ABSTRACT OF CAPSTONE

Ralph W. Hamilton

The Graduate School

Morehead State University

March 26, 2018

SENATE BILL 200 AND STUDENT ATTENDANCE

Abstract of Capstone

A capstone submitted in partial fulfillment of the
Requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in the
College of Education
At Morehead State University

By

Ralph W. Hamilton

West Liberty, Kentucky

Committee Chair: Dr. Shane C. Shope, Assistant Professor

Morehead, Kentucky

March 26, 2018

ABSTRACT OF CAPSTONE

SENATE BILL 200 AND STUDENT ATTENDANCE

A substantial overhaul of the Kentucky Juvenile Justice System changed the process that schools used to address habitual truant students. This exploratory study examined the average daily attendance (ADA) of Kentucky traditional high schools and how it has been affected by the implementation of Senate Bill 200. Six research questions and ten hypotheses were tested. Results indicated that there existed a significant difference between high schools with the highest ADA and the lowest ADA for the 2012-13 school year. This difference still existed two years after the implementation of Senate Bill 200 in the 2016-17 school year. Examinations of the high schools with the highest ADA indicated that there exists a significant difference between the two years prior to and the two years after the implementation of Senate Bill 200. Though not significant, descriptive statistics indicate that there exists a difference between the high schools with the lowest ADA the two years prior to and the two years after the implementation of Senate Bill 200.

KEYWORDS: Average daily attendance, Senate Bill 200, Kentucky traditional high school, Habitual truant

_____

Candidate Signature

_____

Date

SENATE BILL 200 AND STUDENT ATTENDANCE

By

Ralph W. Hamilton

Approved by

_____
C. Thomas Potter, Ed.D
Committee Member Date

_____
Michael W. Kessinger, Ed.D
Committee Member Date

_____
Shane C. Shope, Ed.D
Committee Chair Date

_____
Timothy L. Simpson, Ph.D
Interim Department Chair Date

RULES FOR THE USE OF CAPSTONES

Unpublished capstones submitted for the Doctor's degree and deposited in the Morehead State University Library are as a rule open for inspection, but are to be used only with due regard to the rights of the authors. Bibliographical references may be noted, but quotations or summaries of parts may be published only with the permission of the author, and with the usual scholarly acknowledgements.

Extensive copying or publication of the capstone in whole or in part also requires the consent of the Dean of the Graduate School of Morehead State University.

A library that borrows this dissertation for use by its patrons is expected to secure the signature of each user.

Name Date

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

CAPSTONE

Ralph W. Hamilton

The Graduate School

Morehead State University

March 26, 2018

SENATE BILL 200 AND STUDENT ATTENDANCE

Capstone

A capstone submitted in partial fulfillment of the
Requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in the
College of Education
At Morehead State University

By

Ralph W. Hamilton

West Liberty, Kentucky

Committee Chair: Dr. Shane C. Shope, Assistant Professor

Morehead, Kentucky

March 26, 2018

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my wife, Nikki, and new daughter, Brylee Klaire. My wife's persistent encouragement and motivation has enabled me to complete this journey that began three years ago. This work is dedicated to my Dad, who completed only the third grade and persistently emphasized the importance of a proper education. And to my Mom, who ensured I was given all the opportunities available to be successful throughout my educational experience.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to start first with a mentor, friend, and incredible person, Mrs. Jennifer Salyer. Thank you for pushing me to further my education in completing this journey and motivating me to be the best educator I can be!

My Doctoral Committee, Dr. Shane Shope, Dr. Michael Kessinger, and Dr. C. Thomas Potter have been unbelievable throughout this process in their willingness to support me in my study. Thank you for everything!

A special thanks to my Doctoral Chair, Dr. Shane Shope. You have helped me grow as an educator through great dialog and feedback that has allowed me to see things in a more diverse way. Your passion for ALL students is evident and admirable.

A special thanks to Dr. Michael Kessinger for the support and guidance throughout this process that has been vital for the completion of this journey.

A special thanks to Dr. C. Thomas Potter for supporting me as a mentor in our professional relationship and during this journey.

I would like to thank Nick Carter, my friend and fellow journeyman from Cohort 6. I remember when we had our interviews for entrance into the program, your desire to serve students was evident and that speaks volumes. I appreciate our friendship and will continue to value it in our greatest journey – life. Thank you for everything!

I want to acknowledge my wife, Nikki, and daughter, Brylee Klaire. I started this journey with Nikki and then in the final year, little Brylee Klaire joined in. You girls are the most important things in my life! Thank you for making my life full of joy!

Finally, to my parents – Newell and Wanda – who made all sacrifices necessary to ensure I was afforded any and all opportunities growing up. You are the reason for my successes! You are the best!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

Introduction

Passionate educators will often recognize that the most difficult students to educate are the ones who are not at school. One of the prevalent barriers educators must work to elevate is the habitual truancy. The Kentucky Department of Education mandates educators to close the achievement gap, ensure all students are College and/or Career Ready, increase graduation rates, ensure students have social skills through Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS), teach practical living skills needed to function in society, and provide services to close the gap between home and school. These expectations cannot become a reality if students do not attend school.

Student truancy, has become one of the greatest obstacles for educators in their effort to provide a quality education to all students (Benton & Schagen, 2006; Parke & Kanyongo, 2012). School administrators, social service agencies, court officials, and other agencies that deal with juveniles have worked to overcome these challengers. “Truancy is a serious issue facing all schools across the country, from elementary through high school, and impacting all of our communities, regardless of income and social class” (Hendricks, Sale, Evans, McKinley & Carter, 2010, p. 173). Ideas to combat truancy have involved zero tolerance policies, systematic approaches within the school, providing interventions, using public agencies, strengthening laws and/or combinations of each. The toughest issue is understanding the different

reasons students miss school, including but not limited to age, circumstances, home environment, perception of school, and expectations of teachers and administrators.

With the incorporation of graduations rates being added to the formula of determining school is success, it is important that school systems work to elevate the issue of truancy because of the rick factors that follow. According to Zhang, Willson, Katsiyannis and Barrett (2010):

> Truancy, especially chronic truancy, often is associated with serious problems in academic achievement, school completion, social adjustments, post-school outcomes and other social economic problems (e.g., lower employment opportunities and pay, increased chance of living in poverty, and more reliance on social welfare). (p. 230)

Graduation aside, research (Garry, 1996; Gump, 2005; Reid, 2005; Schoeneberger, 2012) supports why truancy is such an important issue for educators to work against. There are no positives associated with truancy. If students do not attend school regularly then both the school system and student will suffer regardless of how well a school system provides quality instruction.

In the state of Kentucky, all school districts are required to employ a Director of Pupil Personnel (DPP) that works with school administrators to provide interventions to combat truant behavior for students before it reaches habitual status. A study conducted by the Office of Education Accountability (OEA) revealed that 40 percent of all Kentucky students were habitually truant between the 2012 and 2016 school years (Alexander et al, 2017).

Why does Truancy matter?

The idea of simply providing a student with a quality education has changed over time. The 21st Century educator has the charge to provide students with an education that will allow them to be competitive in an ever-changing and diverse world. Students no longer have to be competitive in their hometowns, larger cities, state levels, or even nationally, but internationally. With the world becoming more diverse, our students are now competing with students from all over the world for opportunities to attend post-secondary schools, work in jobs that lead to a successful career and to obtain jobs that were not necessarily sought after in the 20th Century. A study conducted in Scottish schools correlated that "pupils who truanted from school were regularly out-performed in terms of academics at every level of schooling from primary to secondary" (Reid, 2010, p. 2). "If governments wish to drive academic standards up to their optimum they must decrease pupils' non-attendance, and truancy" (Reid, 2010, p. 2).

Background of the Problem

In the state of Kentucky – though students' achievement level is the most important issue in education – schools are funded using a formula based on average daily attendance (ADA). The formula is used with the ADA to determine the amount funding to be allocated to each school system by the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE). The higher percentage of ADA correlates to the level of funding the district receives from KDE. High or increased ADA can be an asset for school districts but, unfortunately, many districts that see a decrease in ADA cautiously

prepare budgets each year to attempt to sustain the needed funding to provide all students with a quality and competitive education.

Schools in the state of Kentucky, referenced above, are assessed using the Kentucky Performance Rating for Educational Progress (KPREP) accountability system that was once comprised of achievement, achievement gap, growth, college and/or career readiness, and graduation rate. This system is being overhauled and a new system will be implemented in the 2018-19 school year. Each of the components will be directly linked to the performance of students.

To ensure students are being prepared appropriately, they must be in school punctually and consistently. A study by Paredes and Ugarte (2011) revealed that students who were absent for nine days during a school year performed significantly lower on a standardized mathematics test. In fact, students reduced performance by at least 23% of the standard deviation score of the standardized test administered (Paredes & Ugarte, 2011). Surprisingly, the study revealed that once a student was absent 13 days, their academic performance leveled off and did not continue to decrease (Paredes & Ugarte, 2011).

With mathematics and sciences being at the forefront to many of the desired occupations in the 21st Century, it is obvious that students missing school will cause those students to lack those skills to compete. Likewise, schools' assessment results will be much lower because each are assessed on the students' performance and, like the 21st Century job market, are centered on mathematics and sciences.

Issues in the Kentucky General Assembly

In 2014, the Kentucky General Assembly passed Senate Bill (SB) 200 that was signed into law by then Kentucky Governor Steve Beshear. This changed how schools could mitigate truancy issues. Before the passing of SB 200, the systematic approach could be described in two steps: school interventions and court referral through the Court Designated Worker (CDW). The process worked well for many school districts because of its validity and potential consequences that students could face if there was not an improvement in their attendance. In severe cases, the family judge had the power to court order students to attend school regularly and, if this order was disobeyed, the student could be sentenced to juvenile detention.

The new law outlined in SB 200 restructured the referral process to address youths who have a status offense, misdemeanor, or Class D felony referrals filed against them. All truancy referrals are considered a status offense. This unfunded mandate slowed the process and the programs implementation. During this time, all family court judges – the court that hears truancy cases – were ordered to cease using their current process even though the new program was in the early stages of implementation. This study specifically targeted SB 200 in how it has affected ADA for all Kentucky high schools since its implementation in 2015-16 school year.

The new process provides school interventions and up to three diversions depending on the severity of the habitual truancy offense. First, the student is given a Global Appraisal of Individual Needs (GAIN) assessment by the CDW to determine the level of intervention needed by the offender. Depending on the offender's score,

they will be placed on a diversion with either the CDW, Court Designated Specialist (CDS), the Family, Accountability, Intervention, and Response (FAIR) team, or the Family Court Judge. If an offender scores low enough on the GAIN they could be given up to four diversions in an effort to remedy the habitual truancy behavior. If the offender is unsuccessful with their diversion with the CDW, they are referred to the CDS and/or the FAIR team.

The FAIR team is comprised of social services agents, Youth Service Center (YSC) school coordinators, the County Attorney, the DPP, foster care services, and any other agencies that can provide services to help improve the truant behavior (KRS § 605.035). If these diversions fail, then the offender is referred to the county attorney and will be placed under court order by the Family Court Judge to allow one last opportunity at a diversion before a change placement may be ordered.

The U.S. Department of Justice (1996) recommended that schools and communities include "parents, educators, law enforcement personnel, juvenile and family court judges, and representatives from social service, community, and religious organizations" in truancy intervention. This collaborative process set forth by SB 200 provides many services to help elevate issues that cause the habitual truant behavior but lacks urgency and severe consequences that some offenders need. The instructional days a student misses between the three-to-four failed diversions could be detrimental to their success moving forward.

A barrier to its implementation was the lack of experienced CDWs who could assume the role of CDSs and deemed credible enough to begin training replacement

CDWs. This caused a domino effect in that there was a shortage in CDWs that must be hired and trained with no allocated funds to expedite the process. Therefore, leaving school systems with limited support systems to meet the needs of truant students.

Statement of the Problem

Several studies have supported that truancy is an issue that is a risk factor leading to vulnerable behavior such as drug and alcohol use, more serious crimes that lead to incarceration, an inability to maintaining a job or support themselves, and other social and emotional issues that can affect a student's future (Wilson, Malcolm, Edward & Davison, 2008; Reid, 2008; Zhang et al, 2010; Paredes & Ugarte, 2011; Monahan, VanDerhei, Bechtold & Cauffman, 2014). In addition, schools attempt to proscribe to the state mandated program to work with the appropriate agencies to support student truancy.

The leading factors associated with the development of truancy are socioeconomic status, lack of interest in school by the parent or the student, parental support at home toward school success, teacher support, and the lack of meaningful instruction (Monahan et al, 2014). Building relationships with parents and students is essential in the school's process of reducing truancy. Often, truant behaviors stem from parents who had a negative school experience and it is important that measures are taken to build a relationship with them to ensure their confidence will grow with the idea of their child succeeding academically (Benton & Schagen, 2006). Henry

(2007) found that students exhibiting habitual truancy were more likely to come from households where parents' education levels were low – high school or less.

The court system as an intervention has shown success in improving school attendance, though this method can yield negative reaction that often resulting in a larger gap between the home and school that can lead to the removal of the student (Gleich-Bope, 2014). A survey conducted by OEA reported that 36.6% of respondents indicated the court, new legislation, and the lack of consequences were the reasons for attendance issues in the state of Kentucky (Alexander et al., 2017). Though this may be part of the reason, the school, parent, and student must work proactively to build relationships that will ensure students' success and high-risk factors do not develop. Indeed, it is the hope that a good school and parent/student relationship fortifies positive student outcomes.

Research Question

This research was designed to determine the impact SB 200 has had on Kentucky high schools' ADA since the full implementation of the bill in July 2015. Data collected from the 35 highest and 35 lowest performing high schools in terms of ADA was used to determine if SB 200 had increased, decreased, or no significant effect on the schools' ADA. The guiding question for this capstone was:

> How has the implementation of Senate Bill 200 impacted Kentucky high schools' ADA?

The following research questions relate to the guiding question:

1. In 2012-13, how did the ADA of the highest high schools compare to the lowest high schools?
2. How has ADA of high schools been affected by the implementation of Senate Bill 200?
3. How has ADA for the highest high schools been affected by the implementation of Senate Bill 200?
4. How has ADA for the lowest high schools been affected by the implementation of Senate Bill 200?
5. Two years after the implementation of Senate Bill 200 (2016-17), how has the ADA of the highest high schools compared to the lowest high schools?
6. What impact has Senate Bill 200 had on the gap between the ADA of the highest high schools and the lowest high schools?

The ADA of high school was determined by the Superintendent's Annual Attendance Report (SAAR) submitted for the school years of 2013, 2014, 2016, and 2017. The 2015 school year was not used because SB 200 was phased in and not fully implemented. Ten hypotheses were tested to provide a basis for response to the research question. The 10 hypotheses were:

Ho1: There is no significant difference between the ADA of the high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2012-13 when compared to the high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2012-13.

Ho2: There is no significant difference in ADA for high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2012-13 when compared to the high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2015-16.

Ho3: There is no significant difference in ADA for high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2013-14 when compared to the high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2015-16.

Ho4: There is no significant difference in ADA for high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2012-13 when compared to the high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2016-17.

Ho5: There is no significant difference in ADA for high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2013-14 when compared to the high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2016-17.

Ho6: There is no significant difference in ADA for high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2012-13 when compared to the high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2015-16.

Ho7: There is no significant difference in ADA for high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2013-14 when compared to the high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2015-16.

Ho8: There is no significant difference in ADA for high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2012-13 when compared to the high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2016-17.

Ho9: There is no significant difference in ADA for high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2013-14 when compared to the high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2016-17.

Ho10: There is no significant difference between the ADA of the high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2016-17 when compared to the high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2016-17.

Conclusion

As mentioned previously, the problem truancy causes for school districts and juveniles regarding their educational success and, ultimately, their life-path success. Student attendance is the foundation to everything that represents Kentucky education. The truancy process has become complicated in regard to providing intervention that ensures compliance. “Governments have tended to shy away from penalizing too much from non-attendance” (Reid, 2010. p. 5). The state of Kentucky claims that they are trying to change the perception of juvenile justice by moving away from incarceration as a punishment to providing multiple chances to take a proactive approach to preventing and mitigating the problem through intervention. Though, it seems as if the state is trying to stay away from controversy and, at the same time, save money. Less juveniles are being addressed in court and ADA for schools could potentially drop, which will decrease funding for school districts.

Definition of Terms

The following definition of terms will help ensure the reader understands and can develop clear meaning to the issue being addressed in this capstone.

2012-13 school year: the school year used to identify the sample

2015-16 school year: the school year when Senate Bill 200 was implemented

Average Daily Attendance (ADA): the aggregate days attended by students divided by the number of days school is in session.

Senate Bill 200 (SB 200): the legislation passed by the Kentucky General Assembly in 2014 that substantially overhauled Kentucky's juvenile justice system.

Superintendent's Annual Attendance Report (SAAR): the annual attendance report submitted electronically to the Kentucky Department of Education by June 30 of each year.

Kentucky traditional high school: Kentucky high schools that are comprised of grades nine through twelve.

Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Bracket (Highest and Lowest): two groups of Kentucky traditional high schools determined by the average daily attendance in the 2012-13 school year. The 35 traditional high schools with the highest ADA represented the "highest ADA bracket," and the 35 traditional with the lowest represented the "lowest ADA bracket."

Truant: Any student who has attained the age of six (6) years, but has not reached his or her eighteenth birthday, who has been absent from school without valid excuse for three (3) or more days, or tardy without valid excuse on three (3) or more days (KRS § 159.150).

Habitual Truant: Any student who has been reported as a truant two (2) or more times (KRS § 159.150).

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

What is Truancy?

Truancy has many definitions; all describe a version of student absenteeism. Each state defines truancy to support their system of public education. "Since no single truancy definition exists across the United States, there are no nationwide truancy statistics" (Skinner, 2014, p. 154). Maryland defines truancy as a student who accumulates eighteen unexcused absences; Texas defines truancy as a student who has 10 unexcused absences within six months, Florida and Indiana defines truancy as a student who has 10 unexcused absences in 90 calendar days (Skinner, 2014). Kentucky defines truancy as a student who accumulates three unexcused events at any time during a school year (KRS § 159.150).

One issue to consider with each of these definitions is the fact that the calculation of funds is drastically different depending on the formula used to calculate school district's state funding annually. In Indiana, the Department of Education uses average daily membership (ADM) – the average number of students enrolled throughout the year – to calculate their funding (Indiana Department of Education Office of School Finance, 2017). The state of Kentucky uses average daily attendance (ADA) – the average number of students present throughout the year (KRS § 157.360). Indiana schools receive funding regardless of daily attendance whereas Kentucky is penalized when a student misses.

In both instances, the students are suffering academically, making it an even greater issue that must be addressed with great effort by all schools. “According to the National Center for Education Statistics, students access to education is directly related to time spent in the classroom, and truant students have fewer opportunities to learn because of their absences” (Gleich-Bope, 2014, p. 111). Teachers and school administrators must work to enhance students’ learning process that will motivate students to be present and for parents to want to send them to school.

Factors that Cause Truancy

“Experts agree that truancy is often one of the fastest ‘gateways’ into criminal justice” (Skola & Williamson, 2012, p. 405). Therefore, the factors that causes truancy must be identified in order to understand why truancy occurs and the ramifications of the habit. Truancy issues are all unique to the student in that the factor(s) causing a student to be absent are unique. The factors that can cause truancy remains a persistent concern, with serious consequences for the individual, family, and society because of the links between truancy and academic failure, disengagement with school, school dropouts and delinquent behavior (Zhang et al., 2010). In a detailed study of 128 persistent absentees, “all individual cases contained aspects of social, physiological, and institutional aspects that lead to their truant behavior” (Reid, 2005, p. 61).

Social Factors

The literature is consistent in saying that home environment and socioeconomic status (SES) is often a factor in why a student exhibits truant behavior

(Reid, 2010). Home environment has many aspects that can influence truant behavior. Often, parents perceive school negatively because of prior experiences, and devaluate their child's education through casual conversation and resulting in negatively influencing their child's desire to become educated. Parents that fail to equip their child with the proper material to be successful in the classroom, show little to no interest in their child's success, make excuses and lay blame on the school in all issues and, most devastatingly, allow their child to miss school upon request. Other parental factors that causes truancy is neglecting to take care of their child, leading to the child having to take care of themselves, and their home (Monahan et al., 2014). Manahan et al. (2014) states that "unsupervised and unstructured activities increase the likelihood that adolescents will engage in problem behavior, which, in turn, increases the likelihood of police contact" (p. 1119).

Parental lifestyle is included in the home environment. Parents who use alcohol excessively and/or abuse prescription or illegal drugs can, again, lead to their child becoming truant because they are unable to support them in their education (Reid, 1999). Students who are not old enough to wake up and make sure they get to school by bus or other means on their own are neglected because of the parent's inability to stay sober. Students who are old enough to be responsible often times follow their parent's lead and become at risk to emulate same behavior of the parent or feel obligated to stay home and take care of their younger siblings.

Families that have criminal history can play a role in truant behavior. Zhang et al. (2010) collected data that supported the claim that students with family criminal

history are more likely to display truant behavior. Students are products of their home environment and the exposure to criminal activity can lead to the student committing the same activities that can cause truant behavior. Students from families who have multiple criminal offenses were more likely to commit multiple truancy offenses (Zhang et at., 2010). Criminal behavior is learned similarly to how respectable behavior is learned. Students exposed to negative behavior are at risk of exhibiting that same behavior.

Low socioeconomic status of families is another factor that can lead to truant behavior (Reid, 1999). Zhang (2003) states that "child poverty is a social phenomenon extremely difficult to measure" (p. 11). Factors that can lead to low socioeconomic status or child poverty are unemployment, poor housing conditions, receiving government assistance, and criminal activity such as alcohol and drug addiction (Zhang, 2003).

Students who live in a low socioeconomic home lack resources needed to be successful in the home setting and at school. These resources can be proper parenting that supports education, material that facilitates the learning process, and a safe environment conducive to success. The educational process begins at home and when that process is lacking it can cause issue at school. Poor home life can lead to learned behaviors due to observed parental behaviors, lack of parental oversight, and/or uncontrollable behavior by the student. These learned behaviors can lead to truant behavior because parents are unable to support their home and educational needs (Reid, 1999).

Learned hopelessness can be a result of low socioeconomic status. Students who see their parents working hard and never getting ahead may be led to believe this to be true in their own classwork (Woolfolk, 1995). Seeing their parents struggle leads to students believing that they are in a situation that cannot be helped. They gradually begin to be disinterested in the educational process and finally drop out just like their family members before them. This can be a decision that is out of the students' control because they can be pulled from school to help support the family.

In the state of Kentucky this is often times a way of life. Students are signed out or put in generic home schools thereby clearing what the parent may perceive as obstacles in the way of the daily activity of the nuclear family. Parents though, do not realize that they are crippling their children for life because they "reject the behaviors that would make them successful in school – studying, cooperating with teachers, even coming to class" (Woolfolk, 1995, p. 163). Again, the idea of generational poverty and low socioeconomic status wins the battle because it is expected, and the idea of improving life through education is not the norm and is considered much more difficult.

Psychological Factors

Like social factors above, psychological factors often have the same causes. Having anxiety and fear when it comes to school is often normal and expected during the development of all students. Some students never get over this anxiety and fear, leading to truant behavior. A phobia of school can develop and lead to truant behavior that can be detrimental to their success moving forward. Rettig and Crawford (2000)

defines school phobia as “anxiety and fear related to going to school” (p. 54). Students who become truant at an early age continue to be truant as they transition through each grade, which can be a result of the fear of going to school. Students who develop a phobia of school will use any excuse not to go to school ranging from complaining about being sick, about being bullied, about disliking their teacher, and other factors that can lead to their parents not sending them.

Students having a phobia of school can be linked to a combination of genetic factors and environmental factors (Rettig & Crawford, 2000). Anxiety disorders can be inherited from one generation to the other that can lead to the student fearing the idea of going to school. This issue must be combated by working with the parents and appropriate medical or psychological help to ensure students are handled appropriately in alieving this barrier. The environmental factor that leads to psychological issues is similar to what leads to social issues involving students and regular student attendance. Students can develop a phobia of school if a traumatic event or change occurs in their life such as death, divorce, substance abuse, child abuse, bad school experiences and, the hottest topic in education, being bullied by fellow peers or by their teachers.

Institutional/Educational Factors

Educators must realize that they play a huge role in student attendance. It is important for educators to understand why students miss in regard to their influences. The influence of friends and peers, relationship with teachers, content and delivery of the curriculum, bullying and classroom environment all play a major role in the

attendance of students (Reid, 2005). Understanding students and what they deem to be important educationally is vital to the success of the teacher and, more importantly, the student.

Another issue often over looked is the attendance of teachers in regard to student attendance (Roby, 2013). Student attendance is adversely affected when a teacher is absent, and a substitute is provided (Roby, 2013). It is important that educators attend work regularly to set an example all students can follow. Roby (2013) concluded that "schools with low teacher attendance had an average daily attendance for students of 87.28 in comparison to schools with high teacher attendance that had an average daily attendance for students of 97.83" (p. 205). Therefore, though educators often want to point the finger to the home environment of students and their truant behavior, the answer to resolving the issue may lie within the walls of the institution.

These factors should be prioritized by educators as they develop plans to combat the truant behaviors of their students. This should be done by observations, class surveys, and data collection. The teacher can be the gateway for students who do not attend school because it only takes one person to make difference. Taking an interest in a student's success can lead to a more positive educational experience resulting in less absences and promoting more responsible behavior.

Chapter 3

Methodology

Introduction

The purpose of this exploratory study was to determine the impact Senate Bill 200 has had on Kentucky high schools' ADA since its implementation. This study examined the ADA of Kentucky high schools the two years prior to the implementation of SB 200 to the two years after implementation. The question addressed by the study was:

`How has the implementation of Senate Bill 200 impacted Kentucky high schools' ADA?

The following research questions relate to the guiding question:

1. In 2012-13, how did the ADA of the highest high schools compare to the lowest high schools?
2. How has ADA of high schools been affected by the implementation of Senate Bill 200?
3. How has ADA for the highest high schools been affected by the implementation of Senate Bill 200?
4. How has ADA for the lowest high schools been affected by the implementation of Senate Bill 200?
5. Two years after the implementation of Senate Bill 200 (2016-17), how has the ADA of the highest high schools compared to the lowest high schools?

6. What impact has Senate Bill 200 had on the gap between the ADA of the highest high schools and the lowest high schools?

The ADA of high school was determined by the Superintendent's Annual Attendance Report (SAAR) submitted for the school years of 2012-13, 2013-14, 2015-16, and 2016-17. The 2014-15 school year was not used because SB 200 was phased in and not fully implemented. Ten hypotheses were tested to provide a basis for response to the research question. The 10 hypotheses were:

Ho1: There is no significant difference between the ADA of the high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2012-13 when compared to the high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2012-13.

Ho2: There is no significant difference in ADA for high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2012-13 when compared to the high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2015-16.

Ho3: There is no significant difference in ADA for high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2013-14 when compared to the high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2015-16.

Ho4: There is no significant difference in ADA for high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2012-13 when compared to the high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2016-17.

Ho5: There is no significant difference in ADA for high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2013-14 when compared to the high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2016-17.

Ho6: There is no significant difference in ADA for high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2012-13 when compared to the high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2015-16.

Ho7: There is no significant difference in ADA for high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2013-14 when compared to the high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2015-16.

Ho8: There is no significant difference in ADA for high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2012-13 when compared to the high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2016-17.

Ho9: There is no significant difference in ADA for high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2013-14 when compared to the high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2016-17.

Ho10: There is no significant difference between the ADA of the high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2016-17 when compared to the high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2016-17.

Population and Sample

The population was all traditional Kentucky high schools. ADA for the school years of 2012-13, 2013-14, 2015-16, 2016-17 were obtained for all high schools and ranked from highest to lowest. Using this list, the highest 35 and lowest 35 high schools were grouped and referred to as the highest ADA bracket and lowest ADA bracket.

Procedures

The Office of Finance and Operations and Division of District Support within the Kentucky Department of Education were contacted via email regarding the acquisition of data for the research study. This information existed in digital form. Data files for school years 2012-13, 2013-14, 2015-16, and 2016-17 were requested and received via email from Ronda Devine, Education Consultant for the Office of Finance and Operations.

All Kentucky high school attendance data were imported into Microsoft Excel. Only A1 high schools with the traditional grades of nine through twelve were selected. Any other classification and/or high schools that served other grades were not selected.

The excel document was ranked on the 2013 school year data and the highest 35 and the lowest 35 high schools were identified. These two groups were identified by assigning a value of "1" for the highest performing schools and "2" for the lowest performing schools.

Implementation

ADA data was obtained from the Office of Finance and Operations and Division of District Support within the Kentucky of Department of Education. The data collected was compiled from the Superintendents Annual Attendance Report (SAAR) submitted annually after the last student attendance day or by June 30th. The attendance data collected were for school years 2012-13, 2013-14, 2015-16, and 2016-17 which represents two years prior and two years after the implementation of

SB 200. School year 2015 was not used because the bill was being phased in and part of the year was under the former procedure and the other part using SB 200.

Design

An ex post facto design was utilized in this study. Kerlinger (1970) defines ex post facto research more formally as that in which the independent variable or variables have already occurred and in which the researcher starts with the observation of a dependent variable or variables. There are two kinds of ex post facto designs: co-relational study and criterion-group design. A co-relational study attempts to determine the relationship between two or more sets of data and a criterion-group design determines the difference between a set of data of a certain state with its opposite state (Tuckman, 1972). By identifying two groups of high schools from the 2012-13 school year, this study used the criterion-group design. The following table illustrates the model used for this study.

Table 1

Criterion-Group Design Model for the Study

Groups	2012-13	2013-14	2015-16	2016-17
H1	AB1	AB2	AA3	AA4
H2	AB5	AB6	AA7	AA8

Where

H = Highest 35 and lowest 35
AB = ADA Before Senate Bill 200
AA = ADA After Senate Bill 200

Analysis

The data organized within one spread sheet using Microsoft Excel consisted of the high school's name and their average ADA for the 2012-13, 2013-14, 2015-16, and 2016-17 school years. Copies of the spreadsheet were stored on Microsoft Outlook drive and Dropbox to insure the existence of a backup if something were to happen to the working copy.

Descriptive statistics were calculated for each of the brackets and years. Statistics included were the means, standard deviations, maximums and minimums.

To examine Ho1, an independent sample *t*-test was used to test for a significant difference between the schools in the highest ADA bracket and lowest ADA bracket from the 2012-2013 school year.

To examine Ho2, Ho3, Ho4, and Ho5, a dependent paired *t*-test were used to test for significant differences between the ADA of the high schools comprised in the highest ADA bracket selected from the 2012-13 school year with the 2015-16 and 2016-17 school years. Likewise, a dependent paired *t*-test were used to test for significant differences between the ADA of the high schools comprised in the highest ADA bracket in the 2013-14 school year with the 2015-16 and 2016-17 school years.

To examine Ho6, Ho7, Ho8, and Ho9, a dependent paired *t*-test were used to test for significant differences between the ADA of the high schools comprised in the lowest ADA bracket from the 2012-13 school year with the 2015-16 and 2016-17 school years. Likewise, a dependent paired *t*-test were used to test for significant

differences between the ADA of the high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in the 2013-14 school year with the 2015-16 and 2016-17 school years.

To examine Ho10, an independent sample *t*-test was used to test for a significant difference between the schools in the highest ADA bracket and lowest ADA bracket from the 2016-2017 school year.

A *t*-test is a statistical analysis of the means of two groups to determine if the difference is significant enough to be a result of change that has occurred between the two groups. This means that the difference between two means is not by chance and a statistical difference exist. Educational researchers typically use a significance level of .05 when testing null hypotheses. In this study, a Bonferroni adjustment was applied to the *t*-test used to decrease the likelihood that an incorrect rejection of a null hypothesis. Since there were ten hypotheses used in this study, the significance level was computed by using .05 and dividing it by ten to get a significance level of .005.

Chapter 4

Findings

Introduction

The purpose of this exploratory study was to determine the impact Senate Bill 200 has had on Kentucky high schools' ADA since its implementation. This study examined the ADA of Kentucky high schools the two years prior to the implementation of SB 200 to the two years after implementation. Chapter 4 presents and discusses the findings of the study and the results of the data analysis. It will focus on the on the research questions in regard to the data collection and the summary of the statistical analysis.

Data Collection

The population included all Kentucky traditional high schools comprised of grades nine through twelve. Any high school that had additional grades were eliminated from the population. These high schools were made up of grades kindergarten through twelve, grades seven through twelve, and grades eight through twelve. One high school was eliminated from the population because it was established in the 2014-15 school year.

Population Summary Statistics

The means, standard deviations, minimums, and maximums for the population are displayed in Table 2. These descriptive statistics describe the ADA for traditional Kentucky high schools in 2012-13, 2013-14, 2015-16, and 2016-17. The average ADA statewide increased from 2012-13 to 2013-14 school year and decreased in the

2015-16 and 2016-17 school years following the implementation of SB 200. Examining the minimum ADA, there was a decrease of 2.3% to 2.6% in the years following the implementation of SB 200.

Table 2

Population Average Daily Attendance

	N	M	SD	Minimum	Maximum
2012-13	188	93.35%	1.71	88.10%	96.90%
2013-14	189	93.51%	1.68	88.20%	96.90%
2015-16	189	93.15%	1.86	85.90%	96.80%
2016-17	189	93.00%	1.87	85.60%	97.10%

Table 3

Population ADA Before and After Implementation of SB 200

	N	M	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Before					
2012-14	188	93.43%	1.70	88.10%	96.90%
After					
2015-17	188	93.06%	1.87	85.60%	97.10%

Table 3 contains the population means, standard deviation, minimum, and maximum for the school years of 2012-13 and 2013-14 compared to the school years 2015-16, 2016-17. The mean for the school years of 2012-13 and 2013-14 was 93.43% (SD = 1.70) with a maximum ADA of 96.90% and a minimum ADA of 88.10% compared to the mean for the school years of 2015-16 and 2016-17 which

was 93.06% (SD = 1.87) with a maximum ADA of 97.10% and a minimum ADA of 85.60%.

The purpose of displaying the population ADA before and after the implementation of SB 200 was to describe how SB 200 affected the ADA for the population of the 188 traditional Kentucky high schools in the 2012-13 school year. Reporting both before and after, the difference, though minimal, can be determined by the mean, standard deviation, minimum, and maximum.

Sample Summary Statistics

Seventy traditional high schools identified from the population from the 2012-13 school year to be used in this study. Each would fall within either the highest 35 and lowest 35 regarding ADA and were used to determine the effects SB 200 had on each sample. A description of the high schools that make up the highest 35 and lowest 35 samples are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

2012-13 Descriptive of the High Schools with the Highest ADA and Lowest ADA

	Highest ADA	Lowest ADA	Population
Independent High Schools	9	2	25
County High Schools	26	33	163
Assessment Performance			
Distinguished	24	1	59
Proficient	9	10	66
Needs Improvement	2	24	63

Of the 25-independent traditional high schools operating in Kentucky in 2012-13, nine were among the 35 highest ADA traditional high school sample and two were in the lowest ADA traditional high school sample. Twenty-six out of the 173 county traditional high schools fell within the highest ADA traditional high school sample and 33 fell within the lowest ADA traditional high school sample.

An examination of the assessment performance per the Kentucky Performance Rating for Educational Progress (K-PREP) shows that the highest ADA performing high schools performed higher on the K-PREP assessment as compared to the lowest ADA performing high schools. High schools that fell within the highest ADA bracket had 24 high schools score a rating of distinguished, nine score a rating of proficient and two score a rating of needs improvement. High schools that fell within the lowest ADA bracket had one high school score a rating of distinguished, 10 score a rating of proficient and 24 score a rating of needs improvement.

This observation from Table 4 is noteworthy because of the comparison of ADA to the assessment performance ratings per K-PREP. The high schools in the highest ADA bracket had a 24 to 1 ratio in schools performing at a distinguished level in comparison to the high schools in the lowest ADA bracket. The high schools in the highest ADA bracket had a 9 to 10 ratio in schools performing at a proficient level in comparison to the high schools in the lowest ADA bracket. The high schools in the highest ADA bracket had a 1 to 12 ratio in schools performing at a needs improvement level in comparison to the high schools in the lowest ADA bracket. This

observation supports the idea that high schools with higher ADA perform at a higher academic level per K-PREP as compared to high schools with lower ADA.

Before the Implementation of Senate Bill 200

Table 5 provides summary statistics of the ADA for the high schools within the highest ADA bracket and the lowest ADA bracket for the 2012-13 school year. The mean for the highest ADA bracket was 95.42% and for the lowest ADA bracket was 90.51%. Per the standard deviation of each sample, the lowest ADA bracket had a greater variation (SD = 1.17) in ADA in comparison to the highest ADA bracket (SD = 0.52).

Table 5 also provides summary statistics of the ADA for the high schools within the highest ADA bracket and the lowest ADA bracket for the 2013-14 school year. The mean for the highest ADA bracket was 95.54% and for the lowest ADA bracket was 90.82%. Per the standard deviation of each sample, the lowest ADA bracket had a greater variation (SD = 1.32) in ADA in comparison to the highest ADA bracket (SD = 0.46).

Table 5

2012-13 and 2013-14 Kentucky High School ADA for the Sample

	N	M	SD	Minimum	Maximum
2012-13					
Highest ADA Bracket	35	95.42%	0.52	94.90%	96.90%
Lowest ADA Bracket	35	90.51%	1.17	88.10%	92.00%
2013-14					
Highest ADA Bracket	35	95.54%	0.46	95.00%	96.90%
Lowest ADA Bracket	35	90.82%	1.32	88.20%	93.30%

After the Implementation of Senate Bill 200

The ADA for the sample comprised from the 2015-16 and 2016-17 school years were calculated to summarize the mean and standard deviation of each (Table 6).

The mean for the highest ADA bracket was 95.09% and for the lowest ADA bracket was 90.40% for the 2015-16 school year. Per the standard deviation of each sample, the lowest ADA bracket had a greater variation (SD = 1.93) in ADA in comparison to the highest ADA bracket (SD = 0.90). Additionally, the mean for the highest ADA bracket was 94.94% and for the lowest ADA bracket was 90.32% for the 2016-17 school year. Consistent with all the other school year samples, the standard deviation of the lower ADA bracket had greater variation (SD = 2.02) in ADA in comparison to the highest ADA bracket (SD = 0.92).

Table 6

2015-16 and 2016-17 Kentucky High School ADA for the Sample

	N	M	SD	Minimum	Maximum
2015-16					
Highest ADA Bracket	35	95.09%	0.90	91.90%	96.80%
Lowest ADA Bracket	35	90.40%	1.93	85.90%	93.00%
2016-17					
Highest ADA Bracket	35	94.94%	0.92	92.20%	97.10%
Lowest ADA Bracket	35	90.32%	2.02	85.60%	93.00%

The summary statistics presented in Table 6 shows that, though minimal, the ADA in the highest ADA bracket decreases from the 95.09% in the 2015-16 school year to 94.94% in the 2016-17 school year. The ADA in the lowest ADA bracket also minimally decreases from 90.40% in the 2015-16 school year to 90.32% in the 2016-17 school year. In the following section, the significance of these downward trends will be discussed.

Analysis of the Research Hypotheses

Data were analyzed by using an independent *t*-test to determine significance in the change in ADA in both the highest ADA bracket and the lowest ADA bracket. For this study, a Bonferroni adjustment was applied to the *t*-test used to decrease the likelihood that an incorrect rejection of a null hypothesis. The analysis helped determine the effect SB 200 on the ADA for the Kentucky high schools selected from a sample in 2012-13.

The analysis was conducted to address the following research questions:

1. In 2012-13, how did the ADA of the highest high schools compare to the lowest high schools?
2. How has ADA of high schools been affected by the implementation of Senate Bill 200?
3. How has ADA for the highest high schools been affected by the implementation of Senate Bill 200?
4. How has ADA for the lowest high schools been affected by the implementation of Senate Bill 200?
5. Two years after the implementation of Senate Bill 200 (2016-17), how has the ADA of the highest high schools compared to the lowest high schools?
6. What impact has Senate Bill 200 had on the gap between the ADA of the highest high schools and the lowest high schools?

These questions developed 10 null hypotheses. To ensure that the likelihood of an incorrect rejection of the null hypothesis, a Bonferroni adjustment was calculated. Since there were 10 hypotheses used in this study, the significance level was computed by using .05 and dividing it by 10 to get a significance level of .005. In the following discussion, each hypothesis is presented with a narrative discussing the results of the corresponding *t*-test.

Ho1: There is no significant difference between the ADA of the high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2012-13 when compared to the high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2012-13.

Table 7

t-test for 2012-13 ADA Between the Highest ADA Bracket and Lowest ADA Bracket

Bracket	N	M	SD	SE of Mean	t	df	p
Highest	35	95.42%	0.52	.089	22.62	68	.000
Lowest	35	90.51%	1.17	.198			

An independent sample *t*-test was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference between the schools in the highest ADA bracket and lowest ADA bracket selected from the 2012-2013 school year. The results of the *t*-test indicated that the 35 districts selected for the highest ADA bracket (M = 95.42%, SD = .52) was significantly higher than the ADA of the 35 districts selected for the lowest ADA bracket (M = 90.51%, SD = 1.17). Thus, the rejection of Ho1 was warranted, $t(68) = 22.62$, $p < .005$. The result of the computation is found in Table 7.

Ho2: There is no significant difference in ADA for high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2012-13 when compared to the high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2015-16.

Table 8

Paired t-test of the Highest ADA Bracket between the 2012-13 and 2015-16 School years

Year	N	M	SD	SE of Mean	t	df	p
2012-13	35	95.42%	0.52	.089	2.615	34	.013
2015-16	35	95.09%	0.89	.152			

An analysis of the mean ADA for the highest ADA bracket for school years 2012-13 and 2015-16 was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference in the ADA with the implementation of SB 200. The results of the *t*-test indicated that the ADA in school year 2012-13 for highest ADA bracket was slightly higher (M = 95.42%, SD = 0.52) than in 2015-16 (M = 95.09%, SD = 0.89) when SB 200 had been implemented. Since the finding was not significant, the rejection of Ho2 was not warrant, $t(34) = 2.615$, $p < .005$. The result of the computation is found in Table 8.

Ho3: There is no significant difference in ADA for high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2013-14 when compared to the high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2015-16.

Table 9

Paired t-test of the Highest ADA Bracket between the 2013-14 and 2015-16 School years

Year	N	M	SD	SE of Mean	t	df	p
2013-14	35	95.54%	0.46	.113	5.151	34	.000
2015-16	35	95.09%	0.89	.152			

An analysis of the mean ADA for the highest ADA bracket for school years 2013-14 and 2015-16 was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference in the ADA with the implementation of SB 200. The results of the *t*-test indicated that the ADA in school year 2013-14 for highest ADA bracket was significantly higher (M = 95.54%, SD = 0.46) than in 2015-16 (M = 95.09%, SD = 0.89) when SB 200

had been implemented. The rejection of Ho3 was warranted, $t(34) = 5.151$, $p < .005$. The result of the computation is found in Table 9.

Ho4: There is no significant difference in ADA for high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2012-13 when compared to the high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2016-17.

Table 10

Paired t-test of the Highest ADA Bracket between the 2012-13 and 2016-17 School years

Year	N	M	SD	SE of Mean	t	df	p
2012-13	35	95.42%	0.52	.089	2.615	34	.000
2016-17	35	94.94%	0.92	.155			

An analysis of the mean ADA for the highest ADA bracket for school years 2012-13 and 2016-17 was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference in the ADA with the implementation of SB 200. The results of the *t*-test indicated that the ADA in school year 2012-13 for highest ADA bracket was significantly higher ($M = 95.42\%$, $SD = 0.52$) than in 2015-16 ($M = 94.94\%$, $SD = 0.92$) when SB 200 had been implemented. The rejection of Ho4 was warranted, $t(34) = 2.615$, $p < .005$. The result of the computation is found in Table 10.

Ho5: There is no significant difference in ADA for high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2013-14 when compared to the high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2016-17.

Table 11

Paired t-test of the Highest ADA Bracket between the 2013-14 and 2016-17 School years

Year	N	M	SD	SE of Mean	t	df	p
2013-14	35	95.42%	0.67	.113	5.782	34	.000
2016-17	35	94.94%	0.92	.152			

An analysis of the mean ADA for the highest ADA bracket for school years 2013-14 and 2016-17 was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference in the ADA with the implementation of SB 200. The results of the *t*-test indicated that the ADA in school year 2013-14 for highest ADA bracket was significantly higher (M = 95.42%, SD = 0.67) than in 2016-17 (M = 94.94%, SD = 0.92) when SB 200 had been implemented. The rejection of Ho5 was warranted, $t(34) = 5.782$, $p < .005$. The result of the computation is found in Table 11.

Ho6: There is no significant difference in ADA for high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2012-13 when compared to the high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2015-16.

Table 12

Paired t-test of the Lowest ADA Bracket between the 2012-13 and 2015-16 School years

Year	N	M	SD	SE of Mean	t	df	p
2012-13	35	90.51%	1.17	.198	0.413	34	.682
2015-16	35	90.40%	1.93	.326			

An analysis of the mean ADA for the lowest ADA bracket for school years 2012-13 and 2015-16 was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference in the ADA with the implementation of SB 200. The results of the *t*-test indicated that the ADA in school year 2012-13 for lowest ADA bracket was not significantly higher (M = 90.51%, SD = 1.17) than in 2015-16 (M = 90.40%, SD = 1.93) when SB 200 had been implemented. The rejection of Ho6 was not warranted, $t(34) = 0.413$, $p < .005$. The result of the computation is found in Table 12.

Ho7: There is no significant difference in ADA for high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2013-14 when compared to the high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2015-16.

Table 13

Paired t-test of the Lowest ADA Bracket between the 2013-14 and 2015-16 School years

Year	N	M	SD	SE of Mean	t	df	p
2013-14	35	90.82%	1.32	.223	2.017	34	.052
2015-16	35	90.40%	1.93	.326			

An analysis of the mean ADA for the lowest ADA bracket for school years 2012-13 and 2015-16 was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference in the ADA with the implementation of SB 200. The results of the *t*-test indicated that the ADA in school year 2013-14 for lowest ADA bracket was not significantly higher (M = 90.82%, SD = 1.32) than in 2015-16 (M = 90.40%, SD = 1.93) when SB 200 had been implemented. The rejection of Ho7 was not warranted, $t(34) = 2.017$, $p < .005$. The result of the computation is found in Table 13.

Ho8: There is no significant difference in ADA for high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2012-13 when compared to the high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2016-17.

Table 14

Paired t-test of the Lowest ADA Bracket between the 2012-13 and 2016-17 School years

Year	N	M	SD	SE of Mean	t	df	p
2012-13	35	90.51%	1.17	.198	0.684	34	.499
2016-17	35	90.32%	2.01	.341			

An analysis of the mean ADA for the lowest ADA bracket for school years 2012-13 and 2016-17 was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference in the ADA with the implementation of SB 200. The results of the *t*-test indicated that the ADA in school year 2012-13 for lowest ADA bracket was not significantly higher (M = 90.51%, SD = 1.17) than in 2016-17 (M = 90.32%, SD = 2.01) when SB 200

had been implemented. The rejection of Ho8 was not warranted, $t(34) = 0.684$, $p < .005$. The result of the computation is found in Table 14.

Ho9: There is no significant difference in ADA for high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2013-14 when compared to the high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2016-17.

Table 15

Paired t-test of the Lowest ADA Bracket between the 2013-14 and 2016-17 School years

Year	N	M	SD	SE of Mean	t	df	p
2013-14	35	90.82%	1.32	.223	2.276	34	.029
2016-17	35	90.32%	2.01	.341			

An analysis of the mean ADA for the lowest ADA bracket for school years 2013-14 and 2016-17 was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference in the ADA with the implementation of SB 200. The results of the *t*-test indicated that the ADA in school year 2013-14 for lowest ADA bracket was not significantly higher ($M = 90.82\%$, $SD = 1.32$) than in 2016-17 ($M = 90.32\%$, $SD = 2.01$) when SB 200 had been implemented. The rejection of Ho9 was not warranted, $t(34) = 2.276$, $p < .005$. The result of the computation is found in Table 15.

Ho10: There is no significant difference between the ADA of the high schools in the highest ADA bracket in 2016-17 when compared to the high schools in the lowest ADA bracket in 2016-17.

Table 16

t-test for 2016-17 ADA Between the Highest ADA Bracket and Lowest ADA Bracket

Bracket	N	M	SD	SE of Mean	t	df	p
Highest	35	94.94%	0.92	.155	12.32	68	.000
Lowest	35	90.32%	2.02	.341			

An independent sample *t*-test was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference between the schools in the highest ADA bracket and lowest ADA bracket selected from the 2016-2017 school year. The results of the *t*-test indicated that the 35 districts selected for the highest ADA bracket (M = 94.94%, SD = .92) was significantly higher than the ADA of the 35 districts selected for the lowest ADA bracket (M = 90.32%, SD = 2.02). Thus, the rejection of Ho10 was warranted, $t(68) = 12.32$, $p < .005$. The result of the computation is found in Table 16.

Summary of Statistical Analysis

The ADA for the 35 highest performing high schools and the 35 lowest performing high schools from the 2012-13 school year was obtained from the Kentucky Department of Education to examine the affect SB 200 had on ADA. A significant difference existed between the highest ADA bracket and the lowest ADA bracket selected from the 2012-13 school year. This finding suggests that there were issues causing attendance to fluctuate throughout the population of Kentucky high schools.

Descriptive statistics were calculated for the ADA that included the mean, standard deviation, maximum, and minimum. The ADA has dropped each year since the implementation of SB 200. The highest ADA bracket displayed the largest statistical change whereas the lowest ADA bracket displayed statistical change but minimal.

Null hypotheses 1, 3, 4, 5, and 10 were rejected and hypotheses 2, 6, 7, 8 and 9 were not rejected. Ho1 examined 2012-13 data between the highest and lowest ADA brackets before SB 200 was implemented. Ho2, Ho3, Ho4, and Ho5 examined the data between the highest ADA bracket the two years prior to the implementation of SB 200 and the two years after the implementation of SB 200. Ho6, Ho7, Ho8, Ho9 examined the data between the lowest ADA bracket the two years prior to the implementation of SB 200 and the two years after the implementation SB 200. Ho10 examined the data between the highest and lowest ADA brackets after SB 200 was implemented.

From the examination of the results, three factors were consistent. First, attendance has not improved since the implementation of SB 200. The high schools average ADA has decreased .37% when comparing the average ADA for population the two years before and after the implementation of SB 200. The average ADA for the highest ADA bracket decreased by .60% and the average ADA for the lowest ADA bracket has decreased by .50% since the implementation of SB 200.

Second, high schools in the highest ADA bracket has significantly decreased average ADA since the implementation of SB 200 by .48%. High schools in the

lowest ADA bracket has not significantly decreased ADA since the implementation though descriptive statistics show a decrease has occurred by .50%.

Finally, SB 200 has not significantly decreased the gap between the high schools in the highest ADA bracket and the lowest ADA bracket. In the 2012-13 school year there existed a 4.91% difference in average ADA between the highest ADA bracket and the lowest ADA bracket. There still exists a significant difference of 4.62% between the high schools with the highest ADA as compared to the high schools with the lowest ADA.

Chapter 5

Conclusions

Introduction

The purpose of this exploratory study was to determine the impact Senate Bill 200 has had on Kentucky high schools' ADA since its implementation. This study examined the ADA of Kentucky high schools the two years prior to the implementation of SB 200 to the two years after implementation. The question addressed by the study was:

` How has the implementation of Senate Bill 200 impacted Kentucky high schools' ADA?

The following research questions relate to the guiding question.

1. In 2012-13, how did the ADA of the highest high schools compare to the lowest high schools?
2. How has ADA of high schools been affected by the implementation of Senate Bill 200?
3. How has ADA for the highest high schools been affected by the implementation of Senate Bill 200?
4. How has ADA for the lowest high schools been affected by the implementation of Senate Bill 200?
5. Two years after the implementation of Senate Bill 200 (2016-17), how has the ADA of the highest high schools compared to the lowest high schools?

6. What impact has Senate Bill 200 had on the gap between the ADA of the highest high schools and the lowest high schools?

The ADA of high school was determined by the Superintendent's Annual Attendance Report (SAAR) submitted for the 2012-13, 2013-14, 2015-16, and 2016-17. The 2015 school year was not used because SB 200 was phased in and not fully implemented.

This chapter discusses the findings of the study. First, a summary of the descriptive statistics. Second, a summary of the findings in relation to the research questions and hypothesis. Finally, a summary of the implications, limitations, and further research.

Descriptive Statistics

The ADA for all Kentucky high schools in the 2012-13, 2013-14, 2015-16 and the 2016-17 (Table 2) was 93.35%, 93.51%, 93.15%, and 93.00% respectively. School years 2012-13 and 2013-14 represented the population before SB 200 was implemented and school years 2015-16 and 2016-17 represented the population after the SB 200 was implemented. The average ADA of the combined school years of 2012-13 and 2013-14 was 93.43% and the average ADA of school years 2015-16 and 2016-17 was 93.06% (Table 3).

The 35 highest ADA traditional high schools and the 35 lowest ADA traditional high schools were selected from the 2012-13 school year. Nine independent high schools and 26 county high schools made up the highest ADA bracket (Table 4). Two independent high schools and 33 county high schools made up

the lowest ADA bracket. Of the 35 high schools in the highest ADA bracket, 24 scored distinguished, nine scored proficient, and two scored needs improvement rating per the KPREP assessment (Table 4). Of the 35 high schools in the lowest ADA bracket, one scored distinguished, 10 scored proficient, and 24 scored a need improvement rating per the KPREP assessment (Table 4).

A *t*-test was conducted between the 35 high schools with the highest ADA and the 35 high schools with the lowest ADA to determine if a significant statistical difference existed between the two groups. The finding (Table 7) indicated that there was a significant statistical difference between the two samples, $t(68) = 22.62$, $p < .005$.

The population statistics shows a decrease in attendance after the implementation of SB 200 and is supported when the ADA of the 2012-13 and 2013-14 school years is compared to the ADA of the 2015-16 and 2016-17 school years. By analyzing the assessment scores per KPREP, the claim that student attendance is directly related to student success is reinforced. The *t*-test between the high schools with the highest ADA and the high schools with the lowest ADA showed that there is a significant difference in performance. This data supports that SB 200 has had a negative effect on ADA that since its implementation in the 2015-16 school year and could lead to a drop in academic performance.

Research Question

The question addressed by the study was:

How has the implementation of Senate Bill 200 impacted Kentucky high schools' ADA?

Finding 1: *Kentucky high schools has seen a decrease in ADA since the implementation of SB 200.* Table 2 presents descriptive statistics for the population of the traditional high schools selected for this study. The ADA for Kentucky high schools in 2012-13 was 93.35% (SD = 1.71) with a minimum ADA of 88.10% and a maximum ADA of 96.90% and in 2013-14 the ADA was 93.51% (SD = 1.68) with a minimum ADA of 88.20% representing the two years before the implementation of SB 200. The ADA for Kentucky high schools in 2015-16 was 93.15% (SD = 1.86) with a minimum of 85.90% and a maximum of 96.80% and in 2016-17 the ADA was 93.00% (SD = 1.87) with a minimum of 85.60% and a maximum of 97.10%.

Table 3 averages the school years between 2012 and 2014 ADA before SB 200 was implemented and averages the school years between 2015 and 2017 ADA after SB 200 was implemented. The ADA for the school years of 2012-14 was 93.43% (SD = 1.70) with a minimum of 88.10% and a maximum of 96.90% as compared to the school years of 2015-17 was 93.06% (SD = 1.87) with a minimum of 85.60% and a maximum of 97.10%. These statistics supports the finding that Kentucky high schools have seen a decrease in ADA since the implementation of SB 200.

Finding 2: *Kentucky high schools with the highest ADA has significantly decreased since the implementation of SB 200.* Table 5 presents the ADA of the Kentucky high

schools with the highest ADA for the 2012-13 and 2013-14 school years for the sample used in this study before the implementation of SB 200. The ADA for the highest ADA bracket in the 2012-13 school year was 95.42% (SD = .52) with a minimum of 94.90% and a maximum of 96.90% and in the 2013-14 school year the ADA was 95.54% (SD = .46) with a minimum of 95.00% and a maximum of 96.90%.

Table 6 presents the ADA of the Kentucky high schools with the highest ADA for the 2015-16 and 2016-17 school years for the same in this study after the implementation of SB 200. The ADA for the highest ADA bracket in the 2015-16 school year was 95.09% (SD = .90) with a minimum of 91.90% and a maximum of 96.80% and in the 2016-17 school year the ADA was 94.94% (SD = .92) with a minimum of 92.20% and a maximum of 97.10%.

Paired *t*-test were used to test the significance between each school year. Results of the paired *t*-test supported that a significant difference existed between the two years before the implementation of SB 200 and the two years after the implementation of SB 200. These statistics and paired *t*-test results supports the finding that Kentucky high schools with the highest ADA has significantly decreased since the implementation of SB 200.

Finding 3: *Kentucky high schools with the lowest ADA has decreased since the implementation of SB 200.* Table 5 presents the ADA of the Kentucky high schools with the lowest ADA for the 2012-13 and 2013-14 school years for the sample used in this study before the implementation of SB 200. The ADA for the lowest ADA bracket in the 2012-13 school year was 90.51% (SD = 1.17) with a minimum of

88.10% and a maximum of 92.00% and in the 2013-14 school year the ADA was 90.82% (SD = 1.32) with a minimum of 88.20% and a maximum of 93.30%.

Table 6 presents the ADA of the Kentucky high schools with the lowest ADA for the 2015-16 and 2016-17 school years for the same in this study after the implementation of SB 200. The ADA for the lowest ADA bracket in the 2015-16 school year was 90.40% (SD = 1.93) with a minimum of 85.90% and a maximum of 93.00% and in the 2016-17 school year the ADA was 90.32% (SD =2.02) with a minimum of 85.60% and a maximum of 93.00%.

Paired *t*-test were used to test the significance between each school year. Results of the paired *t*-test supported that significant difference did not exist between the two years before the implementation of SB 200 and the two years after the implementation of SB 200. These statistics and paired *t*-test results supports the finding that Kentucky high schools with the lowest ADA has decreased since the implementation of SB 200.

Finding 4: *The gap between Kentucky high schools with the highest ADA and lowest ADA is still significant after the implementation of SB 200.* Two paired independent *t*-test were conducted to determine the difference between the high schools in the highest ADA bracket and the high schools in the lowest ADA bracket before and after the implementation of SB 200. Table 7 presents the results of the independent paired *t*-test between the highest ADA bracket and lowest ADA bracket in the 2012-13 school year. Results of the *t*-test supports a significant difference exist between the highest ADA bracket and the lowest ADA bracket before the implementation of SB

200. Table 16 presents the results of the independent paired *t*-test between the highest ADA bracket and lowest ADA bracket in the 2016-17 school year.

Results of the *t*-test supports a significant difference exist between the highest ADA bracket and the lowest ADA bracket after the implementation of SB 200. The two-independent *t*-test supports the finding that the gap between the high schools with the highest ADA and lowest ADA is still significant after the implementation of SB 200.

Limitations, Delimitations, and Assumptions

Limitations. This study had several limitations resulting in a restriction of the generalizability of the findings and may have an influence upon the analysis and results.

First, the population of this study was limited to Kentucky traditional high schools comprised of grades nine through twelve. The sample was chosen from the ADA data submitted in the Superintendent Annual Attendance Report (SAAR) to the Kentucky Department of Education in the 2012-13 school year. Any discrepancies in that data could skew results since the same schools were used for each the following three school years in the study.

Second, demographics for the population were not considered for this study. The study simply looked at the ADA for each high school selected but did consider the number of students enrolled, gender count, race, location, socioeconomic status, or students qualified by Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). All of these factors could have an impact on ADA. This study did not attempt to analyze

these different groups in determining the effect that SB 200 had on student attendance.

Third, SB 200 addresses juveniles ages 12 through 17 that fall within grades six through twelve and this study only accounted for students in a traditional high school comprised of grades nine through twelve. Student who are 18 years of age are exempt from SB 200 because they are considered an adult. Those students were not removed from the population and sample data. This limitation could cause the results to be skewed and cause the conclusion to be a fallacy or a hasty generalization.

Fourth, this study was limited to by the statistical analysis used and the level of significance (.005) obtained through an adjustment using the Bonferroni.

Fifth, this study was limited to traditional high schools in the state of Kentucky during the early years of SB 200.

Delimitations. This study had several delimitations resulting in a restriction of the generalizability of the findings and may have an influence upon the analysis and results.

First, the selection of only Kentucky traditional high schools was used to determine how SB 200 impacted ADA. SB 200 addresses juveniles age 12 through 17 and by not including all Kentucky schools that serves student that fall within that age rage is a delimitation to this research study.

Second, the only thing considered was SB 200 in terms of impacting student attendance. There may exist other reasons that caused a change in average ADA after the implementation of SB 200.

Third, SB 200 has only been implemented for two school years. It is possible that once SB 200 has established all the processes mandated that there could be a different result yielded as compared to the conclusions found in this study.

Assumptions. An assumption about the study that can be made is that the Kentucky General Assembly value student attendance. The passing SB 200 into law had intentions on improving the process in addressing status offenses such as habitual truancy. Another assumption about the study is that all school districts complied with their respective judiciary systems to ensure that SB 200 was fully implemented and utilized appropriately.

Recommendations

The purpose of this exploratory study was to examine the impact SB 200 has had on Kentucky high schools' ADA. This study examined the ADA of Kentucky high schools the two years prior to the implementation of SB 200 to the two years after implementation. Since this study only considers the two before and after the implementation of SB 200, this study provided statistics and information on how the early years of the implementation has affected ADA in traditional Kentucky High schools.

The results support that SB 200 has affected ADA in Kentucky high schools by significantly decreasing high schools' ADA in the highest ADA bracket and by not significantly decreasing high schools' ADA in the lowest ADA bracket. This is important because descriptive statistics (Table 4) suggest that a relationship may exist

between standardized test score (K-PREP) and the high schools ADA. For students to be successful they must attend school regularly.

With any study, there is need for additional research relating to similar areas and the limitations presented. Information is needed to further support the effect SB 200 has had on ADA. With SB 200 only being implemented for two years, additional analysis moving forward will determine the validity of this study. An analysis of the impact SB 200 has had on student achievement would also reinforce this study if the same impact is present. This would help build a case that SB 200 has had no positive effects on improving Kentucky's public education.

The literature review suggests that one of the major factors in student attendance is teacher attendance (Roby, 2013). Further research is needed to determine how Kentucky teacher attendance relates to student attendance.

The literature review also suggests that socioeconomic status can have a negative effect on student attendance (Reid, 1999). Looking at the attendance of different demographic groups of students may provide a more precise conclusion to what factors cause students to miss. Were the high schools that made up the highest ADA bracket comprised of a low student population who live in poverty compared to the high schools that made up the lowest ADA bracket? Knowing this information and how it effects the ADA of Kentucky high schools could lead to modifications to SB 200 or other processes being used to combat truancy.

Conclusion

The results of this study indicated that SB 200 has affected ADA in Kentucky high schools by significantly decreasing ADA in the highest ADA bracket and by not significantly decreasing ADA in the lowest ADA bracket since being implemented in the 2015-16 school year. There still exist a significant difference between the highest ADA bracket and lowest ADA bracket. If this trend continues to occur in the coming future school years, then the Kentucky General Assembly will need to modify the process because the issues that accompany truancy are detrimental to the success of students.

The process of providing positive interventions to improve student attendance is necessary but when those interventions do not produce improvement, there needs to be punitive measures applied to the parent and/or student. Unfortunately, it takes some harsh penalties to get parents and/or students to realize the importance of student attendance before an improvement can occur. If they are given chance after chance to improve without repercussions, then what reason is there to improve? A high percentage of student attendance will enhance the likelihood of high student achievement and will result in a high rate of student success.

References

Alexander, A., Joffrion, C. B., Liguori, B., Nelson, D., Olds, S. J., Riley, C., & Rupard, L. D. (2017). *School Attendance In Kentucky* (Vol. 449, Research Report, pp. 1-107) (Kentucky, Legislative Research Commission, Office of Education Accountability).

Benton, T. & Schagen, I. (2006). Don't judge schools purely on raw attendance data or examination results. *Education Journal, 96*, 30-31.

Garry, E. (1996). Truancy: First step to a lifetime of problems. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*, 2-7.

Gleich-Bope, D. (2014). Truancy laws: How are they affecting our legal systems, our schools, and the students involved. *The Clearing House, 87*, 110-114.

Gump, S. (2004). The truth behind truancy: student rationales for cutting class. *Educational Research Quarterly*, *28*(2), 50-58.

Hendricks, M.A., Sale, E. W., Evans, C.J., McKinley, L., & Carter, S. D. (2010). Evaluation of a truancy court intervention in four middle schools. *Psychology in the Schools, 47*(2), 173-183.

Henry, K. (2007). Who's skipping school: Characteristics of truants in 8th and 10th grade. *Journal of School Health, 77*(1), 29-35.

Indiana Department of Education Office of School Finance (2017). *Indiana K-12 State Tuition Support Annual Report*. pp.1-24.

Kentucky Revised Statue § 157.360.

Kentucky Revised Statue § 159.150.

Kentucky Revised Statue § 605.035.

Kerlinger, F.N. (1970). Foundations of behavioral research. *New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.*

Monahan, K., VanDerhei, S., Bechtold, J., & Cauffman, E. (2014). From the school yard to the squad car: School discipline, truancy, and arrest. *J Youth Adolescence, 43*, 1110-1122.

Paredes, R. & Ugarte, G. (2011). Should students be allowed to miss? *The Journal of Educational Research, 104*(3), 194-201.

Parke, C. & Kanyongo, G. (2012). Student attendance, mobility, and mathematics achievement in urban school district. *The Journal of Educational Research, 105*, 161-175.

Reid, K. (1999). *Truancy and schools*. New York: Routledge.

Reid, K. (2005). The causes, views and traits of school absenteeism and truancy. *Research in Education, 74*, 59-82

Reid, K. (2010). Finding strategic solutions to reduce truancy. *Research in Education, 84*, 1-19.

Rettig, M. & Crawford, J. (2000). Getting past the fear of going to school. *Education Digest, 65*(9), 54-59.

Roby, D. (2013). Teacher attendance effects on student achievement: Research study of Ohio schools. *Education, 134*(2), 201-206.

Schoeneberger, J. (2012). Longitudinal attendance patterns: Developing high school dropouts. *The Clearing House, 85*, 7-14.

Skinner, A. (2014). Reducing Truancy in Indiana: A balanced approach. *Brigham Young University Education & Law Journal, 1*, 151-186.

Skola, E. & Williamson, K (2012). The truancy intervention project: Our tips for success. *Family Court Review, 50*(3), 405-412.

Tuckman, B. W. (1972). *Conducting educational research*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

U.S. Department of Justice. (1996). *Manual to combat truancy*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Woolfolk, A.E. (1995). *Educational psychology.* United States: Allyn and Bacon.

Wilson, V., Malcolm, H., Edward, S., & Davidson, J. (2008). 'Bunking off': The impact of truancy on pupils and teachers. *British Educational Research Journal, 34*(1), 1-17.

Zhang, D., Katsiyannis, A., Barrett, D., & Willson, V. (2007). Truancy offenders in juvenile justice system: Examinations of the first and second referrals. *Remedial and Special Education, 28*(4), 244-256.

Zhang, D., Willson, V., Katsiyannis, A., Barrett, D., Wu, J., & Ju, S., (2010). Truancy offenders in the juvenile justice systems: A multicohort study. *Behavioral Disorders, 35*(3), 229-242.

Zhang, M. (2003). Links between school absenteeism and child poverty. *Pastoral Care, 21*(1), 10-17.

Appendices

VITA

Ralph W. Hamilton

EDUCATION

May, 2009	Bachelor of Science Morehead State University Morehead, Kentucky
December, 2010	Master of Arts Morehead State University Morehead, Kentucky
Pending	Doctor of Education Morehead State University Morehead, Kentucky

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCES

July 2009 - June 2010	High School Mathematics Teacher Elliott County Board of Education Sandy Hook, Kentucky
July 2010 - June 2014	High School Mathematics Teacher Morgan County Board of Education West Liberty, Kentucky
July 2014 - Present	Director of Pupil Personnel Morgan County Board of Education West Liberty, Kentucky
September 2015 - June 2016	East Valley Elementary Interim Principal Morgan County Board of Education West Liberty, Kentucky
August 2017 - October 2017	Wrigley Elementary Interim Principal Morgan County Board of Education West Liberty, Kentucky