

BRIEFING PACKET STATE RELEASE

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND (NCLB)

Adequate Yearly Progress Report
2011



Public Release
September 27, 2011
12:01 a.m. EDT

KENTUCKY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Terry Holliday, Ph.D., Commissioner



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction.....	3
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).....	3
Timing of NCLB Reports.....	3
Identification of NCLB Improvement Schools - NCLB Consequences.....	4
Eligibility for State Assistance.....	4
District Accountability.....	4
2011 Observations for Schools.....	5
2011 Observations for School Districts.....	5
2011 Observations for the State.....	6
State Adequate Yearly Progress Summary.....	7
School Results For 2011.....	8
Table 1: Schools That Did Not Make AYP by Subpopulation	
Table 2: Schools That Did Not Make AYP by School Type	
Table 3: Percent of Target Goals That Were Met by School Type	
District Results For 2011.....	9
Table 4: Districts That Did Not Make AYP by Subpopulation	
Table 5: Districts That Did Not Make AYP by District Type	
Table 6: Percent of Target Goals That Were Met by District Type	
School/District Consequences For 2011.....	10
Table 7: Title I Schools in Consequences by School Type	
Table 8: Title I Districts in Consequences by School Type	
Table 9: Non-Title I Schools Eligible for State Assistance	
Attachment A.....	11
Final School and District Results For 2010	

Introduction

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

Senate Bill 1 (SB1), enacted in the 2009 Kentucky General Assembly, outlines numerous changes to Kentucky's assessment and accountability program. SB1 created a three-year interim period (2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11) and a new state assessment program beginning in 2012. The interim period allowed Kentucky time to develop the new assessment system while maintaining components necessary for federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) reporting.

Kentucky schools completed the 2011 Kentucky Core Content Test (KCCT) in five content areas: reading, mathematics, science, social studies and writing on-demand. Individual student reports and student performance level definitions have not changed. Students will still receive reports that place their performance in each content area into the categories of Novice (low/medium/high), Apprentice (low/medium/high), Proficient and Distinguished (NAPD).

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

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

- measuring growth in the percentage of students scoring proficient or above in reading and mathematics in grades 3-8, reading grade 10 and mathematics grade 11
- assessing improvement on the "other academic indicator"
- testing at least 95% of enrolled students and student subpopulations of sufficient size

Details regarding these three components of AYP, and how schools and districts are able to make AYP, can be found in the NCLB Interpretive Guide on the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) web site.

Timing of NCLB Reports

NCLB requires that assessment results be made available and AYP determinations be made prior to the start of the next school year. Kentucky was approved by the United States Department of Education (USED) to delay the release of results. The delay was granted due to the impact multiple natural disasters in 2010-11 had on state test administration. The September AYP determinations are final and are based on the complete reading and mathematics assessment scores. For example, if the September AYP decision results in NCLB consequences at the school or district level (i.e., the requirement to offer school choice), then parents must be given the option of school choice.

Identification of NCLB Improvement Schools - NCLB Consequences

If a Title I school fails to make AYP in the *same content area for two consecutive years*, the school becomes a NCLB Improvement School. A series of consequences is outlined in NCLB for an Improvement School. Note that these consequences do *not* apply when a school misses its Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) in reading one year (but makes AYP in mathematics) and misses its AMO in mathematics the next year (but makes AYP in reading). AYP must be missed in the same content area (for whatever reason) for two consecutive years for consequences to apply. *It is important to note that if a school or district does not meet the requirement of the Other Academic Indicator or Participation Rate, the school is considered to have missed its AYP in both reading and mathematics.* If that school or district misses its AMO in reading or mathematics the following year, the school/district will be considered as not making AYP in the same content area for two consecutive years.

The NCLB consequences for Title I schools are listed below:

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

Details regarding each consequence and the timing of consequences can be found in the NCLB Interpretive Guide on the KDE web site (**NCLB consequences only apply to Title I schools and districts.**)

Eligibility for State Assistance

Senate Bill 1 requires state accountability for non-Title I schools based on Adequate Yearly Progress status. If a non-Title I school does not make AYP in the same content area for two consecutive years, the school will be eligible for state assistance.

District Accountability

NCLB requires district-level accountability to be based on an aggregate of students' scores from all schools in the district. District accountability for subpopulations, based on aggregated scores, also is required.

2011 Observations for Schools

- 489 schools met 100% of their No Child Left Behind (NCLB) AYP goals. That's 42.6% of all schools in Kentucky.
- 56.8% of elementary schools, 19.3% of middle schools and 22.1% of high schools met all their NCLB goals.
- Of the 659 schools (57.4%) that did not make AYP, 189 of these schools made 80% or more of their goals (104 of these schools met at least 90% or more of their goals). Overall, 678 schools in the state (59.1%) met 80% or more of their goals.
- 159 schools (13.9% overall) did not make AYP on the Other Academic Indicator. To make AYP on the Other Academic Indicator, elementary and middle schools must increase the percentage proficient\distinguished in combined science, social studies and writing on-demand compared to prior year; or perform at or above the state average percentage proficient\distinguished in combined science, social studies and writing on-demand plus a confidence interval; or decrease the percentage novice in combined reading, mathematics, science, social studies and writing on-demand compared to the prior year. For high schools, the graduation rate is the Other Academic Indicator (74 schools did not meet the goal for graduation rate).
- On the performance of the African-American subpopulation, 131 schools did not make AYP in reading, and 116 schools did not make AYP in mathematics.
- On the performance of the free/reduced-price meal subpopulation, 474 schools did not make AYP in reading, and 360 schools did not make AYP in mathematics.
- On the performance of the students with disabilities subpopulation, 193 schools did not make AYP in reading, and 174 schools did not make AYP in mathematics.

2011 Observations for School Districts

- 22 of 174 school districts (12.6%) met 100% of their No Child Left Behind (NCLB) AYP goals.
- Of the 152 school districts (87.4%) that did not make AYP, 30 of these districts made 80% or more of their goals (9 of these school districts met at least 90% or more of their goals). Overall, 52 of 174 school districts (29.9%) in the state met 80% or more of their goals.
- 67 school districts (38.5% overall) did not make AYP on the Other Academic Indicator. For districts to make AYP on the Other Academic Indicator, the elementary and middle grades must increase the percentage proficient\distinguished in combined science, social studies and writing on-demand compared to prior year; or perform at or above the state average percentage proficient\distinguished in combined science, social studies and writing on-demand plus a confidence interval;

or decrease the percentage novice in combined reading, mathematics, science, social studies and writing on-demand compared to the prior year. For the high school grades, the district graduation rate is the Other Academic Indicator.

- On the performance of the African-American subpopulation, 31 school districts did not make AYP in reading, and 26 school districts did not make AYP in mathematics.
- On the performance of the free/reduced-price meal subpopulation, 123 school districts did not make AYP in reading, and 111 school districts did not make AYP in mathematics.
- On the performance of the students with disabilities subpopulation, 81 school districts did not make AYP in reading, and 66 school districts did not make AYP in mathematics.

2011 Observations for the State

- 13 of 25 target goals (52%) were met at the state level. All student subpopulations met the requirements for Participation Rate.
- Statewide, 132 Title I schools are in first-year School Improvement consequences; 37 Title I schools are in second-year School Improvement consequences; 18 Title I schools are in first-year Corrective Action consequences; 16 Title I schools are in second-year Corrective Action consequences; 11 Title I schools are in first-year Restructuring consequences; 4 Title I schools are in second-year Restructuring consequences; 11 Title I schools are in third-year Restructuring consequences; 15 Title I schools are in fourth-year Restructuring consequences; 0 Title I schools are in fifth-year Restructuring consequences; and 1 Title I school is in sixth-year Restructuring consequences.
- Statewide, 32 Title I districts are in first-year District Improvement consequences; 22 Title I districts are in second-year District Improvement consequences; 6 Title I districts are in first-year Corrective Action consequences; 8 Title I districts are in second-year Corrective Action consequences; 10 Title I districts are in third-year Corrective Action consequences; 21 Title I districts are in fourth-year Corrective Action consequences; 10 Title I districts are in fifth-year Corrective Action consequences; and 13 Title I districts are in sixth-year Corrective Action consequences.



**NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND
ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS REPORT - 2011**
September 15, 2011

State
Grades: PRIMARY-12
Code:999

Met 13 out of 25 target goals (52.0 percent)

Title I: Yes

Made Overall AYP: No

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

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

For more information see the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Interpretive Guide at: <http://www.education.ky.gov/>.

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

** Other Academic Indicator is defined on page 2.

*** If a subpopulation doesn't meet its Annual Measurable Objective, it can still be in "Safe Harbor" and considered to have made AYP if the school reduced by at least 10% the number of students in the subpopulation who perform below proficient.



School Results For 2011

Table 1: Schools That Did Not Make AYP by Subpopulation: 659 of 1148 (57.40%)

Student Group	Reading AMO	Mathematics AMO	Participation Rate	Other Academic Indicator
All Students	333 (29.01%)	259 (22.56%)	0 (0.00%)	159 (13.85%)
White (Non-Hispanic)	250 (21.78%)	184 (16.03%)	0 (0.00%)	
African-American	131 (11.41%)	116 (10.10%)	0 (0.00%)	
Hispanic	16 (1.39%)	12 (1.05%)	0 (0.00%)	
Asian	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
Limited English Proficient	11 (0.96%)	10 (0.87%)	0 (0.00%)	
Free/Reduced-Priced Meal	474 (41.29%)	360 (31.36%)	0 (0.00%)	
With Disability	193 (16.81%)	174 (15.16%)	0 (0.00%)	

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

	Overall AYP	Other Academic Indicator	Reading AMO	Mathematics AMO	Participation Rate
Elementary (3-5)	270 (40.97%)	56 (8.50%)	242 (36.72%)	164 (24.89%)	0 (0.00%)
Middle (6-8)	176 (26.71%)	11 (1.67%)	168 (25.49%)	135 (20.49%)	0 (0.00%)
E,M (3-8)	34 (5.16%)	8 (1.21%)	30 (4.55%)	18 (2.73%)	0 (0.00%)
High (10-12)	155 (23.52%)	74 (11.23%)	87 (13.20%)	142 (21.52%)	0 (0.00%)
M,H (6-12)	12 (1.82%)	4 (0.61%)	9 (1.37%)	10 (1.52%)	0 (0.00%)
E, M, H (3-12)	12 (1.82%)	6 (0.91%)	7 (1.06%)	11 (1.67%)	0 (0.00%)
Total	659 (100.00%)	159 (24.13%)	543 (82.40%)	480 (72.84%)	0 (0.00%)

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

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

	0-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-99%	100%	Total
Elementary (3-5)	1 (0.09%)	1 (0.09%)	6 (0.52%)	15 (1.31%)	26 (2.26%)	28 (2.44%)	45 (3.92%)	38 (3.31%)	45 (3.92%)	65 (5.66%)	355 (30.92%)	625 (54.44%)
Middle (6-8)	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.09%)	0 (0.00%)	17 (1.48%)	14 (1.22%)	30 (2.61%)	42 (3.66%)	35 (3.05%)	20 (1.74%)	17 (1.48%)	42 (3.66%)	218 (18.99%)
E,M (3-8)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.09%)	2 (0.17%)	5 (0.44%)	1 (0.09%)	8 (0.70%)	9 (0.78%)	2 (0.17%)	6 (0.52%)	41 (3.57%)	75 (6.53%)
High (10-12)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	7 (0.61%)	11 (0.96%)	21 (1.83%)	44 (3.83%)	41 (3.57%)	17 (1.48%)	14 (1.22%)	44 (3.83%)	199 (17.33%)
M,H (6-12)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (0.17%)	2 (0.17%)	2 (0.17%)	2 (0.17%)	3 (0.26%)	1 (0.09%)	0 (0.00%)	5 (0.44%)	17 (1.48%)
E, M, H (3-12)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (0.26%)	2 (0.17%)	2 (0.17%)	2 (0.17%)	1 (0.09%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (0.17%)	2 (0.17%)	14 (1.22%)
Total	1 (0.09%)	2 (0.17%)	7 (0.61%)	46 (4.01%)	60 (5.23%)	84 (7.32%)	143 (12.46%)	127 (11.06%)	85 (7.40%)	104 (9.06%)	489 (42.60%)	1148 (100.00%)

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

Note: Table 1 is based on the 1148 accountable schools. The percentages are not mutually exclusive. For example, a school may not have made AYP in both reading and mathematics.

District Results For 2011

Table 4: Districts That Did Not Make AYP by Subpopulation: 152 of 174 (87.36%)

Student Group	Reading AMO	Mathematics AMO	Participation Rate	Other Academic Indicator
All Students	81 (46.55%)	66 (37.93%)	0 (0.00%)	67 (38.51%)
White (Non-Hispanic)	66 (37.93%)	52 (29.89%)	0 (0.00%)	
African-American	31 (17.82%)	26 (14.94%)	0 (0.00%)	
Hispanic	6 (3.45%)	9 (5.17%)	0 (0.00%)	
Asian	1 (0.57%)	1 (0.57%)	0 (0.00%)	
Limited English Proficient	5 (2.87%)	4 (2.30%)	0 (0.00%)	
Free/Reduced-Price Meal	123 (70.69%)	111 (63.79%)	0 (0.00%)	
With Disability	81 (46.55%)	66 (37.93%)	0 (0.00%)	

Table 5: Districts That Did Not Make AYP by District Type: 114 of 174 (65.52%)

	Overall AYP	Other Academic Indicator	Reading AMO	Mathematics AMO	Participation Rate
E, M (3-8)	2 (1.32%)	1 (0.66%)	2 (1.32%)	2 (1.32%)	0 (0.00%)
E, M, H (3-12)	150 (98.68%)	66 (43.42%)	137 (90.13%)	122 (80.26%)	0 (0.00%)
Total	152 (100.00%)	67 (44.08%)	139 (91.45%)	124 (81.58%)	0 (0.00%)

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

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

	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-99%	100%	Total
E, M (3-8)	1 (0.57%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.57%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (1.72%)	5 (2.87%)
E, M, H (3-12)	0 (0.00%)	24 (13.79%)	23 (13.22%)	20 (11.49%)	35 (20.11%)	18 (10.34%)	21 (12.07%)	9 (5.17%)	19 (10.92%)	169 (97.13%)
Total	1 (0.57%)	24 (13.79%)	24 (13.79%)	20 (11.49%)	35 (20.11%)	18 (10.34%)	21 (12.07%)	9 (5.17%)	22 (12.64%)	174 (100.00%)

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

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

School/District Consequences For 2011

Table 7: Title I Schools in Consequences by School Type

	School Consequences										Total
	School Improvement – Yr 1	School Improvement – Yr 2	Corrective Action – Yr 1	Corrective Action – Yr 2	Restructuring – Yr 1	Restructuring – Yr 2	Restructuring – Yr 3	Restructuring – Yr 4	Restructuring – Yr 5	Restructuring – Yr 6	
Elementary (3-5)	87	13	6	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	110
Middle (6-8)	23	13	10	7	8	2	6	9	0	1	79
E,M (3-8)	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
High (10-12)	8	9	1	5	2	1	5	6	0	0	37
M,H (6-12)	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
E, M, H (3-12)	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Total	132	37	18	16	11	4	11	15	0	1	245

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

Table 8: Title I Districts in Consequences by School Type

	District Consequences								Total
	District Improvement – Yr 1	District Improvement – Yr 2	Corrective Action - Yr 1	Corrective Action – Yr 2	Corrective Action – Yr 3	Corrective Action – Yr 4	Corrective Action – Yr 5	Corrective Action – Yr 6	
E,M (3-8)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
E, M, H (3-12)	32	22	6	8	10	21	10	13	122
Total	32	22	6	8	10	21	10	13	122

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

Table 9: Non-Title I Schools Eligible for State Assistance

	Non-Title I Schools				
	Number Eligible – 1 Yr	Number Eligible – 2 Yr	Number Eligible – 3 Yr	Number Not Eligible	Total
Elementary (3-5)	10	5	1	61	77
Middle (6-8)	9	25	28	22	84
E,M (3-8)	0	0	0	1	1
High (10-12)	22	44	59	32	157
M,H (6-12)	1	1	1	7	10
E, M, H (3-12)	0	0	0	1	1
Total	42	75	89	124	330

ATTACHMENT A

Final School and District Results For 2010

School Results For 2010

Table 1: Schools That Did Not Make AYP by Subpopulation: 505 of 1151 (43.87%)

Student Group	Reading AMO	Mathematics AMO	Participation Rate	Other Academic Indicator
All Students	146 (12.68%)	221 (19.20%)	0 (0.00%)	147 (12.77%)
White (Non-Hispanic)	91 (7.91%)	159 (13.81%)	0 (0.00%)	
African-American	122 (10.60%)	123 (10.69%)	0 (0.00%)	
Hispanic	12 (1.04%)	8 (0.70%)	0 (0.00%)	
Asian	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
Limited English Proficient	11 (0.96%)	12 (1.04%)	0 (0.00%)	
Free/Reduced-Price Meal	253 (21.98%)	292 (25.37%)	0 (0.00%)	
With Disability	186 (16.16%)	180 (15.64%)	1 (0.09%)	

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

	Overall AYP	Other Academic Indicator	Reading AMO	Mathematics AMO	Participation Rate
Elementary (3-5)	161 (31.88%)	35 (6.93%)	141 (27.92%)	94 (18.61%)	0 (0.00%)
Middle (6-8)	141 (27.92%)	29 (5.74%)	122 (24.16%)	114 (22.57%)	0 (0.00%)
E,M (3-8)	18 (3.56%)	8 (1.58%)	11 (2.18%)	5 (0.99%)	0 (0.00%)
High (10-12)	170 (33.66%)	66 (13.07%)	79 (15.64%)	164 (32.48%)	1 (0.20%)
M,H (6-12)	11 (2.18%)	6 (1.19%)	5 (0.99%)	9 (1.78%)	0 (0.00%)
E, M, H (3-12)	4 (0.79%)	3 (0.59%)	1 (0.20%)	3 (0.59%)	0 (0.00%)
Total	505 (100.00%)	147 (29.11%)	359 (71.09%)	389 (77.03%)	1 (0.20%)

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

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

	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-99%	100%	Total
Elementary (3-5)	4 (0.35%)	11 (0.96%)	8 (0.70%)	21 (1.82%)	19 (1.65%)	27 (2.35%)	30 (2.61%)	41 (3.56%)	467 (40.57%)	628 (54.56%)
Middle (6-8)	2 (0.17%)	7 (0.61%)	11 (0.96%)	16 (1.39%)	27 (2.35%)	21 (1.82%)	32 (2.78%)	25 (2.17%)	78 (6.78%)	219 (19.03%)
E,M (3-8)	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.09%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.09%)	2 (0.17%)	3 (0.26%)	3 (0.26%)	8 (0.70%)	58 (5.04%)	76 (6.60%)
High (10-12)	1 (0.09%)	9 (0.78%)	8 (0.70%)	19 (1.65%)	50 (4.34%)	56 (4.87%)	14 (1.22%)	13 (1.13%)	30 (2.61%)	200 (17.38%)
M,H (6-12)	0 (0.00%)	2 (0.17%)	1 (0.09%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.09%)	3 (0.26%)	1 (0.09%)	3 (0.26%)	5 (0.43%)	16 (1.39%)
E, M, H (3-12)	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.09%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.09%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.09%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.09%)	8 (0.70%)	12 (1.04%)
Total	7 (0.61%)	31 (2.69%)	28 (2.43%)	58 (5.04%)	99 (8.60%)	111 (9.64%)	80 (6.95%)	91 (7.91%)	646 (56.13%)	1151 (100.00%)

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

Note: Table 1 is based on the 1151 accountable schools. The percentages are not mutually exclusive. For example, a school may not have made AYP in both reading and mathematics.

District Results For 2010

Table 4: Districts That Did Not Make AYP by Subpopulation: 112 of 174 (64.37%)

Student Group	Reading AMO	Mathematics AMO	Participation Rate	Other Academic Indicator
All Students	10 (5.75%)	17 (9.77%)	0 (0.00%)	58 (33.33%)
White (Non-Hispanic)	8 (4.60%)	11 (6.32%)	0 (0.00%)	
African-American	20 (11.49%)	21 (12.07%)	0 (0.00%)	
Hispanic	2 (1.15%)	2 (1.15%)	0 (0.00%)	
Asian	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
Limited English Proficient	1 (0.57%)	1 (0.57%)	0 (0.00%)	
Free/Reduced-Price Meal	41 (23.56%)	49 (28.16%)	0 (0.00%)	
With Disability	47 (27.01%)	54 (31.03%)	0 (0.00%)	

Table 5: Districts That Did Not Make AYP by District Type: 112 of 174 (64.37%)

	Overall AYP	Other Academic Indicator	Reading AMO	Mathematics AMO	Participation Rate
E,M (3-8)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
E, M, H (3-12)	112 (100.00%)	58 (51.79%)	71 (63.39%)	86 (76.79%)	0 (0.00%)
Total	112 (100.00%)	58 (51.79%)	71 (63.39%)	86 (76.79%)	0 (0.00%)

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

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

	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-99%	100%	Total
E,M (3-8)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	5 (2.87%)	5 (2.87%)
E, M, H (3-12)	7 (4.02%)	1 (0.57%)	6 (3.45%)	16 (9.20%)	15 (8.62%)	33 (18.97%)	34 (19.54%)	57 (32.76%)	169 (97.13%)
Total	7 (4.02%)	1 (0.57%)	6 (3.45%)	16 (9.20%)	15 (8.62%)	33 (18.97%)	34 (19.54%)	62 (35.63%)	174 (100.00%)

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

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

School/District Consequences For 2010

Table 7: Title I Schools in Consequences by School Type

	School Consequences									Total
	School Improvement – Yr 1	School Improvement – Yr 2	Corrective Action – Yr 1	Corrective Action – Yr 2	Restructuring – Yr 1	Restructuring – Yr 2	Restructuring – Yr 3	Restructuring – Yr 4	Restructuring – Yr 5	
Elementary (3-5)	22	8	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	34
Middle (6-8)	19	9	9	8	2	6	12	0	1	66
E,M (3-8)	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
High (10-12)	13	2	5	1	2	1	10	0	0	34
M,H (6-12)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
E, M, H (3-12)	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Total	55	21	18	10	5	7	22	0	1	139

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

Table 8: Title I Districts in Consequences by School Type

	District Consequences							Total
	District Improvement – Yr 1	District Improvement – Yr 2	Corrective Action - Yr 1	Corrective Action – Yr 2	Corrective Action – Yr 3	Corrective Action – Yr 4	Corrective Action – Yr 5	
E,M (3-8)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
E, M, H (3-12)	24	6	8	9	22	11	13	93
Total	24	6	8	9	22	11	13	93

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

Table 9: Non-Title I Schools Eligible for State Assistance

	Non-Title I Schools			Total
	Number Eligible – 1 Yr	Number Eligible – 2 Yr	Number Not Eligible	
Elementary (3-5)	4	2	71	77
Middle (6-8)	21	33	28	82
E,M (3-8)	0	0	2	2
High (10-12)	34	73	48	155
M,H (6-12)	1	1	6	8
E, M, H (3-12)	0	0	1	1
Total	60	109	156	325