Kentucky's Priority Schools: What the Data Tells Us



December 9, 2015

Office of Next Generation Schools & Districts

Kentucky Department of Education



Priority Schools by Cohort Kentucky Department of Education Deston Middle/ Righ School Cohort 1 Schools (2010-2013) Dayton Newport Newport High School Western Region Cohort 2 Schools (2011-2014) excludes Jefferson and Trimble counties Cohort 3 Schools (2012-2015) Kenton Boone Campbell Whygener High School Includes Cohort 1, 2 and 3 Schools Trimble Coasty High School Gallatin Pendleton Sheart Middle Phomes Jefferro Michile School Bracken School Carroll Grant Mason Righ School Classed Reight Middle School Trimble High School Academy North Lewis Robertson Owen Greenup Walley Seaoca High School High School Myurs Middle School Henry Prep Harrison Fleming Arn Creek Oldham Carter Westport Academy at Middle School Shewbee Bigh School Nicholas Plenning County FranklinScott Boyd Western High School Bigh School Jefferson Bourbol Middle School Shelby Rowan Bath Doss Nigh School Wood Byes Statise High School Elliott Montgomery Lawrenc Spencer Fayette County & Independent Bullitt 5 Anderson Menifes Morgan Clarl Meade School Districts ancock Nelson Jessamin ohnson Independent districts indicated with ital/cired type Mercer Powell, Martin Henderson Breckinridge Hardin Madison Wolfe Washington Boyle Garrard Magoffir 120 School Districts Estill Daviess Union 53 Independent School Districts Lee County High School Floyd Breathitt Marion Larue McLean Lee Pike Webster Lincoln JacksonOwsley Ohio Gravson Lincoln Count High School Hopkins Taylor Knott Crittenden Rockcastle Central High School Central High School Perry Hart Perry County Central High Scho Green Butler Edmonson Casey Livingston Pulaski Clay Iuhlenberg Laurel Leslie Caldwell Palaski County High School Warren Letcher Adair Ballard Barren IcCracken Metcalle Coanty High School Christian County Nigh School Russell Lyon Knox Logan Wayne Harlan Rear Centre High School Carlisl Marsha NERYCHU Christian umberland Trigg Graves Todd Bell Allen Whitley Hickman Simpson Simpson Nigh School Monroe Clinton McCreary Calloway Fulton Eastern Region

Kentucky's Priority Schools: What the Data Tells Us

Table of Contents

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
Growth in Combined Reading and Math 2013-2015	2
College and Career Readiness (CCR)	3
ACT	5
Middle School Explore Data 2011-2015	6
Graduation Rate	8
Priority Schools Proficiency Level and Percentile Rank 2013-2015	9
Gap Data	.10
Summary and Implications	.11
TELL Kentucky Survey Findings in 2015	.13
The 2015 Annual Evaluation Report for School Improvement Grant from the University of Kentucky Human	
Development Institute	.13
- What Are Our Next Steps?	.14
Data Charts	.15



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 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
- 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. <u>GROWTH</u>

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 (7th & 8th) 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 (7th & 8th), 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 (7th & 8th) 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 (7th & 8th), 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 (7th & 8th), 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.

- 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.

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. <u>EXPLORE</u>

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 (7th & 8th), and Stuart Middle Schools.
- The Explore Math mean across four years indicates a decline at five schools: Westport, Thomas Jefferson, Myers (7th & 8th), Stuart and Olmsted Academy North Middle Schools.
- The Explore Reading mean across four years indicates a decline at four schools: Thomas Jefferson, Stuart, Myers (7th & 8th), 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.

- 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.

- 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 50th 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 90th 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, Franklin-Simpson, 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 1st to the 97th 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 50th percentile rank.

- 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.

G. <u>GAP</u>

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 (7th & 8th), 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 (7th & 8th), 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.

- 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 2nd to 97th 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
 - o Status of professional learning communities
 - o Professional development tailored to emerging and individual needs
 - o Student engagement and involvement in learning
 - Successes and challenges
 - School leadership
 - o Instructional practices
 - o Classroom management
 - o 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:
 - o Periodic reflection of data processes and systems to ensure deployment with fidelity
 - o 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
 - o 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.

High School	2013 Growth Reading & Math	2014 Growth Reading & Math	2015 Growth Reading & Math	Gain/Loss 14-15	Gain/Loss 13-15	Middle School	2013 Growth Reading & Math	2014 Growth Reading & Math	2015 Growth Reading & Math	Gain/Los s 14-15	Gain/L oss 13- 15		
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		
Eleming County HS	58.2	47 4	46.6	-0.8	-11.6	Olmsted 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	2013 - 57.2
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	2014 - 56.3
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	2015 - 57.1
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	2013- 59.9
Fairdale HS	48.6	56.8	44.0	-12.8	-4.6	Myers (7 th & 8 th)	46.2	39.7	41.7	2.0	-4.5	State MS	2014 - 59.9
n Creek Traditional HS	58.0	59.8	58.6	-1.2	0.6							State MS	2015 - 59.9
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								

Growth in Combined Reading and Math 2013-2015

High School	2013 Growth Reading & Math	2014 Growth Reading & Math	2015 Growth Reading & Math	Gain/Loss 14-15	Gain/Loss 13-15	Middle School	2013 Growth Reading & Math	2014 Growth Reading & Math	2015 Growth Reading & Math	Gain/Los s 14-15	Gain/L oss 13- 15
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	2014- 15	Met CCR Target (High School only)	Gain/Loss 2012- 2015					
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	2014- 15	Met CCR Target (High	Gain/Loss 2012- 2015					
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)	10.9					
20001.0		=0.0				17.0					
Fairdale HS	22.8	34.7	50.9	57.4	Yes (54.5)	34.6					
Fairdale HS Greenup HS	22.8 45.9	34.7 58.1	50.9 64.6	57.4 66.8	Yes (54.5) Yes (63.0)	34.6 20.9					
Fairdale HS Greenup HS Iroquois HS	22.8 45.9 24.8	34.7 58.1 32.0	50.9 64.6 47.5	57.4 66.8 36.2	Yes (53.0) Yes (63.0) No (55.0)	34.6 20.9 11.4					
Fairdale HS Greenup HS Iroquois HS Knight MS	22.8 45.9 24.8 20.2	34.7 58.1 32.0 20.2	50.9 64.6 47.5 19.3	57.4 66.8 36.2 22.6	Yes (53.0) Yes (63.0) No (55.0)	34.6 20.9 11.4 2.4					
Fairdale HS Greenup HS Iroquois HS Knight MS Newport HS	22.8 45.9 24.8 20.2 36.7	34.7 58.1 32.0 20.2 48.4	50.9 64.6 47.5 19.3 53.3	57.4 66.8 36.2 22.6 68.1	Yes (53.0) Yes (63.0) No (55.0) Yes (61.0)	34.6 20.9 11.4 2.4 31.4					
Fairdale HS Greenup HS Iroquois HS Knight MS Newport HS Seneca HS	22.8 45.9 24.8 20.2 36.7 33.6	34.7 58.1 32.0 20.2 48.4 45.2	50.9 64.6 47.5 19.3 53.3 50.3	57.4 66.8 36.2 22.6 68.1 49.7	Yes (53.5) Yes (54.5) Yes (63.0) No (55.0) Yes (61.0) No (59.5)	34.6 20.9 11.4 2.4 31.4 16.1					
Fairdale HS Greenup HS Iroquois HS Knight MS Newport HS Seneca HS Southern HS	22.8 45.9 24.8 20.2 36.7 33.6 24.9	34.7 58.1 32.0 20.2 48.4 45.2 33.6	50.9 64.6 47.5 19.3 53.3 50.3 56.4	57.4 66.8 36.2 22.6 68.1 49.7 57.2	Yes (53.5) Yes (54.5) Yes (63.0) No (55.0) Yes (61.0) No (59.5) Yes (55.5)	34.6 20.9 11.4 2.4 31.4 16.1 32.3					
Fairdale HS Greenup HS Iroquois HS Knight MS Newport HS Seneca HS Southern HS Waggener HS	22.8 45.9 24.8 20.2 36.7 33.6 24.9 27.9	34.7 58.1 32.0 20.2 48.4 45.2 33.6 32.8	50.9 64.6 47.5 19.3 53.3 50.3 56.4 45.7	57.4 66.8 36.2 22.6 68.1 49.7 57.2 48.0	Yes (53.5) Yes (54.5) Yes (63.0) No (55.0) Yes (61.0) No (59.5) Yes (55.5) No (56.5)	34.6 20.9 11.4 2.4 31.4 16.1 32.3 20.1					
Fairdale HS Greenup HS Iroquois HS Knight MS Newport HS Seneca HS Southern HS Waggener HS School	22.8 45.9 24.8 20.2 36.7 33.6 24.9 27.9 2011-12 (identified)	34.7 58.1 32.0 20.2 48.4 45.2 33.6 32.8 2012-13	50.9 64.6 47.5 19.3 53.3 50.3 56.4 45.7 2013-14	57.4 66.8 36.2 22.6 68.1 49.7 57.2 48.0 2014- 15	Yes (54.5) Yes (54.5) Yes (63.0) No (55.0) Yes (61.0) No (59.5) Yes (55.5) No (56.5) Met CCR Target (High School)	34.6 20.9 11.4 2.4 31.4 16.1 32.3 20.1 Gain/Loss 2012- 2015					
Fairdale HS Greenup HS Iroquois HS Knight MS Newport HS Seneca HS Southern HS Waggener HS School Dayton HS	22.8 45.9 24.8 20.2 36.7 33.6 24.9 27.9 2011-12 (identified) 30.8	34.7 58.1 32.0 20.2 48.4 45.2 33.6 32.8 2012-13 50.0	50.9 64.6 47.5 19.3 53.3 50.3 56.4 45.7 2013-14 59.5	57.4 66.8 36.2 22.6 68.1 49.7 57.2 48.0 2014- 15 56.4	Yes (54.5) Yes (54.5) Yes (63.0) No (55.0) Yes (61.0) No (59.5) Yes (55.5) No (56.5) Met CCR Target (High School) No (57.0)	34.6 20.9 11.4 2.4 31.4 16.1 32.3 20.1 Gain/Loss 2012- 2015 25.6					
Fairdale HS Greenup HS Iroquois HS Knight MS Newport HS Seneca HS Southern HS Waggener HS School Dayton HS Dayton MS	22.8 45.9 24.8 20.2 36.7 33.6 24.9 27.9 2011-12 (identified) 30.8 32.6	34.7 58.1 32.0 20.2 48.4 45.2 33.6 32.8 2012-13 50.0 45.6	50.9 64.6 47.5 19.3 53.3 50.3 56.4 45.7 2013-14 59.5 45.3	57.4 66.8 36.2 22.6 68.1 49.7 57.2 48.0 2014- 15 56.4 43.0	Yes (54.5) Yes (54.5) Yes (63.0) No (55.0) Yes (61.0) No (59.5) Yes (55.5) No (56.5) Met CCR Target (High School) No (57.0)	34.6 20.9 11.4 2.4 31.4 16.1 32.3 20.1 Gain/Loss 2012- 2015 25.6 10.4					

Г

Franklin-Simpson	20.5	60.2	07 5	01.6	Voc (68 0)	61 1				
113 Oliveated	50.5	05.2	57.5	91.0	163 (00.0)	01.1				
Oimsted	45.4	47.4	10.0	10.0		1.0				
Academy North	15.1	17.4	13.9	13.2		-1.9				
Hopkins Central										
HS	47.5	68.7	80.9	72.0	Yes (66.0)	24.5				
Knox Central HS	30.3	42.3	47.9	63.7	Yes (59.5)	33.4				
Lee Co. HS	51.3	62.7	77.8	69.0	Yes (64.0)	17.7				
Lincoln Co. HS	42.9	56.8	72.0	73.6	Yes (63.5)	30.7				
Livingston Central										
HS	34.3	51.1	72.3	69.6	Yes (61.0)	35.3				
Myers (7 th & 8 th)	23.9	19.3	20.7	12.0		-11.9				
Perry Co. Central										
HS	22.6	45.8	56.8	69.6	Yes (59.0)	47.0				
Pulaski Co. HS	61.2	67.7	81.2	80.4	Yes (64.5)	19.2				
Stuart MS	21.4	20.4	23.0	15.7		-5.7				
Thomas Jefferson										
MS	24.0	20.6	22.4	14.3		-9.7				
Trimble Co. HS	31.3	68.2	75.0	72.6	Yes (61.5)	41.3				
Westport MS	18.4	24.0	29.8	26.4		8.0				
Bryan Station HS	34.2	38.1	53.9	53.3	No (62.0)	19.1				
	= At or Above State Average									
	2012 HS47.2 2013 HS54.1 2014 HS62.5 2015 HS66.8									
State Avgs.	2012 MS44.1 2013 MS47.2 2014 MS47.8 2015 MS43.9									

Graduation Rate

Cohort 1 District	High School	2014 5-year rate	2015 5-year rate	Change 2014- 2015	2015 Delivery target met?
Jefferson	Fern Creek HS	89.1	88.4	-0.7	N (90.2)
Lawrence	Lawrence Co. HS	95.2	95.4	0.2	N (95.6)
Metcalfe	Metcalfe Co. HS	92.0	93.3	1.3	Y (92.8)

lefferson	Academy @ Shawnee	72 5	72 5	0.0	N (75 7)
lefferson	Valley HS	72.9	81.4	3.5	Y (80.4)
lefferson	Western HS	81.6	85.5	3.9	V (83.7)
	Westernins	01.0	05.5	Change 2014-	2015 Delivery
Conort 2 District	High School	2014 5-year rate	2015 5-year rate	2015	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	Change 2014- 2015	
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)
Кпох	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 hi	gh schools	88.3	89.4		
State	State			0.9	N (89.3)
Graduation Rate At	or Above State Average				

ACT Data 2011-2015

Year	School	Title I	Cohort	Transform/Re staff	Mean English	% English Bench	Mean Math	% Math Bench	Mean Reading	% Readin g Bench
2011	Christian Co HS		2	Transform	16.2	36.0%	17.1	20.1%	17.2	24.4%
2012	Christian Co HS				16.1	38.5%	17.5	25.6%	17.2	27.8%
2013	Christian Co HS				17.6	50.5%	18.0	33.8%	18.6	37.1%
2014	Christian Co HS				16.9	47.1%	17.3	23.5%	18.1	36.9%
2015	Christian Co HS				16.5	39.6%	17.1	20.7%	17.2	28.5%
	Four-Year Change				0.3	3.6%	0.0	0.6%	0.0	4.1%
2011	Dayton HS	Yes	3	Transform	15.7	33.9%	16.6	15.3%	16.5	23.7%
2012	Dayton HS	Yes			17.5	46.7%	17.7	30.0%	17.6	31.7%
2013	Dayton HS	Yes			17.4	47.5%	17.8	27.5%	17.8	37.5%
2014	Dayton HS	Yes			17.2	39.5%	17.3	25.6%	17.8	39.5%
2015	Dayton HS	Yes			16.9	36.6%	17.7	24.4%	18.3	41.5%
	Four-Year Change				1.2	2.7%	1.1	9.1%	1.8	17.8%
2011	Bryan Station HS	Yes	3	Transform	16.5	37.4%	17.6	28.2%	18.2	32.1%
2012	Bryan Station HS	Yes			16.2	34.0%	17.8	29.8%	17.2	30.0%
2013	Bryan Station HS	Yes			16.8	41.8%	17.9	30.9%	18.2	35.9%
2014	Bryan Station HS	Yes			16.9	42.1%	18.2	34.7%	18.4	38.0%
2015	Bryan Station HS	Yes			16.3	36.4%	17.5	25.1%	18.1	34.2%
	Four-Year Change				-0.2	-1.0%	-0.1	-3.1%	-0.1	2.1%
2011	Fleming Co HS		3	Transform	16.4	40.4%	17.5	26.5%	17.7	30.1%
2012	Fleming Co HS				16.4	38.5%	17.5	26.4%	17.7	33.0%
2013	Fleming Co HS				16.4	39.2%	18.4	34.5	18.1	32.7%

Year	School	Title I	Cohort	Transform/Re	Mean	% English	Mean	% Math	Mean	% Readin
				Staff	English	Bench	wath	Bench	Reading	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		1	PoStoff	15 9	34.6%	17.6	30.8%	17/	27.1%
2011	Fern Creek		1	Restan	13.5	34.070	17.0	50.070	17.4	27.170
2012	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				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	% Readin g
										Bench
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	% Readin q
									·····j	Bench
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 g 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		3	Transform	18 3	50.0%	17.2	20.5%	18.4	36.4%
2011	Livingston Central		5	Tansionn	10.5	50.070	17.2	20.370	10.1	30.170
2012	HS				18.2	53.8%	17.8	30.8%	18.5	41.3%
2013	Livingston Central				18.8	51.5%	18.8	39.7%	20.0	52.9%
2014	Livingston Central				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	Transform/Re staff	Mean English	% English Bench	Mean Math	% Math Bench	Mean Reading	% Readin g Bench
2011	Metcalfe Co HS		1	Transform	17.9	46.7%	19.3	46.7%	19.4	42.9%
2012	Metcalfe Co HS				16.3	34.0%	19.5	52.6%	17.6	32.0%
2013	Metcalfe Co HS				17.0	50.0%	18.9	50.0%	19.3	42.7%
2014	Metcalfe Co HS				17.5	46.5%	20.6	62.6%	19.5	48.5%
2015	Metcalfe Co HS				17.1	46.1%	18.4	33.0%	19.2	44.3%
	Four-Year Change				-0.8	-0.6%	-0.9	-13.7%	-0.2	1.4%
2011	Newport HS		2	Transform	16.0	35.7%	17.1	24.1%	17.5	29.5%
2012	Newport HS				16.6	35.0%	17.7	28.0%	17.0	25.0%
2013	Newport HS				16.0	26.0%	17.4	23.1%	16.9	23.1%
2014	Newport HS				17.1	48.6%	17.6	28.4%	17.0	36.5%
2015	Newport HS				15.2	30.5%	16.6	21.9%	16.1	21.0%
	Four-Year Change				-0.80	-5.2%	-0.50	-2.2%	-1.40	-8.5%
	-									
2014	Perry Co Central		_		45.0	22.7%	46.4	47.00/	47.0	27.40/
2011	HS Borry Co. Control		3	Transform	15.6	32.7%	16.4	17.8%	17.3	27.1%
2012	HS				17.1	47.6%	17.0	21.6%	17.8	36.5%
2012	Perry Co Central				46.4	20.5%	47.4	22.40/	10.0	22.20/
2013	HS Perry Co Central				16.1	38.5%	17.1	22.4%	18.0	33.3%
2014	HS				17.9	51.8%	17.8	29.9%	18.7	43.1%
2015	Perry Co Central				17.0	47.00/	47.4	26.00/	10.7	40.00/
2015	HS				17.0	47.2%	17.4	26.8%	18.7	40.0%
	Four-Year Change				1.4	14.5%	1.0	9.0%	1.4	12.9%
2011	Pulaski Co HS		3	Transform	17.7	48.7%	17.9	30.9%	19.5	46.8%

Year	School	Title I	Cohort	Transform/Re staff	Mean English	% English Bench	Mean Math	% Math Bench	Mean Reading	% Readin g
					U					Bench
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%
	Franklin-Simpson									
2011	HS Frenklin Simmern	Yes	3	Transform	16.8	38.1%	17.7	25.7%	17.7	27.9%
2012	HS	Yes			17.7	49.8%	18.3	32.0%	18.6	37.4%
	Franklin-Simpson									
2013	HS Frenklin Circurate	Yes			19.3	60.2%	19.3	45.9%	20.4	49.0%
2014	HS	Yes			19.4	60.8%	19.9	50.5%	20.2	52.0%
	Franklin-Simpson				-				-	
2015	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										
Benchmark										
2012-13					18.4	53.1	18.9	39.6	19.4	44.2
State										
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 Benchmark 2014-15					19.0	55.3	18.9	38.1	19.8	47.4
Grea	ter than state benchm	ark		Gain			Gre	ater than s	tate averag	e %

Kentucky Priority Middle School Explore Data 2011-2015

Year	School	Title I	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%

						%			Mean	
Voor	School	Title	Cohort	Transform/	Mean English	English	Mean Moth	% Math	Readin	% Reading
Tear	Thomas lefferson	•	Conort	Restan	English	Delicii	Walli	Delicii	y	Dench
2012	Middle	Yes			12.3	40.8%	13.6	12.6%	12.8	19.9%
	Thomas Jefferson									
2013	Middle	Yes			11.7	33.9%	13.1	13.6%	12.1	15.3%
	Thomas Jefferson									
2014	Middle	Yes			11.6	32.5%	13.1	13.6%	11.9	16.7%
	Thomas Jefferson									
2015	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 th & 8 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%

						%			Mean	
N		Title	0.1	Transform/	Mean	English	Mean	% Math	Readin	% Reading
Year	School		Conort	Restaff	English	Bench	Math	Bench	g	Bench
2014	Olmsted Academy	N	2	T	40.0	25 40/	42 5	0.00	44 5	12.00/
2011	North	Yes	3	Transform	10.8	25.1%	12.5	9.6%	11.5	12.8%
	Olmsted Academy					/				
2012	North	Yes			11.0	25.4%	12.3	8.5%	11.4	12.5%
	Olmsted Academy									
2013	North	Yes			11.6	32.1%	13.4	13.1%	11.5	10.9%
	Olmsted Academy									
2014	North	Yes			11.1	24.4%	12.7	11.1%	11.3	11.5%
	Olmsted Academy									
2015	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%
	Western Middle									
2011	School	Yes	1	Restaff	10.2	17.2%	12.0	3.3%	11.1	3.3%
	Western Middle									
2012	School	Yes			10.6	18.4%	12.0	9.2%	11.4	5.7%
	Western Middle									
2013	School	Yes			12.7	49.5%	13.3	6.6%	12.9	22.0%
	Western Middle									
2014	School	Yes			13.3	50.4%	14.3	12.6%	13.5	30.3%
	Western Middle									
2015	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 Pren	Yes			11.1	27.0%	11.3	3.4%	11.5	8.8%
								011/0		0.070
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 s	tate benchmark		Gair	<u>ו</u>						

Priority School	District	Model	Overall Score 2014	Overall Score 2015	OS Gain or loss 2014- 15	2014 Percentile (started below 5 th %)	2015 Percentile (started below 5 th %)	% Gain or loss 2014- 2015	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 Schools Proficiency Level and Percentile Rank 2014-2015

Priority School	District	Model	Overall Score 2014	Overall Score 2015	OS Gain or loss 2014- 15	2014 Percentile (started below 5 th %)	2015 Percentile (started below 5 th %)	% Gain or loss 2014- 2015	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 th & 8 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
	Overall Score 2014	Overall Score 2015	OS Gain or Loss 2013-14	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							
Green: Cohort 2,		Prof =							
2010		Proficient							
Blue: Cohort 3, 2011		Prog = Progressing							
		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 Group % Prof/Dis 2014-15	Gap Group Met Target 2014-15	All Student s % Prof/Di s 2012- 13	All Students % Prof/Dis 2013- 2014	All Student s % Prof/Dis 2014-15	Proficienc y Delivery Target Met 2014-15?	% GAP Between Group and All 2012-13	% GAP Between Group and All 2013-14	% Gap Between Group and All 2014-15	Change in gap from 2012-13 to 2014- 15	≤5 Gap Between 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	~
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 @ 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	✓
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	✓
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	✓
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	✓
School	Gap Group % Prof/Dis 2012-13	Gap Group % Prof/Dis 2013-14	Gap Group % Prof/Dis 2014-15	Gap Group Met Target 2014-15	All Student s % Prof/Di s 2012- 13	All Students % Prof/Dis 2013- 2014	All Student s % Prof/Dis 2014-15	Proficienc y Delivery Target Met 2014-15?	% GAP Between Group/A II 2012- 13	% GAP Between Group/A II 2013- 14	% Gap Between Group/Al I 2014-15	Change in gap from 2012-13 to 2014- 15	≤5 Gap Between Groups 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	~
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	✓
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	✓
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	✓
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	✓
School	Gap Group % Prof/Dis 2012-13	Gap Group % Prof/Dis 2013-14	Gap Group % Prof/Dis 2014-15	Gap Group Met Target 2014-15	All Student s % Prof/Di s 2012- 13	All Students % Prof/Dis 2013- 2014	All Student s % Prof/Dis 2014-15	Proficienc y Delivery Target Met 2014-15?	% GAP Between Group/A II 2012- 13	% GAP Between Group/A II 2013- 14	% Gap Between Group/Al I 2014-15	Change in gap from 2012-13 to 2014- 15	≤5 Gap Between Groups 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	✓
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	✓
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	✓
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 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	~
Hopkins 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. 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)					

High School (State)	34.5	34.2	35.8	N (40.8)	45.9	46.2	47.5	N (51.6)			
Above State		6	la sin s								

Average

Gaps closing