages of students meeting the benchmark in Explore Math from 2011-2015 with an increase of 31.9 points at Dayton and an increase of 10.5 points at Western.
- Western and Dayton Middle Schools had the largest gains in the percentages of students making the benchmark in Explore Reading with an increase of 20.8 points at Western and an increase of 10.9 points at Dayton.
- The only Explore score that exceeded a state benchmark was Dayton Middle's score of 39.4 percent in Explore Math. The state average for percentage of students meeting the benchmark was 31.6 percent. Dayton also exceeded the state mean score in math.


## What are the opportunities for improvement?

- The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in Explore English ranges from 16.5 percent to 59.1 percent.
- The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in Explore Math ranges from 3.4 percent to 39.4 percent.
- The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in Explore Reading ranges from 7.0 percent to 33.3 percent.
- The Explore English mean declined across the four year period from 2011-15 at three schools: Thomas Jefferson, Myers ( $7^{\text {th }} \& 8^{\text {th }}$ ), and Stuart Middle Schools.
- The Explore Math mean across four years indicates a decline at five schools: Westport, Thomas Jefferson, Myers ( $\left.7^{\text {th }} \& 8^{\text {th }}\right)$, Stuart and Olmsted Academy North Middle Schools.
- The Explore Reading mean across four years indicates a decline at four schools: Thomas Jefferson, Stuart, Myers (7 $\left.7^{\text {th }} \& 8^{\text {th }}\right)$, and Olmsted Academy North Middle Schools.
- Dayton Middle School was the only priority middle school that met or exceeded the state percentage of students meeting the benchmark in Explore Math with 39.4 percent of students meeting the benchmark. The next closest was Western Middle School with 13.8 percent.
- No priority middle school met or exceeded the state percentage of students meeting the English benchmark of 60.7 percent. The closest was Dayton Middle School at 59.1 percent. The next closest were Western Middle School at 42.5 percent and Westport Middle School at 42.4 percent.
- No priority middle school met or exceeded the state percentage of students meeting the reading benchmark of 39.5 percent. The closest was Dayton Middle School at 33.3 percent.

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
- This is a critical data point for College- and Career-Readiness and meeting the Next Generation Learners Delivery Plan trajectory.


## E. GRADUATION RATE

## What are the causes for celebration?

- The 5-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate is used in accountability calculations, and is used in this report to describe levels of performance.
- The highest graduation rate among the priority schools is Livingston Central High School with 98.6 percent.
- Seventeen of the twenty-seven priority high schools increased their graduation rate over the two-year period from 2013-14 to 2014-15.
- Fifteen of the twenty-seven high schools indicate graduation rates at or above the state average: Lawrence, Metcalfe, Christian, Doss, Greenup, Waggener, Dayton, Fleming, Franklin-Simpson, Hopkins Central, Knox Central, Lee, Lincoln, Livingston Central, and Pulaski County High Schools.
- Fifteen of the twenty-seven high schools met their Graduation Delivery targets in 2015: Metcalfe, Valley, Western, Doss, Greenup, Southern, Dayton, Franklin-Simpson, Hopkins Central, Knox Central, Lee, Lincoln, Livingston Central, Perry Central, and Trimble County High Schools.
- The average graduation rate of all priority high schools is greater than the state average.


## What are the opportunities for improvement?

- The lowest graduation rate among the priority schools is the Academy @ Shawnee with 72.5 percent.
- Nine schools decreased their graduation rate from 2013-14 to 2014-15: Fern Creek, Christian, Fairdale, Iroquois, Newport, Seneca, Fleming, Pulaski, and Bryan Station High Schools. The Academy @ Shawnee had no change over the 2-year period.
- Twelve of the twenty-seven high schools indicate graduation rates below the state average of 88.9 percent: Fern Creek, The Academy @ Shawnee, Valley, Western, Fairdale, Iroquois, Newport, Seneca, Southern, Perry Central, Trimble, and Bryan Station High Schools.
- Twelve of the twenty-seven high schools failed to meet their Graduation Delivery targets: Fern Creek, Lawrence, The Academy @ Shawnee, Christian, Fairdale, Iroquois, Newport, Seneca, Waggener, Fleming, Pulaski, 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)

- Graduation rates above the state average assist the state trajectory for improvement to be met.
- Graduation rate is one of the key criteria for entry to and exit from priority status.
- Inconsistency in graduation rate may indicate that there is not a comprehensive intervention system in place to ensure student success.
- Graduation rate impacts and informs all Delivery plans.


## F. PROFICIENCY and PERCENTILE RANK

## What are the causes for celebration?

- Four of 36 schools are Distinguished: Lawrence, Franklin-Simpson, Lincoln and Pulaski County High Schools.
- Nine of 36 schools are Proficient: Fern Creek, Metcalfe, Greenup, Fleming, Hopkins Central, Lee, Livingston Central, Perry Central, and Trimble County High Schools.
- Fifteen schools are above the $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile rank: Fern Creek, Lawrence, Metcalfe, Greenup, Dayton, Fleming, Franklin-Simpson, Hopkins Central, Knox Central, Lee, Lincoln, Livingston Central, Perry Central, Pulaski, and Trimble County High Schools. Schools in boldface type are at or above the $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile rank.
- Twenty-one of the thirty-six schools had increases in their overall score from 2014-2015. One school (Knox Central) had a double-digit increase in overall score.
- Pulaski County High School has the highest overall score, at 81.8.
- Fifteen schools had overall scores at or above the state average of 68.0: Fern Creek, Lawrence, Metcalfe, Greenup, Dayton HS, Fleming, FranklinSimpson, Hopkins Central, Knox Central, Lee, Lincoln, Livingston Central, Perry Central, Pulaski and Trimble County High Schools.


## What are the opportunities for improvement?

- The range of percentile rank is from the $1^{\text {st }}$ to the $97^{\text {th }}$ percentile.
- Overall school scores range from 39.6 to 81.8.
- Twenty-three schools are in the Needs Improvement Category: fourteen of the twenty-seven high schools, and all nine middle schools. Of these, four schools are in the Needs Improvement/Progressing category, indicating their scores are trending upward: Valley and Newport High Schools; and Knight and Dayton Middle Schools.
- Twenty-one schools did not meet the state benchmark of an overall score of 68.0.
- Twenty-one schools did not meet the $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile rank.

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.
- Proficiency levels above the state average assist the Next Generation Learners Delivery Plan trajectory for improvement to be met.
- Proficiency levels above the 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 percent 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 District Improvement Plans.


## What are the causes for celebration?

- Pulaski County High School has the highest gap proficiency rate, at 59.4 percent.
- Six schools met their Gap Delivery targets: Lawrence, Greenup, Dayton, Knox Central, and Pulaski County High Schools; and Valley Prep.
- Four schools met their Proficiency targets for both the Gap group and the All Students group: Dayton, Knox Central, and Pulaski County High Schools; and Valley Prep.
- Twenty-four of 36 schools had less than a five-point difference in the percentages of students from the Gap group and the All Students group who scored Proficient and Distinguished in Combined Reading and Math: Lawrence, The Academy @ Shawnee, Valley, Western, Christian, Doss, Fairdale, Iroquois, Newport, Seneca, Southern, Waggener, Dayton, Fleming, Knox Central, and Perry Central High Schools; and Western, Knight, Dayton, Myers $\left(7^{\text {th }} \& 8^{\text {th }}\right)$, Olmsted Academy North, Valley Prep, Stuart, and Thomas Jefferson Middle Schools.
- Twenty schools have shown improvement in closing subgroup gaps over the three year period from 2012-13 to 2014-15: Fern Creek, Lawrence, Metcalfe, Valley, Christian, Doss, Fairdale, Greenup, Newport, Seneca, Waggener, Fleming, Franklin-Simpson, Perry Central, Pulaski and Bryan Station High Schools; and Olmsted Academy North, Stuart, Myers ( $7^{\text {th }} \& 8^{\text {th }}$ ), and Thomas Jefferson Middle Schools.
- Ten schools met or exceeded the state average for proficiency of the non-duplicated gap group in Combined Math and Reading: Lawrence, Greenup, Waggener, Dayton, Fleming, Franklin-Simpson, Hopkins Central, Knox Central, Lincoln, and Pulaski County High Schools.


## What are the opportunities for improvement?

- Gap group performance in Combined Reading and Math percentage proficient/distinguished ranges from 11.1 to 59.4. The All Student group performance ranges from 11.7 to 65.7.
- The three-year trend indicates that in 15 schools, gaps in percentages of students reaching proficiency on Combined Reading and Math have widened between students in the gap group and all students from 2012-13 and 2014-15.
- Only six schools out of thirty-six met their Gap Delivery targets.
- Only three schools met or exceeded the state average for proficiency of the All Students group.
- Twenty-six schools have gap group performance below the state average for gap groups.
- Twelve schools have larger than 5 percentage points difference between gap group and all student performance: Fern Creek, Metcalfe, Greenup, Franklin-Simpson, Hopkins Central, Lee, Lincoln, Livingston Central, Pulaski, Trimble, and Bryan Station High Schools; and Westport Middle School.
- None of the priority middle schools exceeded the state average for proficiency of the non-duplicated gap group in Combined Math and Reading.
- 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)

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


## 5. Summary and Implications

## A. GROWTH

- Eight schools showed positive growth over the three-year period from 2012-13 to 2014-15, but there remains a greater number of schools that have seen decreases in growth scores ( 27 schools).
- Middle schools have been less successful at meeting state averages over the three-year period, with one middle school meeting the average in 2013, one school meeting the average in 2014, and no schools meeting the average in 2015.
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 32.7 percent to 91.6 percent.
- Many of the lower rates of gain and lower percentages of students who are College-and Career-Ready are at the middle school level.
- Seventeen high schools met their College and Career Readiness targets, while ten failed to reach 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 the state average percentage of students meeting benchmarks with the exception of four of twenty-seven schools that met the English state mean, two of twenty-seven schools that met the math state mean, and three of twenty-seven schools that met the reading state mean.
- Overall, school performance against state benchmarks shows school scores on each of the three subtests of the ACT are below the state average with the exception of four of twenty-seven schools that met the English state average score, one of twenty-seven schools that met the math state average score, and two of twenty-seven schools that met the reading state average score.


## 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 generally lower.
- Only one of nine schools in one of the three subtests exceeded the state average mean and percentage of students meeting benchmark.


## E. GRADUATION RATE

- Fifteen of the twenty-seven high schools met their Graduation Delivery targets in 2015.
- Fifteen of the twenty-seven high schools indicate graduation rates at or above the state average of 88.9.


## F. PROFICIENCY AND PERCENTILE

- Four Priority Schools scored in the Distinguished range (top 90 percent), nine scored in the Proficient range (top 70 percent), and twentythree scored in the Needs Improvement range (below 70 percent). Of the 23 schools categorized as Needs Improvement, four were identified Progressing. All of these schools had initially been within the bottom 5 percent of schools statewide.
- The range of percentile rank for Priority Schools is from $2^{\text {nd }}$ to $97^{\text {th }}$ percentile.
- Two of the thirty-six schools is in the bottom 5 percent of percentile rank, which is an improvement from three schools last year.
- Twenty-one schools did not meet the state benchmark of an overall score of 68.0.
- Twenty-one schools did not meet the 50th percentile rank.
G. GAP
- In twenty-four schools, there was a five point or less 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.
- The achievement gap between the Gap Students group and the All Students group in terms of the percentage of students Proficient or Distinguished in Combined Reading and Math widened in fifteen schools from 2012-13 to 2014-15.
- Four schools met their Proficiency targets for both the Gap group and the All Students group.
- Twenty-six of thirty-six schools scored below state averages of 37.1 percent for middle schools and 35.8 percent for high schools in Gap Group percentages of students proficient or distinguished in Combined 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 longer than others. 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, still low. A number of schools reflecting the lowest scores are clustered at the middle school level. 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.

## From the TELL Kentucky Survey in 2015 Findings:

- Response rates: For Cohort 1, the highest percentage of respondents was in 2011 ( 83 percent), with slight declines in the latter two administrations ( 77 percent in 2013 and 73 percent in 2015). Cohort 2's highest participation occurred in 2013 at 91 percent, up from 68 percent in 2011; the participation rate in 2015 was 78 percent. For Cohort 3, 95 percent of educators participated in 2013, up from 76 percent in 2011 , and 92 percent participated in 2015.
- Sizable increases in agreement rates are present for a number of school leadership questions, particularly for Cohorts 1 and 2. These are associated with teacher performance, school improvement, and school councils.
- Important gains associated with teacher empowerment are indicated in Cohort 1 and 2 results and as compared to Non-District 180 schools, while the gap in this area between Non-District 180 schools and Cohort 3 widened slightly from 2011 to 2015.
- More educators in both Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 report that teachers have autonomy to make decisions about instructional delivery, with agreement rates improving substantially between 2011 and 2015.


## The 2015 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:
- School culture and climate
- Status of professional learning communities
- Professional development tailored to emerging and individual needs
- Student engagement and involvement in learning
- Successes and challenges
- School leadership
- Instructional practices
- Classroom management
- Educational Recovery efforts
- 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 action plans for sustainability
- Continue to work with leadership to remove internal and external barriers


## 6. 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 a formative evaluation for professional learning experiences to ensure ER team is meeting the needs of staff.
- Review data processes to ensure data turns into 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 percentiles. ER staff will continue to work with districts which have schools not making acceptable progress.
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. The goal of the leadership development training is to grow successful leaders that can strategically deal with low performing schools. This training, called LEAD Kentucky, is offered regionally across the state.
b. With partners, continue the 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 AdvancEd for the Diagnostic Review process.

Growth in Combined Reading and Math 2013-2015

| High School | 2013 Growth Reading \& Math | $2014$ <br> Growth <br> Reading <br> \& Math | 2015 <br> Growth Reading <br> \& Math | $\begin{gathered} \text { Gain/Loss } \\ 14-15 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Gain/Loss } \\ 13-15 \end{gathered}$ | Middle <br> School | $2013$ <br> Growth <br> Reading <br> \& Math | 2014 <br> Growth Reading <br> \& Math | $2015$ <br> Growth <br> Reading <br> \& Math | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Gain/Los } \\ & \text { s 14-15 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Gain/L } \\ \text { oss 13- } \\ 15 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Christian County HS | 57.9 | 47.2 | 43.8 | -3.4 | -14.1 | Western MS | 65.4 | 61.1 | 53.2 | -7.9 | -12.2 |  |  |
| ayton Independent HS | 58.4 | 48.6 | 47.1 | -1.5 | -11.3 | Knight MS | 46.5 | 47.8 | 50.8 | 3.0 | 4.3 |  |  |
| Bryan Station HS | 56.2 | 49.8 | 50.1 | 0.3 | -6.1 | Dayton MS | 54.8 | 51.7 | 50.8 | -0.9 | -4.0 |  |  |
| Fleming County HS | 58.2 | 47.4 | 46.6 | -0.8 | -11.6 | Olmsted <br> Academy North | 47.0 | 48.8 | 44.5 | -4.3 | -2.5 |  |  |
| Greenup County HS | 54.2 | 52.1 | 48.5 | -3.6 | -5.7 | Stuart MS | 51.2 | 43.1 | 45.9 | 2.8 | -5.3 | State HS | $\begin{gathered} 2013 \\ -57.2 \end{gathered}$ |
| opkins County Central HS | 66.1 | 65.7 | 46.8 | -18.9 | -19.3 | Thomas Jefferson MS | 54.9 | 54.4 | 49.0 | -5.4 | -5.9 | State HS | $\begin{gathered} 2014 \\ -56.3 \end{gathered}$ |
| Academy @ Shawnee | 34.0 | 45.1 | 57.4 | 12.3 | 23.4 | Valley Prep (7th \& 8th) | N/A | N/A | 38.1 | N/A | N/A | State HS | $\begin{gathered} 2015 \\ -57.1 \end{gathered}$ |
| Doss HS | 45.3 | 54.2 | 47.7 | -6.5 | 2.4 | Westport MS | 52.1 | 49.5 | 49.2 | -0.3 | -2.9 | State MS | $\begin{aligned} & 2013- \\ & 59.9 \end{aligned}$ |
| Fairdale HS | 48.6 | 56.8 | 44.0 | -12.8 | -4.6 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Myers }\left(7^{\text {th }}\right. \\ \left.\& 8^{\text {th }}\right) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 46.2 | 39.7 | 41.7 | 2.0 | -4.5 | State MS | $\begin{gathered} 2014 \\ -59.9 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\bigcirc$ Creek Traditional HS | 58.0 | 59.8 | 58.6 | -1.2 | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | State MS | $\begin{gathered} 2015 \\ -59.9 \end{gathered}$ |
| Iroquois HS | 45.1 | 43.4 | 39.4 | -4.0 | -5.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Gain |  |
| Seneca HS | 49.5 | 48.6 | 44.8 | -3.8 | -4.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Southern HS | 48.8 | 50.9 | 47.0 | -3.9 | -1.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Valley Traditional HS | 40.4 | 39.6 | 46.1 | 6.5 | 5.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| High School | 2013 Growth Reading \& Math | 2014 <br> Growth <br> Reading <br> \& Math | 2015 <br> Growth <br> Reading <br> \& Math | $\begin{gathered} \text { Gain/Loss } \\ 14-15 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Gain/Loss } \\ 13-15 \end{gathered}$ | Middle <br> School | 2013 <br> Growth <br> Reading <br> \& Math | 2014 <br> Growth <br> Reading <br> \& Math | 2015 <br> Growth <br> Reading <br> \& Math | $\begin{gathered} \text { Gain/Los } \\ \text { s 14-15 } \end{gathered}$ | Gain/L oss 1315 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Waggener HS | 45.9 | 60.6 | 58.0 | -2.6 | 12.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Western HS | 48.0 | 36.6 | 45.2 | 8.6 | -2.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Knox Central HS | 51.2 | 43.4 | 49.5 | 6.1 | -1.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lawrence County HS | 59.4 | 49.6 | 49.6 | 0.0 | -9.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lee County HS | 50.0 | 50.7 | 57.0 | 6.3 | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lincoln County HS | 64.4 | 54.1 | 55.8 | 1.7 | -8.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Livingston Central HS | 62.2 | 61.8 | 46.4 | -15.4 | -15.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Metcalfe County HS | 66.4 | 66.4 | 48.2 | -18.2 | -18.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Newport HS | 49.0 | 50.0 | 46.3 | -3.7 | -2.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| rry County Central HS | 50.6 | 44.3 | 51.4 | 7.1 | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pulaski County HS | 64.9 | 68.1 | 56.3 | -11.8 | -8.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| nklin-Simpson County HS | 63.9 | 53.1 | 55.7 | 2.6 | -8.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trimble County HS | 63.3 | 54.2 | 55.3 | 1.1 | -8.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delivery Targets and \% of Students CCR: Data from 2012-2015

| School | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | $\begin{gathered} 2014- \\ 15 \end{gathered}$ | Met CCR <br> Target (High School only) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Gain/Loss } \\ 2012- \\ 2015 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fern Creek HS | 37.5 | 49.2 | 61.0 | 63.2 | Yes (59.5) | 25.7 |
| Lawrence Co. HS | 28.4 | 50.0 | 58.7 | 73.2 | Yes (60.5) | 44.8 |
| Metcalfe Co. HS | 51.3 | 50.0 | 62.7 | 70.9 | Yes (62.0) | 19.6 |
| Academy @ Shawnee | 14.9 | 9.9 | 35.0 | 43.8 | No (52.0) | 28.9 |
| Valley HS | 10.9 | 22.8 | 35.2 | 51.1 | No (52.0) | 40.2 |
| Valley Prep (7th \& 8th) | N/A | N/A | N/A | 11.7 |  |  |
| Western MS | 10.8 | 23.7 | 31.0 | 27.8 |  | 17.0 |
| Western HS | 17.4 | 42.7 | 38.6 | 46.6 | No (52.0) | 29.2 |
| School | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2012-13 | $\begin{gathered} 2014- \\ 15 \end{gathered}$ | ```Met CCR Target (High School)``` | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Gain/Loss } \\ 2012- \\ 2015 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Christian Co. HS | 36.4 | 52.7 | 63.5 | 50.3 | No (62.5) | 13.9 |
| Doss HS | 12.9 | 20.5 | 40.7 | 32.7 | No (55.5) | 19.8 |
| Fairdale HS | 22.8 | 34.7 | 50.9 | 57.4 | Yes (54.5) | 34.6 |
| Greenup HS | 45.9 | 58.1 | 64.6 | 66.8 | Yes (63.0) | 20.9 |
| Iroquois HS | 24.8 | 32.0 | 47.5 | 36.2 | No (55.0) | 11.4 |
| Knight MS | 20.2 | 20.2 | 19.3 | 22.6 |  | 2.4 |
| Newport HS | 36.7 | 48.4 | 53.3 | 68.1 | Yes (61.0) | 31.4 |
| Seneca HS | 33.6 | 45.2 | 50.3 | 49.7 | No (59.5) | 16.1 |
| Southern HS | 24.9 | 33.6 | 56.4 | 57.2 | Yes (55.5) | 32.3 |
| Waggener HS | 27.9 | 32.8 | 45.7 | 48.0 | No (56.5) | 20.1 |
| School | 2011-12 <br> (identified) | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2014- } \\ 15 \end{gathered}$ | Met CCR Target (High School) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Gain/Loss } \\ \text { 2012- } \\ 2015 \end{gathered}$ |
| Dayton HS | 30.8 | 50.0 | 59.5 | 56.4 | No (57.0) | 25.6 |
| Dayton MS | 32.6 | 45.6 | 45.3 | 43.0 |  | 10.4 |
| Fleming Co. HS | 56.7 | 65.3 | 75.2 | 72.9 | Yes (69.0) | 16.2 |



Graduation Rate

| Cohort $\mathbf{1}$ District | High School | 2014 5-year rate | 2015 5-year rate | Change 2014- <br> 2015 | 2015 Delivery <br> target met? |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Jefferson | Fern Creek HS | 89.1 | 88.4 | -0.7 | $\mathrm{~N}(90.2)$ |
| Lawrence | Lawrence Co. HS | 95.2 | 95.4 | 0.2 | $\mathrm{~N}(95.6)$ |
| Metcalfe | Metcalfe Co. HS | 92.0 | 93.3 | 1.3 | $\mathrm{Y}(92.8)$ |


| Jefferson | Academy @ Shawnee | 72.5 | 72.5 | 0.0 | N (75.7) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jefferson | Valley HS | 77.9 | 81.4 | 3.5 | Y (80.4) |
| Jefferson | Western HS | 81.6 | 85.5 | 3.9 | Y (83.7) |
| Cohort 2 District | High School | 2014 5-year rate | 2015 5-year rate | $\begin{gathered} \text { Change 2014- } \\ 2015 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2015 Delivery target met? |
| Christian | Christian Co. HS | 91.7 | 89.1 | -2.6 | N (92.5) |
| Jefferson | Doss HS | 86.3 | 89.6 | 3.3 | Y (87.8) |
| Jefferson | Fairdale HS | 91.8 | 87.6 | -4.2 | N (92.6) |
| Greenup | Greenup HS | 89.5 | 92.6 | 3.1 | Y (90.6) |
| Jefferson | Iroquois HS | 78.6 | 76.0 | -2.6 | $N(81.0)$ |
| Newport Ind. | Newport HS | 86.7 | 85.8 | -0.9 | $N(88.1)$ |
| Jefferson | Seneca HS | 89.9 | 88.2 | -1.7 | $N$ (90.9) |
| Jefferson | Southern HS | 84.5 | 86.6 | 2.1 | Y (86.2) |
| Jefferson | Waggener HS | 88.5 | 88.9 | 0.4 | N (89.7) |
| Cohort 3 District | High School | 2014 5-year rate | 2015 5-year rate | $\begin{gathered} \text { Change 2014- } \\ 2015 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Dayton Ind. | Dayton HS | 84.1 | 90.5 | 6.4 | Y (85.8) |
| Fleming | Fleming Co. HS | 97.1 | 96.2 | -0.9 | $N$ (97.2) |
| Simpson | Franklin Simpson HS | 95.3 | 96.2 | 0.9 | $Y$ (95.6) |
| Hopkins | Hopkins Central HS | 88.5 | 91.4 | 2.9 | Y (89.7) |
| Knox | Knox Central HS | 90.9 | 92.6 | 1.7 | Y (91.8) |
| Lee | Lee Co. HS | 91.1 | 96.5 | 5.4 | $Y$ (92.0) |
| Lincoln | Lincoln Co. HS | 93.8 | 95.5 | 1.7 | Y (94.3) |
| Livingston | Livingston Co. HS | 96.6 | 98.6 | 2.0 | Y (96.8) |
| Perry | Perry Co. Central HS | 85.3 | 88.2 | 2.9 | Y (86.9) |
| Pulaski | Pulaski Co. HS | 96.0 | 95.3 | -0.7 | $N$ (96.3) |
| Trimble | Trimble Co. HS | 83.0 | 86.8 | 3.8 | Y (84.9) |
| Fayette | Bryan Station HS | 85.7 | 85.4 | -0.3 | N (87.2) |
| Average of all priority | schools | 88.3 | 89.4 |  |  |
| State |  | 88.0 | 88.9 | 0.9 | N (89.3) |
| Graduation Rate At or Above State Average |  |  |  |  |  |

ACT Data 2011-2015

| Year | School | Title I | Cohort | Transform/Re <br> staff | Mean <br> English | \% English <br> Bench | Mean <br> Math | \% Math <br> Bench | Mean <br> Reading |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Readin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{g}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bench |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |$|$


| Year | School | Title I | Cohort | Transform/Re staff | Mean English | \% English Bench | Mean Math | \% Math Bench | Mean Reading | Readin g Bench |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014 | Fleming Co HS |  |  |  | 17.5 | 49.6\% | 18.5 | 36.5\% | 18.5 | 39.4\% |
| 2015 | Fleming Co HS |  |  |  | 16.2 | 37.7\% | 17.4 | 25.2\% | 17.2 | 33.1\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | -0.2 | -2.7\% | -0.1 | -1.3\% | -0.5 | 3.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Greenup Co HS |  | 2 | Transform | 17.1 | 45.6\% | 17.5 | 31.4\% | 18.4 | 35.4\% |
| 2012 | Greenup Co HS |  |  |  | 17.6 | 48.4\% | 18.1 | 30.1\% | 18.7 | 38.7\% |
| 2013 | Greenup Co HS |  |  |  | 16.6 | 42.2\% | 17.6 | 24.1\% | 17.9 | 35.8\% |
| 2014 | Greenup Co HS |  |  |  | 17.7 | 51.4\% | 18.1 | 33.0\% | 18.7 | 45.4\% |
| 2015 | Greenup Co HS |  |  |  | 16.7 | 44.0\% | 17.6 | 30.0\% | 18.1 | 37.2\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | -0.4 | -1.6\% | 0.1 | -1.4\% | -0.3 | 1.8\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Hopkins Central HS |  | 3 | Transform | 17.1 | 46.6\% | 17.6 | 25.6\% | 18.6 | 37.0\% |
| 2012 | Hopkins Central HS |  |  |  | 18.1 | 51.9\% | 18.4 | 38.8\% | 18.9 | 37.2\% |
| 2013 | Hopkins Central HS |  |  |  | 18.2 | 55.1\% | 18.3 | 39.8\% | 19.6 | 47.4\% |
| 2014 | Hopkins Central HS |  |  |  | 18.8 | 56.0\% | 19.6 | 51.3\% | 19.7 | 48.2\% |
| 2015 | Hopkins Central HS |  |  |  | 18.3 | 49.5\% | 17.7 | 27.5\% | 18.9 | 37.4\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | 1.20 | 2.9\% | 0.10 | 1.9\% | 0.30 | 0.4\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Fern Creek Traditional HS |  | 1 | ReStaff | 15.9 | 34.6\% | 17.6 | 30.8\% | 17.4 | 27.1\% |
| 2012 | Fern Creek Traditional HS |  |  |  | 16.6 | 40.2\% | 17.8 | 31.2\% | 18.0 | 32.4\% |
| 2013 | Fern Creek Traditional HS |  |  |  | 17.4 | 49.6\% | 17.8 | 32.0\% | 17.9 | 31.5\% |
| 2014 | Fern Creek Traditional HS |  |  |  | 16.7 | 44.8\% | 17.9 | 35.3\% | 17.7 | 32.8\% |
| 2015 | Fern Creek Traditional HS |  |  |  | 17.7 | 45.8\% | 17.8 | 30.8\% | 18.4 | 37.5\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | 1.80 | 11.2\% | 0.20 | 0.0\% | 1.00 | 10.4\% |


| Year | School | Title I | Cohort | Transform/Re staff | Mean English | \% English Bench | Mean Math | \% Math Bench | Mean Reading |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Southern HS | Yes | 2 | ReStaff | 13.9 | 18.4\% | 16.6 | 20.7\% | 15.9 | 19.5\% |
| 2012 | Southern HS | Yes |  |  | 15.0 | 27.2\% | 17.2 | 25.4\% | 15.9 | 19.2\% |
| 2013 | Southern HS | Yes |  |  | 15.5 | 31.3\% | 17.5 | 27.7\% | 17.2 | 29.3\% |
| 2014 | Southern HS | Yes |  |  | 15.3 | 31.7\% | 16.7 | 20.6\% | 16.4 | 25.2\% |
| 2015 | Southern HS | Yes |  |  | 14.8 | 24.9\% | 16.1 | 13.0\% | 16.2 | 22.2\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | 0.9 | 6.5\% | -0.50 | -7.7\% | 0.30 | 2.7\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Valley HS | Yes | 1 | Transform | 14.3 | 22.7\% | 15.6 | 8.6\% | 15.8 | 17.3\% |
| 2012 | Valley HS | Yes |  |  | 13.8 | 20.9\% | 15.7 | 9.0\% | 15.4 | 18.1\% |
| 2013 | Valley HS | Yes |  |  | 13.6 | 19.6\% | 16.1 | 13.6\% | 15.6\% | 18.7\% |
| 2014 | Valley HS | Yes | 1 |  | 15.0 | 28.2\% | 16.2 | 14.5\% | 15.6 | 17.7\% |
| 2015 | Valley HS | Yes |  |  | 14.7 | 24.1\% | 16.0 | 13.4\% | 15.9 | 18.8\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | 0.40 | 1.4\% | 0.4 | 4.8\% | 0.1 | 1.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Waggener HS | Yes | 2 | ReStaff | 14.6 | 27.2\% | 17.1 | 25.5\% | 16.4 | 21.2\% |
| 2012 | Waggener HS | Yes |  |  | 14.9 | 31.3\% | 16.9 | 22.2\% | 16.2 | 23.9\% |
| 2013 | Waggener HS | Yes |  |  | 14.3 | 27i.1\% | 17.0 | 22.0\% | 16.0 | 22.9\% |
| 2014 | Waggener HS | Yes |  |  | 15.6 | 36.0\% | 17.5 | 26.7\% | 17 | 28.0\% |
| 2015 | Waggener HS | Yes |  |  | 14.9 | 28.4\% | 16.5 | 16.8\% | 16.8 | 26.9\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | 0.3 | 1.2\% | -0.6 | -8.7\% | 0.4 | 5.7\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Fairdale HS Mca | Yes | 2 | ReStaff | 14.8 | 25.1\% | 17.0 | 23.1\% | 17.0 | 24.6\% |
| 2012 | Fairdale HS Mca | Yes |  |  | 14.1 | 23.5\% | 16.8 | 20.1\% | 15.7 | 15.8\% |
| 2013 | Fairdale HS Mca | Yes |  |  | 14.9 | 31.4\% | 17.0 | 24.2\% | 16.6 | 25.6\% |


| Year | School | Title I | Cohort | Transform/Re staff | Mean English | \% English Bench | Mean Math | \% Math Bench | Mean Reading |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014 | Fairdale HS Mca | Yes |  |  | 15.6 | 34.7\% | 17.9 | 32.7\% | 16.9 | 29.1\% |
| 2015 | Fairdale HS Mca | Yes |  |  | 15.1 | 24.9\% | 16.6 | 17.5\% | 16.6 | 21.4\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | 0.30 | -0.2\% | -0.40 | -5.6\% | -0.40 | -3.2\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Seneca High | Yes | 2 | ReStaff | 15.3 | 35.1\% | 17.0 | 19.9\% | 17.5 | 30.6\% |
| 2012 | Seneca High | Yes |  |  | 16.2 | 35.8\% | 17.5 | 25.9\% | 17.0 | 25.3\% |
| 2013 | Seneca High | Yes |  |  | 15.4 | 34.8\% | 16.6 | 16.2\% | 16.5 | 22.6\% |
| 2014 | Seneca High | Yes |  |  | 15.6 | 34.2\% | 16.7 | 18.4\% | 16.6 | 24.2\% |
| 2015 | Seneca High | Yes |  |  | 15.8 | 32.2\% | 16.1 | 11.5\% | 17.1 | 26.8\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | 0.5 | -2.9\% | -0.9 | -8.4\% | -0.4 | -3.8\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Western HS | Yes | 1 | ReStaff | 12.4 | 11.9\% | 15.7 | 10.0\% | 14.7 | 10.6\% |
| 2012 | Western HS | Yes |  |  | 14.4 | 22.4\% | 16.1 | 13.8\% | 14.9 | 11.5\% |
| 2013 | Western HS | Yes |  |  | 14.6 | 25.8\% | 16.0 | 9.4\% | 15.4 | 13.8\% |
| 2014 | Western HS | Yes |  |  | 13.9 | 19.4\% | 15.7 | 11.6\% | 15.6 | 14.8\% |
| 2015 | Western HS | Yes |  |  | 14.2 | 23.4\% | 16.1 | 13.8\% | 15.7 | 16.5\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | 1.8 | 11.5\% | 0.4 | 3.8\% | 1.0 | 5.9\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Doss High | Yes | 2 | ReStaff | 13.8 | 20.5\% | 16.3 | 17.9\% | 15.4 | 14.2\% |
| 2012 | Doss High | Yes |  |  | 13.7 | 18.3\% | 16.1 | 13.9\% | 15.4 | 14.9\% |
| 2013 | Doss High | Yes |  |  | 13.6 | 22.1\% | 15.9 | 11.6\% | 15.6 | 19.1\% |
| 2014 | Doss High | Yes |  |  | 14.1 | 23.6\% | 16.6 | 16.8\% | 16.2 | 20.5\% |
| 2015 | Doss High | Yes |  |  | 14.1 | 21.2\% | 16.0 | 11.0\% | 16.2 | 20.3\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | 0.3 | 0.7\% | -0.3 | -6.9\% | 0.8 | 6.1\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Year | School | Title I | Cohort | Transform/Re staff | Mean English | \% English Bench | Mean Math | \% Math Bench | Mean Reading | Readin <br> g <br> Bench |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2011 | Iroquois HS | Yes | 2 | ReStaff | 13.4 | 18.3\% | 16.2 | 13.3\% | 15.4 | 16.1\% |
| 2012 | Iroquois HS | Yes |  |  | 12.9 | 13.6\% | 15.9 | 11.0\% | 14.6 | 12.7\% |
| 2013 | Iroquois HS | Yes |  |  | 13.5 | 18.3\% | 16.4 | 16.0\% | 15.0 | 13.2\% |
| 2014 | Iroquois HS | Yes |  |  | 13.1 | 14.5\% | 15.9 | 10.6\% | 15.1 | 14.0\% |
| 2015 | Iroquois HS | Yes |  |  | 13.7 | 19.0\% | 16.3 | 15.2\% | 15.5 | 15.2\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | 0.3 | 0.7\% | 0.1 | 1.9\% | 0.1 | -0.9\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Academy @ Shawnee | Yes | 1 | ReStaff | 12.5 | 9.6\% | 15.8 | 13.3\% | 14.2 | 6.0\% |
| 2012 | Academy @ Shawnee | Yes |  |  | 13.7 | 21.6\% | 15.6 | 7.8\% | 14.7 | 9.8\% |
| 2013 | Academy @ Shawnee | Yes |  |  | 14.4 | 21.1\% | 16.1 | 13.3 | 15.1 | 16.7\% |
| 2014 | Academy @ Shawnee | Yes |  |  | 14.7 | 23.1\% | 16.3 | 15.7\% | 15.3 | 13.2\% |
| 2015 | Academy @ Shawnee | Yes |  |  | 14.8 | 28.0\% | 16.7 | 21.5\% | 16.7 | 22.6\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | 2.3 | 18.4\% | 0.9 | 8.2\% | 2.5 | 16.6\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Knox Central HS | Yes | 3 | Transform | 15.3 | 31.4\% | 17.1 | 23.2\% | 17.1 | 25.3\% |
| 2012 | Knox Central HS | Yes |  |  | 17.0 | 42.7\% | 17.3 | 25.7\% | 17.4 | 29.8\% |
| 2013 | Knox Central HS | Yes |  |  | 16.6 | 43.0\% | 17.5 | 30.2\% | 17.8 | 30.8\% |
| 2014 | Knox Central HS | Yes |  |  | 17.1 | 45.9\% | 17.6 | 31.2\% | 17.6 | 32.2\% |
| 2015 | Knox Central HS | Yes |  |  | 16.8 | 43.2\% | 17.5 | 27.7\% | 18.3 | 33.8\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | 1.50 | 11.8\% | 0.40 | 4.5\% | 1.20 | 8.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Lawrence Co HS | Yes | 1 | Transform | 16.5 | 36.9\% | 16.3 | 11.9\% | 18.1 | 28.6\% |
| 2012 | Lawrence Co HS | yes |  |  | 17.5 | 43.1\% | 16.8 | 23.6\% | 18.7 | 41.0\% |
| 2013 | Lawrence Co Hs | yes |  |  | 16.9 | 45.3\% | 17.6 | 26.6\% | 18.9 | 38.1\% |


| Year | School | Title I | Cohort | Transform/Re staff | Mean English | \% English Bench | Mean Math | \% Math Bench | Mean Reading | Readin g Bench |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014 | Lawrence Co HS | Yes |  |  | 17.8 | 47.5\% | 17.4 | 24.8\% | 19.5 | 47.5\% |
| 2015 | Lawrence Co HS | Yes |  |  | 17.8 | 49.6\% | 16.9 | 22.8\% | 19.1 | 35.8\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | 1.30 | 12.7\% | 0.60 | 10.9\% | 1.00 | 7.2\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Lee Co HS | Yes | 3 | Transform | 15.7 | 29.8\% | 16.9 | 20.2\% | 16.8 | 23.8\% |
| 2012 | Lee Co HS | Yes |  |  | 17.4 | 45.0\% | 17.8 | 33.8\% | 18.4 | 37.5\% |
| 2013 | Lee Co HS | Yes |  |  | 17.3 | 50.6\% | 17.8 | 31.3\% | 17.9 | 31.3\% |
| 2014 | Lee Co HS | Yes |  |  | 17.5 | 45.6\% | 17.6 | 27.8\% | 18.8 | 43.0\% |
| 2015 | Lee Co HS | Yes |  |  | 18.0 | 44.9\% | 16.9 | 18.8\% | 18.4 | 36.2\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | 2.30 | 15.1\% | 0.00 | -1.4\% | 1.60 | 12.4\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Lincoln Co HS |  | 3 | Transform | 16.7 | 39.2\% | 17.1 | 22.0\% | 18.5 | 34.7\% |
| 2012 | Lincoln Co HS |  |  |  | 18.7 | 56.8\% | 18.4 | 37.3\% | 19.5 | 47.9\% |
| 2013 | Lincoln Co HS |  |  |  | 18.8 | 60.0\% | 19.0 | 40.0\% | 20.0 | 50.4\% |
| 2014 | Lincoln Co HS |  |  |  | 18.4 | 54.7\% | 18.7 | 39.8\% | 19.3 | 44.1\% |
| 2015 | Lincoln Co HS |  |  |  | 19.3 | 59.4\% | 18.6 | 36.5\% | 20.2 | 48.4\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | 2.6 | 20.2\% | 1.5 | 14.5\% | 1.7 | 13.7\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Livingston Central HS |  | 3 | Transform | 18.3 | 50.0\% | 17.2 | 20.5\% | 18.4 | 36.4\% |
| 2012 | Livingston Central HS |  |  |  | 18.2 | 53.8\% | 17.8 | 30.8\% | 18.5 | 41.3\% |
| 2013 | Livingston Central HS |  |  |  | 18.8 | 51.5\% | 18.8 | 39.7\% | 20.0 | 52.9\% |
| 2014 | Livingston Central HS |  |  |  | 18.3 | 46.2\% | 18.4 | 37.2\% | 18.4 | 34.6\% |
| 2015 | Livingston Central HS |  |  |  | 19.0 | 59.0\% | 18.3 | 35.9\% | 19.7 | 46.2\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | 0.7 | 9.0\% | 1.1 | 15.4\% | 1.3 | 9.8\% |


| Year | School | Title I | Cohort | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Transform/Re } \\ \text { staff }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Mean } \\ \text { English }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { \% English } \\ \text { Bench }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Mean } \\ \text { Math }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { \% Math } \\ \text { Bench }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Reading |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Readin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ( |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |$\}$


| Year | School | Title I | Cohort | Transform/Re staff | Mean English | \% English Bench | Mean Math | \% Math Bench | Mean Reading |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 | Pulaski Co HS |  |  |  | 18.4 | 56.0\% | 18.5 | 37.9\% | 19.0 | 43.1\% |
| 2013 | Pulaski Co HS |  |  |  | 18.6 | 55.7\% | 18.8 | 43.4\% | 19.7 | 47.5\% |
| 2014 | Pulaski Co HS |  |  |  | 18.4 | 52.7\% | 20.1 | 57.2\% | 19.6 | 48.1\% |
| 2015 | Pulaski Co HS |  |  |  | 19.5 | 64.3\% | 19.2 | 44.3\% | 20.1 | 52.9\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | 1.8 | 15.6\% | 1.3 | 13.4\% | 0.6 | 6.1\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Franklin-Simpson HS | Yes | 3 | Transform | 16.8 | 38.1\% | 17.7 | 25.7\% | 17.7 | 27.9\% |
| 2012 | Franklin-Simpson HS | Yes |  |  | 17.7 | 49.8\% | 18.3 | 32.0\% | 18.6 | 37.4\% |
| 2013 | Franklin-Simpson HS | Yes |  |  | 19.3 | 60.2\% | 19.3 | 45.9\% | 20.4 | 49.0\% |
| 2014 | Franklin-Simpson HS | Yes |  |  | 19.4 | 60.8\% | 19.9 | 50.5\% | 20.2 | 52.0\% |
| 2015 | Franklin-Simpson HS | Yes |  |  | 19.0 | 59.8\% | 18.7 | 38.4\% | 19.7 | 47.9\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | 2.2 | 21.7\% | 1.0 | 12.7\% | 2.0 | 20.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Trimble Co HS |  | 3 | Transform | 18.6 | 50.6\% | 17.9 | 24.7\% | 19.5 | 41.6\% |
| 2012 | Trimble Co HS |  |  |  | 20.9 | 70.8\% | 19.8 | 46.1\% | 20.7 | 57.3\% |
| 2013 | Trimble Co HS |  |  |  | 19.2 | 56.8\% | 18.7 | 35.8\% | 20.4 | 58.0\% |
| 2014 | Trimble Co HS |  |  |  | 19.7 | 68.6\% | 19.0 | 42.2\% | 20.4 | 52.9\% |
| 2015 | Trimble Co HS |  |  |  | 18.4 | 52.4\% | 18.4 | 34.1\% | 19.3 | 40.2\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | -0.2 | 1.8\% | 0.5 | 9.4\% | -0.2 | -1.4\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| State <br> Benchmark 2012-13 |  |  |  |  | 18.4 | 53.1 | 18.9 | 39.6 | 19.4 | 44.2 |
| State <br> Benchmark <br> 2013-14 |  |  |  |  | 18.7 | 55.9 | 19.2 | 43.5 | 19.6 | 47.1 |


| Year | School | Title I | Cohort | Transform/Re staff | Mean English | \% English Bench | Mean Math | \% Math Bench | Mean Reading | Readin g Bench |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State <br> Benchmark 2014-15 |  |  |  |  | 19.0 | 55.3 | 18.9 | 38.1 | 19.8 | 47.4 |
| Greater than state benchmark |  |  |  | Gain |  |  | Greater than state average \% |  |  |  |

Kentucky Priority Middle School Explore Data 2011-2015

| Year | School | Title $1$ | Cohort | Transform/ Restaff | Mean English | \% English Bench | Mean Math | \% Math Bench | Mean Readin g | \% Reading Bench |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2011 | Dayton MS | Yes | 3 | Transform | 12.6 | 40.3\% | 13.2 | 7.5\% | 12.6 | 22.4\% |
| 2012 | Dayton MS | Yes |  |  | 13.1 | 48.8\% | 14.0 | 11.6\% | 13.5 | 37.2\% |
| 2013 | Dayton MS | Yes |  |  | 14.4 | 70.4\% | 14.6 | 23.9\% | 13.8 | 33.8\% |
| 2014 | Dayton MS | Yes |  |  | 13.7 | 58.7\% | 14.9 | 36.5\% | 13.9 | 39.7\% |
| 2015 | Dayton MS | Yes |  |  | 14.2 | 59.1\% | 15.7 | 39.4\% | 13.7 | 33.3\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | 1.6 | 18.8\% | 2.5 | 31.9\% | 1.10 | 10.9\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Westport Middle | Yes | 3 | Transform | 12.0 | 36.3\% | 13.5 | 13.8\% | 12.3 | 18.8\% |
| 2012 | Westport Middle | Yes |  |  | 11.8 | 30.8\% | 13.2 | 8.6\% | 12.2 | 17.7\% |
| 2013 | Westport Middle | Yes |  |  | 12.8 | 42.9\% | 13.7 | 13.9\% | 12.7 | 22.1\% |
| 2014 | Westport Middle | Yes |  |  | 13.2 | 48.3\% | 13.8 | 18.7\% | 12.9 | 25.1\% |
| 2015 | Westport Middle | Yes |  |  | 12.6 | 42.4\% | 12.9 | 13.4\% | 12.6 | 21.5\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | 0.60 | 6.1\% | -0.60 | -0.4\% | 0.30 | 2.7\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Thomas Jefferson Middle | Yes | 3 | ReStaff | 11.4 | 34.3\% | 13.1 | 10.0\% | 12.1 | 15.9\% |


| Year | School | Title I | Cohort | Transform/ Restaff | Mean English | \% <br> English <br> Bench | Mean Math | \% Math Bench | Mean Readin g | \% Reading Bench |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 | Thomas Jefferson Middle | Yes |  |  | 12.3 | 40.8\% | 13.6 | 12.6\% | 12.8 | 19.9\% |
| 2013 | Thomas Jefferson Middle | Yes |  |  | 11.7 | 33.9\% | 13.1 | 13.6\% | 12.1 | 15.3\% |
| 2014 | Thomas Jefferson Middle | Yes |  |  | 11.6 | 32.5\% | 13.1 | 13.6\% | 11.9 | 16.7\% |
| 2015 | Thomas Jefferson Middle | Yes |  |  | 11.0 | 25.7\% | 11.6 | 4.5\% | 11.7 | 10.4\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | -0.40 | -8.6\% | -1.50 | -5.5\% | -0.40 | -5.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Stuart Middle | Yes | 3 | Transform | 11.9 | 35.8\% | 12.8 | 13.9\% | 12.3 | 18.3\% |
| 2012 | Stuart Middle | Yes |  |  | 12.0 | 37.0\% | 13.3 | 10.0\% | 12.3 | 19.0\% |
| 2013 | Stuart Middle | Yes |  |  | 11.9 | 37.0\% | 13.0 | 10.0\% | 12.1 | 15.5\% |
| 2014 | Stuart Middle | Yes |  |  | 12.1 | 39.7\% | 13.3 | 15.0\% | 12.3 | 19.3\% |
| 2015 | Stuart Middle | Yes |  |  | 11.5 | 26.9\% | 11.3 | 7.3\% | 11.6 | 11.4\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | -0.40 | -8.9\% | -1.50 | -6.6\% | -0.70 | -6.9\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Myers Middle School | Yes |  | Transform | 11.5 | 31.9\% | 13.1 | 15.1\% | 12.0 | 16.0\% |
| 2012 | Myers Middle School | Yes |  |  | 12.0 | 37.0\% | 13.4 | 14.4\% | 12.6 | 23.0\% |
| 2013 | Myers Middle School | Yes |  |  | 11.6 | 32.8\% | 13.1 | 9.2\% | 11.9 | 12.2\% |
| 2014 | Myers Middle School | Yes |  |  | 11.6 | 33.3\% | 12.4 | 8.0\% | 11.9 | 14.8\% |
| 2015 | Myers ( $7^{\text {th }} \& 8^{\text {th }}$ ) | Yes |  |  | 10.5 | 16.5\% | 10.80 | 4.4\% | 11.3 | 7.0\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | -1.0 | -15.4\% | -2.30 | -10.7\% | -0.7 | -9.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Knight Middle | Yes | 2 | ReStaff | 11.3 | 31.8\% | 12.6 | 8.0\% | 11.5 | 11.9\% |
| 2012 | Knight Middle | Yes |  |  | 11.9 | 35.7\% | 13.0 | 8.4\% | 12.3 | 16.1\% |
| 2013 | Knight Middle | Yes |  |  | 11.9 | 36.4\% | 13.1 | 11.2\% | 12.2 | 14.7\% |
| 2014 | Knight Middle | Yes |  |  | 12.0 | 42.1\% | 13.3 | 8.3\% | 12.6 | 18.6\% |
| 2015 | Knight Middle | Yes |  |  | 12.2 | 39.1\% | 12.6 | 11.7\% | 12.5 | 19.5\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | 0.9 | 7.3\% | 0.0 | 3.7\% | 1.0 | 7.6\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Year | School | Title I | Cohort | Transform/ Restaff | Mean English | \% <br> English <br> Bench | Mean Math | \% Math Bench | Mean Readin g | \% Reading Bench |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2011 | Olmsted Academy North | Yes | 3 | Transform | 10.8 | 25.1\% | 12.5 | 9.6\% | 11.5 | 12.8\% |
| 2012 | Olmsted Academy North | Yes |  |  | 11.0 | 25.4\% | 12.3 | 8.5\% | 11.4 | 12.5\% |
| 2013 | Olmsted Academy North | Yes |  |  | 11.6 | 32.1\% | 13.4 | 13.1\% | 11.5 | 10.9\% |
| 2014 | Olmsted Academy North | Yes |  |  | 11.1 | 24.4\% | 12.7 | 11.1\% | 11.3 | 11.5\% |
| 2015 | Olmsted Academy North | Yes |  |  | 11.1 | 24.1\% | 11.4 | 5.7\% | 11.5 | 11.8\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | 0.3 | -1.0\% | -1.1 | -3.9\% | 0.0 | -1.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Western Middle School | Yes | 1 | Restaff | 10.2 | 17.2\% | 12.0 | 3.3\% | 11.1 | 3.3\% |
| 2012 | Western Middle School | Yes |  |  | 10.6 | 18.4\% | 12.0 | 9.2\% | 11.4 | 5.7\% |
| 2013 | Western Middle School | Yes |  |  | 12.7 | 49.5\% | 13.3 | 6.6\% | 12.9 | 22.0\% |
| 2014 | Western Middle School | Yes |  |  | 13.3 | 50.4\% | 14.3 | 12.6\% | 13.5 | 30.3\% |
| 2015 | Western Middle School | Yes |  |  | 12.5 | 42.5\% | 13.4 | 13.8\% | 13.1 | 24.1\% |
|  | Four-Year Change |  |  |  | 2.3 | 25.3\% | 1.40 | 10.5\% | 2.0 | 20.8\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | Valley Prep | Yes |  |  | 11.1 | 27.0\% | 11.3 | 3.4\% | 11.5 | 8.8\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Statewide 2012-13 |  |  |  |  | 14.6 | 66.0\% | 15.4 | 33.9\% | 14.5 | 41.6\% |
| Statewide 2013-14 |  |  |  |  | 14.6 | 64.6\% | 15.30 | 34.6\% | 14.5 | 44.1\% |
| Statewide 2014-15 |  |  |  |  | 14.4 | 60.7\% | 14.9 | 31.6\% | 14.3 | 39.5\% |
| Above state benchmark |  | Gain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Priority Schools Proficiency Level and Percentile Rank 2014-2015

| Priority School | District | Model | Overall Score 2014 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Overall } \\ \text { Score } \\ 2015 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { OS Gain or } \\ \text { loss 2014- } \\ 15 \end{gathered}$ | 2014 <br> Percentile (started below $5^{\text {th }}$ \%) | 2015 Percentile (started below $5^{\text {th }}$ <br> \%) | \% Gain or loss 20142015 | Classification |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fern Creek HS | Jefferson | Re-Staff | 71.4 | 72.0 | 0.6 | 73 | 76 | 3 | Prof |
| Lawrence County HS | Lawrence | Transformation | 66.3 | 75.7 | 9.4 | 47 | 90 | 43 | Dist |
| Metcalfe County HS | Metcalfe | Transformation | 75.3 | 72.4 | -2.9 | 88 | 77 | -11 | Prof |
| Academy at Shawnee | Jefferson | Re-staff | 56.1 | 59.1 | 3 | 9 | 16 | 7 | NI |
| Valley HS | Jefferson | Re-staff | 55.0 | 59.7 | 4.7 | 7 | 18 | 11 | NI/Prog |
| Valley Prep (7th \& 8th) | Jefferson | Re-staff | 44.5 | 41.6 | -2.9 | 5 | 2 | -3 | NI |
| Western MS | Jefferson | Re-staff | 63.0 | 56.6 | -6.4 | 57 | 29 | -28 | NI |
| Western HS | Jefferson | Re-staff | 57.3 | 59.3 | 2.0 | 12 | 16 | 4 | NI |
| Christian County HS | Christian | Transformation | 68.7 | 64.6 | -4.1 | 59 | 39 | -20 | NI |
| Doss HS | Jefferson | Re-staff | 61.8 | 57.9 | -3.9 | 25 | 13 | -12 | NI |
| Fairdale HS | Jefferson | Re-staff | 67.4 | 64.7 | -2.7 | 55 | 39 | -16 | NI |
| Greenup County HS | Greenup | Transformation | 71.9 | 72.5 | 0.6 | 75 | 77 | 2 | Prof/Prog |
| Iroquois HS | Jefferson | Re-staff | 58.5 | 56.3 | -2.2 | 15 | 9 | -6 | NI |
| Knight MS | Jefferson | Re-staff | 44.2 | 52.0 | 7.8 | 5 | 16 | 11 | NI/Prog |
| Newport HS | Newport Ind. | Transformation | 61.3 | 66.5 | 5.2 | 23 | 49 | 26 | NI/Prog |
| Seneca HS | Jefferson | Re-staff | 63.2 | 64.4 | 1.2 | 31 | 37 | 6 | NI |
| Southern HS | Jefferson | Re-staff | 63.9 | 64.6 | 0.7 | 34 | 39 | 5 | NI |
| Waggener HS | Jefferson | Re-staff | 65.0 | 66.2 | 1.2 | 40 | 47 | 7 | NI |
| Dayton HS | Dayton Ind. | Transformation | 60.3 | 68.1 | 7.8 | 20 | 58 | 38 | NI |
| Dayton MS | Dayton Ind. | Transformation | 56.2 | 60.8 | 4.6 | 28 | 48 | 20 | NI/Prog |
| Fleming County HS | Fleming | Transformation | 66.4 | 72.4 | 6.0 | 47 | 77 | 30 | Prof |
| Franklin-Simpson HS | Simpson | Transformation | 79.1 | 79.4 | 0.3 | 96 | 97 | 1 | Dist |
| Olmsted Academy N. | Jefferson | Transformation | 47.6 | 46.3 | -1.3 | 8 | 7 | -1 | NI |
| Hopkins Central HS | Hopkins | Transformation | 79.3 | 74.6 | -4.7 | 96 | 88 | -8 | Prof |
| Knox Central HS | Knox | Transformation | 59.5 | 69.6 | 10.1 | 18 | 66 | 48 | NI |


| Priority School | District | Model | Overall Score 2014 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Overall } \\ & \text { Score } \\ & 2015 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { OS Gain or } \\ \text { loss } 2014- \\ 15 \end{gathered}$ | 2014 Percentile (started below $5^{\text {th }}$ \%) | 2015 Percentile (started below $5^{\text {th }}$ <br> \%) | \% Gain or loss 20142015 | Classification |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lee County HS | Lee | Transformation | 72.7 | 74.7 | 2.0 | 78 | 88 | 10 | Prof/Prog |
| Lincoln County HS | Lincoln | Transformation | 75.0 | 77.0 | 2.0 | 88 | 94 | 6 | Dist/Prog |
| Livingston County HS | Livingston | Transformation | 76.4 | 72.5 | -3.9 | 94 | 77 | -17 | Prof |
| Myers ( $7^{\text {th }} \& 8^{\text {th }}$ ) | Jefferson | Transformation | 41.5 | 39.6 | -1.9 | 2 | 1 | -1 | NI |
| Perry County Central | Perry | Transformation | 64.6 | 74.0 | 9.4 | 39 | 85 | 46 | Prof/Prog |
| Pulaski County HS | Pulaski | Transformation | 83.5 | 81.8 | -1.7 | 98 | 97 | -1 | Dist |
| Stuart MS | Jefferson | Transformation | 47.4 | 46.7 | -0.7 | 7 | 7 | 0 | NI |
| Thomas Jefferson MS | Jefferson | Re-staff | 48.6 | 48.6 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 0 | NI |
| Trimble County HS | Trimble | Transformation | 69.2 | 72.1 | 2.9 | 63 | 77 | 14 | Prof/Prog |
| Westport MS | Jefferson | Transformation | 54.5 | 52.9 | -1.6 | 21 | 17 | -4 | NI |
| Bryan Station HS | Fayette | Transformation | 62.6 | 65.4 | 2.8 | 28 | 43 | 15 | NI |
| State |  |  | 67.6 | 68.0 | 0.4 | 79 | 81 | 2 | Prof |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Overall Score } \\ 2014 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Overall Score } \\ 2015 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OS Gain or } \\ & \text { Loss 2013-14 } \end{aligned}$ | Classification |  |  |  |  |  |
| Caverna HS | 61.1 | 63.8 | 2.7 | NI |  |  |  |  |  |
| East Carter HS | 77.0 | 78.1 | 1.1 | Dist/Prog |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sheldon Clark HS | 68.0 | 72.4 | 4.4 | Prof |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yellow: Cohort 1, 2009 |  | Dist = Distinguished |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Green: Cohort 2, } \\ & 2010 \end{aligned}$ |  | Prof = Proficient |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Blue: Cohort 3, 2011 |  | Prog = Progressing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\mathrm{NI}=$ Needs Improvement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Percentage of Students Rated Proficient and Distinguished in Combined Reading and Math for Gap and All

## Student Groups

| School | Gap Group \% Prof/Dis 2012-13 | Gap Group \% Prof/Dis 2013-14 | Gap <br> Group \% <br> Prof/Dis <br> 2014-15 | Gap <br> Group <br> Met <br> Target <br> 2014-15 | All Student <br> s\% <br> Prof/Di <br> s 2012- <br> 13 | All <br> Students <br> \% <br> Prof/Dis <br> $2013-$ <br> 2014 | All Student s\% Prof/Dis 2014-15 | Proficienc <br> y Delivery <br> Target <br> Met <br> 2014-15? | \% GAP <br> Between Group and All 2012-13 | \% GAP <br> Between Group and All 2013-14 | \% Gap <br> Between Group and All 2014-15 | Change in gap from 2012-13 to 201415 | s5 Gap <br> Between <br> Groups 2014-15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fern Creek HS | 29.5 | 32.7 | 35.3 | N (39.4) | 36.2 | 40.1 | 41.3 | N (46.1) | 6.7 | 7.4 | 6.0 | -0.7 |  |
| Lawrence Co. HS | 30.8 | 27.0 | 36.2 | Y (34.3) | 37.5 | 36.1 | 39.1 | N (42.5) | 6.7 | 9.1 | 2.9 | -3.8 | $\checkmark$ |
| Metcalfe Co. HS | 48.6 | 45.4 | 35.2 | $N(50.9)$ | 56.1 | 53.4 | 40.7 | N (58.1) | 7.5 | 8.0 | 5.5 | -2.0 |  |
| Academy @ <br> Shawnee | 17.5 | 16.3 | 20.2 | $N(24.7)$ | 17.8 | 18.6 | 21.2 | N (26.7) | 0.3 | 2.3 | 1.0 | 0.7 | $\checkmark$ |
| Valley HS | 18.6 | 16.4 | 16.4 | $N(24.8)$ | 20.9 | 18.4 | 17.5 | N (26.6) | 2.3 | 2.0 | 1.1 | -1.2 | $\checkmark$ |
| Valley Prep | N/A | N/A | 11.4 | Y (11.4) | N/A | N/A | 12.3 | $Y$ (12.3) | N/A | N/A | 0.9 | N/A | $\checkmark$ |
| Western MS | 35.6 | 33.1 | 30.0 | $N(39.8)$ | 37.9 | 35.4 | 34.2 | N (41.9) | 2.3 | 2.3 | 4.2 | 1.9 | $\checkmark$ |
| Western HS | 22.0 | 24.7 | 17.6 | N (32.2) | 22.4 | 25.8 | 18.9 | N (33.2) | 0.4 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 0.9 | $\checkmark$ |
| School | Gap Group \% Prof/Dis 2012-13 | Gap <br> Group \% <br> Prof/Dis <br> 2013-14 | Gap <br> Group \% <br> Prof/Dis <br> 2014-15 | Gap Group Met Target 2014-15 | All <br> Student <br> s \% <br> Prof/Di <br> s 2012- <br> 13 | All <br> Students <br> \% <br> Prof/Dis <br> $2013-$ <br> 2014 | All Student s \% Prof/Dis 2014-15 | Proficienc <br> y Delivery <br> Target <br> Met <br> 2014-15? | \% GAP <br> Between <br> Group/A <br> II 2012- <br> 13 | \% GAP <br> Between <br> Group/A <br> II 2013- <br> 14 | \% Gap Between Group/AI \| 2014-15 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Change } \\ \text { in gap } \\ \text { from } \\ 2012-13 \\ \text { to } 2014- \\ 15 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | s5 Gap <br> Between <br> Groups <br> 2014-15 |
| Christian Co. HS | 27.0 | 34.4 | 27.1 | N (41.0) | 32.7 | 41.1 | 30.2 | N (47.0) | 5.7 | 6.7 | 3.1 | -2.6 | $\checkmark$ |
| Doss HS | 19.0 | 23.4 | 14.6 | $N(31.1)$ | 21.7 | 26.0 | 15.5 | N (33.4) | 2.7 | 2.6 | 0.9 | -1.8 | $\checkmark$ |
| Fairdale HS | 31.9 | 33.8 | 25.9 | $N(40.4)$ | 35.4 | 36.6 | 28.1 | N (42.9) | 3.5 | 2.8 | 2.2 | -1.3 | $\checkmark$ |
| Greenup HS | 23.6 | 27.5 | 37.2 | Y (34.8) | 29.1 | 37.5 | 42.5 | $N(43.8)$ | 5.5 | 10.0 | 5.3 | -0.2 |  |
| Iroquois HS | 17.8 | 22.4 | 21.7 | N (30.2) | 18.2 | 22.9 | 23.5 | N (30.6) | 0.4 | 0.5 | 1.8 | 1.4 | $\checkmark$ |
| Knight MS | 17.2 | 17.2 | 20.4 | N (25.5) | 19.6 | 19.5 | 22.9 | N (27.6) | 2.4 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 0.1 | $\checkmark$ |
| Newport HS | 27.5 | 26.3 | 24.3 | $N(33.7)$ | 32.8 | 28.1 | 28.2 | N (35.3) | 5.3 | 1.8 | 3.9 | -1.4 | $\checkmark$ |
| Seneca HS | 31.2 | 28.6 | 30.3 | $N(35.7)$ | 36.0 | 34.3 | 32.1 | N (40.9) | 4.8 | 5.7 | 1.8 | -3.0 | $\checkmark$ |


| Southern HS | 29.9 | 27.7 | 20.3 | N (34.9) | 31.3 | 29.7 | 22.9 | N (36.7) | 1.4 | 2.0 | 2.6 | 1.2 | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Waggener HS | 30.0 | 32.8 | 37.9 | N (39.5) | 35.6 | 36.7 | 40.4 | $N(43.0)$ | 5.6 | 3.9 | 2.5 | -3.1 | $\checkmark$ |
| School | Gap Group \% Prof/Dis 2012-13 | Gap Group \% Prof/Dis 2013-14 | Gap <br> Group \% <br> Prof/Dis <br> 2014-15 | Gap <br> Group <br> Met <br> Target <br> 2014-15 | All Student s \% Prof/Di s 2012- 13 | All Students \% Prof/Dis $2013-$ 2014 | $\begin{gathered} \text { All } \\ \text { Student } \\ \text { s\% } \\ \text { Prof/Dis } \\ \text { 2014-15 } \end{gathered}$ | Proficienc <br> y Delivery <br> Target <br> Met <br> 2014-15? | \% GAP <br> Between <br> Group/A <br> II 2012- <br> 13 | \% GAP <br> Between <br> Group/A <br> II 2013- <br> 14 | \% Gap Between Group/AI I 2014-15 | Change in gap from 2012-13 to 201415 | <5 Gap <br> Between <br> Groups <br> 2014-15 |
| Dayton HS | 26.2 | 23.5 | 38.4 | Y (31.2) | 28.7 | 26.5 | 42.3 | Y (33.9) | 2.5 | 3.0 | 3.9 | 1.4 | $\checkmark$ |
| Dayton MS | 35.0 | 31.2 | 35.4 | N (38.1) | 39.2 | 35.1 | 40.2 | N (41.6) | 4.2 | 3.9 | 4.8 | 0.6 | $\checkmark$ |
| Fleming Co. HS | 33.8 | 30.9 | 37.2 | $N(37.8)$ | 40.4 | 38.0 | 42.2 | $N$ (44.2) | 6.6 | 7.1 | 5.0 | -1.6 | $\checkmark$ |
| Franklin Simpson HS | 50.8 | 47.5 | 46.5 | N (52.8) | 61.3 | 57.1 | 56.3 | N (61.4) | 10.5 | 9.6 | 9.8 | -0.7 |  |
| Olmsted <br> Academy | 15.4 | 15.8 | 15.9 | $N(24.2)$ | 16.2 | 16.3 | 16.3 | N (24.7) | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.4 | -0.4 | $\checkmark$ |
| Hopkins <br> Central HS | 51.9 | 49.6 | 38.6 | N (54.6) | 58.0 | 56.9 | 47.7 | N (61.2) | 6.1 | 7.3 | 9.1 | 3.0 |  |
| Knox Central HS | 24.6 | 28.3 | 37.2 | Y (35.5) | 27.1 | 32.4 | 40.1 | Y (39.2) | 2.5 | 4.1 | 3.1 | 0.6 | $\checkmark$ |
| Lee Co. HS | 29.5 | 31.7 | 33.8 | N (38.5) | 36.2 | 38.2 | 41.3 | N (44.4) | 6.7 | 6.5 | 7.5 | 0.8 |  |
| Lincoln Co. HS | 33.2 | 39.0 | 37.8 | $N(45.1)$ | 41.4 | 45.8 | 46.6 | N (51.2) | 8.2 | 6.8 | 8.8 | 0.6 |  |
| Livingston Co. HS | 24.7 | 30.0 | 34.1 | $N(37.0)$ | 30.8 | 39.6 | 41.3 | N (45.6) | 6.1 | 9.6 | 7.2 | 1.1 |  |
| Myers MS | 14.8 | 15.8 | 11.1 | N (24.2) | 16.8 | 17.8 | 11.7 | N (26.0) | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.6 | -1.4 | $\checkmark$ |
| Perry Co. <br> Central HS | 33.7 | 28.6 | 35.0 | $N(35.7)$ | 40.0 | 34.9 | 40.0 | N (41.4) | 6.3 | 6.3 | 5.0 | -1.3 | $\checkmark$ |
| Pulaski Co. HS | 43.2 | 50.4 | 59.4 | $Y$ (55.4) | 50.8 | 58.3 | 65.7 | $Y$ (62.5) | 7.6 | 7.9 | 6.3 | -1.3 |  |
| Stuart MS | 18.5 | 17.7 | 17.6 | N (25.9) | 21.0 | 19.6 | 18.6 | N (27.6) | 2.5 | 1.9 | 1.0 | -1.5 | $\checkmark$ |
| Thomas Jefferson MS | 20.0 | 18.9 | 21.5 | N (27.0) | 21.5 | 20.6 | 21.8 | N (28.5) | 1.5 | 1.7 | 0.3 | -1.2 | $\checkmark$ |
| Trimble Co. HS | 29.1 | 28.5 | 30.0 | $N(35.7)$ | 38.7 | 38.5 | 45.8 | Y (44.7) | 9.6 | 10.0 | 15.8 | 6.2 |  |
| Westport MS | 22.3 | 21.6 | 25.1 | N (29.4) | 26.9 | 25.7 | 30.8 | N (33.1) | 4.6 | 4.1 | 5.7 | 1.1 |  |
| Bryan Station HS | 32.6 | 32.7 | 26.2 | N (39.4) | 39.2 | 39.4 | 31.6 | N (45.5) | 6.6 | 6.7 | 5.4 | -1.2 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Middle School (State) | 34.3 | 34.6 | 37.1 | N (41.1) | 45.9 | 46.2 | 48.3 | N (51.6) |  |  |  |  |  |



## Gaps closing

