



University of Kentucky  
UKnowledge

---

Institute for the Study of Free Enterprise  
Working Papers

Institute for the Study of Free Enterprise

---

12-2020

## Facts and Trends Regarding Performance and Funding of K-12 in Kentucky

John Garen  
University of Kentucky, [john.garen@uky.edu](mailto:john.garen@uky.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://uknowledge.uky.edu/isfe\\_papers](https://uknowledge.uky.edu/isfe_papers)



Part of the [Education Economics Commons](#), and the [Elementary and Middle and Secondary Education Administration Commons](#)

[Right click to open a feedback form in a new tab to let us know how this document benefits you.](#)

---

### Repository Citation

Garen, John, "Facts and Trends Regarding Performance and Funding of K-12 in Kentucky" (2020). *Institute for the Study of Free Enterprise Working Papers*. 35.  
[https://uknowledge.uky.edu/isfe\\_papers/35](https://uknowledge.uky.edu/isfe_papers/35)

This Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Institute for the Study of Free Enterprise at UKnowledge. It has been accepted for inclusion in Institute for the Study of Free Enterprise Working Papers by an authorized administrator of UKnowledge. For more information, please contact [UKnowledge@lsv.uky.edu](mailto:UKnowledge@lsv.uky.edu).



INSTITUTE FOR THE  
STUDY OF  
FREE  
ENTERPRISE

# Facts and Trends Regarding Performance and Funding of K-12 in Kentucky

---

John Garen

***December 2020***

*Institute for the Study of Free Enterprise  
Working Paper 36*

University of Kentucky  
244 Gatton College of Business and Economics  
Lexington, KY 40506-0034  
<http://isfe.uky.edu/>

# **Facts and Trends Regarding Performance and Funding of K-12 in Kentucky**

John Garen\*  
BB&T Professor of Economics  
University of Kentucky

December 2020

## **Abstract**

Kentucky's K-12 experienced an 80% increase in per pupil funds, after inflation, from 1990 to 2019. However, there have been only modest changes in its nationally-administered test scores, and no increases in the past decade. Moreover, per pupil funding seems to exceed that of all but the most exclusive private school tuition. Just over one-half of public funds goes directly to instruction and most funds to local schools come from Frankfort. Scoring on Kentucky's own student assessment tests, the K-PREP, are higher than that of the comparable nationally-administered tests. Also, K-PREP shows improvement, while the other tests do not. About 20% of Kentucky students fall into the lowest K-PREP score category. For African American students, it is double that percentage. Kentucky's K-12 system impedes teachers and other school personnel in devising suitable programs for the varied needs of children, and inhibits parental choice among possible alternatives. A system of robust school choice and competition enables the design of programs by teachers/schools and empowers parental choice among programs to suit their children's needs.

\*During 2018 and 2019, I was part of a group of citizen volunteers that informally discussed Kentucky's K-12 finances and performance with the chair of the Kentucky Board of Education's Finance Committee. This report stems from the discussions, ideas, and work of that group. I am deeply grateful to group members for all of their efforts and insights. However, I am responsible for the content of this report. Some of the material in the report was presented to the Kentucky Board of Education on December 4, 2019, as well as in other venues.

## **Executive Summary**

This paper presents a series of facts and trends regarding K-12 in Kentucky, then draws some inferences and conclusions.

### **Facts and Trends**

- Per-pupil funding (the total of state, local, and federal funds) rose by 80% between 1990 and 2019 after removing inflation. (Without removing inflation, it more than tripled.)
- Per pupil funding, after inflation, rose virtually every year over this time span except for the years following the Great Recession.
- National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) test scores rose by small amounts since the early- to mid-1990s through 2019. Grade 4 reading rose by 4%, grade 4 math by 11.1%, grade 8 reading by 0.3%, and grade 8 math by 8.1%.
- NAEP scores have not risen at all in the last decade.
- Compared to a sampling of private school tuition rates, per pupil funding for Kentucky public schools exceeds that of all but the most exclusive private schools.
- In 2019, just over half (53.27%) of total K-12 expenditure was classified as “instructional.” The remaining 46.73% was spent on a variety of non-instructional uses.
- In 2018-2019, only about one-third of K-12 funding is from local sources; 55.2% is from the state and 11.1% from the federal government.
- Kentucky’s student assessment test, the K-PREP, consistently shows higher scores than the comparable NAEP tests.
- K-PREP test outcomes show substantial improvement while those for NAEP and the ACT test indicate essentially no change.
- Roughly one-fifth of Kentucky students score in the lowest possible score category (“novice”) for 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade reading and math. About 30% of students score in the lowest possible category on the corresponding NAEP tests, except for grade 4 math.
- The percent of African American students who score in the lowest possible category is roughly double that of students as a whole.

### **Inferences and Conclusions**

- The high and increasing cost of K-12, coupled with its weak performance indicate the need for fundamental reform based on sound principles.
- Due to the heterogeneity of students and their needs, there is no single “best practice” that can be planned and implemented by a central authority.
- Devolving decision making regarding schools to those most knowledgeable about the school children and their circumstances enables the evolution of better-suited programs. Those with the most intimate knowledge are parents, teachers, and school personnel.
- This is attained by:
  - Schools having the authority to design programs to meet the needs of their students and communities, with accountability and incentives to do it well.
  - Parents having choice regarding where to send their children to school, where funding follows the student. This provides incentives to schools to offer effective programs.
- This is essentially the system of choice and competition that works well in the provision of many other goods and services.


## **I. Overarching Trends in Funding and Performance**

### **A. The Funding of Kentucky Public Schools, 1990-2019**

In the 1989-1990 school year, per pupil funds, inclusive of state, local, and federal, for K-12 was \$4,014. Adjusted for inflation and expressed in 2019 dollars, this is \$7,852. By 2018-2019, per pupil funding was \$14,115. Thus, taking out inflation, funding was 80% higher than in 1989-1990.

Figure 1 illustrates this. After inflation, per pupil increased virtually every year except during the time period near the Great Recession.

**Figure 1**  
Funding for Kentucky Schools, 1990-2019



Sources: See appendix Table A1.

### **B. Kentucky Students' Achievement Test Score Performance**


The achievement test scores used are the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) scores for 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade reading and math. This is often referred to as the "Nation's

Report Card.” Though the goal of education is to help attain success in life, acquiring the basic reading and math skills that these tests measure is critical preparation for this objective,

Since 2003, each of these tests has been administered in every odd year. Prior to that, they were given intermittently. Figure 2 summarizes the changes in the average score for Kentucky students from the inception of each test, as well as over the past decade.<sup>1</sup>

None of these test scores have improved in the 2009 to 2019 decade and three of the four declined. Moreover, long-term changes since the 1990s been relatively small, ranging from 0.26% to 11.1%.

**Figure 2**  
NAEP Score Changes




Source: See appendix Table A2.

<sup>1</sup> The grade 4 reading and math tests began in 1992. The grade 8 reading test began in 1998 and grade 8 math in 1990.

### C. Illustrating the Comparison of Funding Changes to Test Score Changes

One way to compare funding to test score changes is to plot each data series showing an index of its changes relative to a starting year. Figure 3 presents this. Both grade 4 reading and math start in 1992, 8<sup>th</sup> grade reading and math start in 1998 and 1990, respectively, and the starting point for per pupil funding is 1990. Each year's value is expressed relative to its beginning year. Thus, each data series begins at 1.00 and subsequent values indicate the percent increase since the data began. For example, a subsequent value of 1.20 indicates a 20% increase from the starting year.

**Figure 3**



Source: Data from appendix Tables A1 and A2.

The figure shows the time path of the index data series as well as their 2019 values. For funding (the light blue line), its 2019 value is 1.80, indicating an 80% increase per pupil (after removing inflation) since 1990. The NAEP test score index values are much smaller, ranging from 1.003 to 1.111. As illustrated by the figure, funding increases far outstrip any of the test score increases.

## **II. Other Aspects of K-12 Funding**

### **A. Recent Kentucky K-12 Funding Compared to Private School Tuition**

Table 1 shows per pupil funding for Kentucky schools as a whole, as well as for selected individual school districts. This is the total of state, local, and federal funding for districts during the 2018-2019 academic year. This is the latest year available from the Kentucky Department of Education's website.<sup>2</sup>

A sampling of districts with high levels of funding are shown, along with funding for the two largest school districts (Jefferson and Fayette Counties), some districts near the state average funding of \$14,398, and those at or near the bottom in funding. The highest funded district is Anchorage Independent with \$24,206 per pupil. Note that some rural districts are near the top in funding with over \$20,000 per pupil, i.e., Owsley County and Robertson County. Jefferson County, with nearly \$17,000 per pupil, has well above average funding, as does Fayette County with over \$16,000 per pupil. The least funded districts have over \$12,000 of per pupil funding, with Warren County being the lowest.

---

<sup>2</sup> This is the source of the some Table 1 data, as well as the other funding data: <https://education.ky.gov/districts/FinRept/Pages/Fund%20Balances,%20Revenues%20and%20Expenditures,%20Chart%20of%20Accounts,%20Indirect%20Cost%20Rates%20and%20Key%20Financial%20Indicators.aspx>. This also is a source for other data and is listed in appendix Table A1.



**Table 1**  
**Per Pupil Funding, Selected Jurisdictions, 2018-2019**

<b><u>Public Jurisdiction</u></b>	<b><u>Per Pupil Funds, 2018- 2019</u></b>
Kentucky	\$14,398
Anchorage Independent	\$24,206
Owsley County	\$21,161
Robertson County	\$20,086
Newport Independent	\$19,605
Jefferson County	\$16,858
Wolfe County	\$16,391
Fayette County	\$16,151
Letcher County	\$14,578
Clark County	\$14,388
McCreary County	\$14,311
Anderson County	\$12,895
Oldham County	\$12,645
Laurel County	\$12,527
Warren County	\$12,043

Note: Of Kentucky's total per pupil funding, \$1,603 is accounted for by student food and transportation expenses.

For comparison purposes, Table 2 presents selected private school tuition rates. This is the primary source of funds for private schools, so can be compared to the per pupil funding levels for public schools.<sup>3</sup> The table is broken into two parts: the upper part for elementary school rates and the lower part for high schools. This is a sampling of schools across the state and across the range of tuition costs. It is not a full sample but my judgment is that it is a good representation of private school tuition.

---

<sup>3</sup> Note that public K-12 funding is for the 2018-2019 academic year, while the private school tuition rates are for 2020-2021. A better comparison would be to the 2020-2021 public K-12 funding level. This would be higher than the figures reported but is not available.

**Table 2: Selected Private School Tuition Rates, 2020-2021**

<b><u>Selected Private Schools</u></b>	<b><u>Tuition, 2020-21</u></b>	<b><u>Comments</u></b>
<b><u>Primary</u></b>		
Christian Academy of Carrollton	\$3,250	primary and middle school rate
Christian Fellowship School (Benton)	\$3,725	
Cornerstone Christian Academy (London)	\$4,500	
St. Joseph Academy (Walton)	\$4,935	primary and middle school rate
Foundation Christian Academy (Bowling Green)	\$5,590	
Highlands Latin School (Louisville)	\$7,675	
Christ the King (Lexington)	\$9,795	non-Catholic rate, primary and middle school
Lexington Christian Academy	\$10,497	grade 4-5 rate
Northern Kentucky Montessori Academy	\$11,266	
The Lexington School	\$23,470	primary and middle school rate
<b><u>High School</u></b>		
Christian Academy of Carrollton	\$3,450	
Somerset Christian School	\$4,600	same rate for K-12
Lexington Latin School	\$5,745	middle and high school rate
Foundation Christian Academy (Bowling Green)	\$5,875	
Frankfort Christian Academy	\$6,960	same rate for K-12
Bethlehem High School (Bardstown)	\$8,250	
Newport Central Catholic High	\$8,340	non-Diocesan rate
Calvary Christian School (Covington)	\$8,900	
Trinity Christian (Lexington)	\$10,600	middle and high school rate
Lexington Catholic High School	\$12,412	non-Catholic rate
Lexington Christian Academy	\$12,870	
St. Xavier (Louisville)	\$14,966	
Sayre School (Lexington)	\$25,300	

Sources: See websites in appendix Table A3.

Tuition is typically much lower than the per pupil public school funding levels, and often markedly lower. The only exceptions are the tuition levels for the most exclusive private schools. High school is the most expensive level of schooling and most of the private high school rates are much lower than public per pupil funding for all levels of schools. Public schools funds do, however, include the cost of transportation and food programs for students, which was \$1,603 per pupil in 2018-2019.

### **B. Funding for Instructional Purposes in Kentucky Public Schools**


The Kentucky Department of Education categorizes school expenditures by “instruction” expenses and a host of other categories. The Kentucky Department of Education Uniform Chart of Accounts define expenditures for instruction as: “Activities for instruction that dealing[sic] directly with the interaction between teachers and students. Teaching may be provided for students in a classroom, in another location such as a home or hospital, and in other learning situations such as those involving cocurricular activities. It may also be provided through some other approved medium, such as television, radio, computer, the Internet, multimedia, telephone, and correspondence, that is delivered inside or outside the classroom or in other teacher-student settings. Included here are the activities of aides or classroom assistants of any type who assist in the instructional process.”<sup>4</sup>

Figure 4 depicts the percent of total K-12 expenditure spent on “instruction.” As seen, just over half, 53.27%, is utilized on instruction. Appendix Table A4 has more detail. The remaining 46.73% is spread among many categories, where the major ones are student support services, instructional staff support services, district administration, school administration, business support service, plant operations, pupil transportation, food services, and debt service.

---

<sup>4</sup>[https://education.ky.gov/districts/FinRept/Documents/KDE%20Chart%20of%20Account%20Segment%20Descriptions%20ADA%20\(FY1920\).pdf](https://education.ky.gov/districts/FinRept/Documents/KDE%20Chart%20of%20Account%20Segment%20Descriptions%20ADA%20(FY1920).pdf).

**Figure 4**




Source: See appendix Table A4.

**C. Sources of Funds: State, Local, and Federal**

Figure 5 shows the source of funds for Kentucky’s public schools for 2018-2019. Panel (a) is the percent from each source and panel (b) is the total funding amounts. As is seen, local districts provide about one-third of school funding, with the other two-thirds from the state and federal governments. State government is the dominant source of funds, accounting for 55.2%.

**Figure 5: State, Local, and Federal Funds, 2018-2019**



Source: See appendix Table A1 regarding 2018-2019 sources.

### **III. Aspects of Student Performance**

#### **A. Comparing K-PREP Scores, ACT Scores, and NAEP Scores**

Kentucky uses the K-PREP test to assess student progress among public school students. K-PREP has been administered every year from 2012 to 2019. This section tracks trends in the K-PREP during that time for 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade reading and math. It is compared to trends in NAEP scores for those same grades and subjects, as well as to ACT test score trends given to 11<sup>th</sup> graders. The ACT test scores are available for each of these years. The NAEP test is given in odd years, so we make comparisons to Kentucky's NAEP test scores for odd years from 2011 to 2019.<sup>5</sup>


Panel (a) of Figure 6 shows the comparison of K-PREP and NAEP for grade 8 reading. For K-PREP (shown in orange), the figure plots the percent of students scoring “proficient and distinguished.” For NAEP (in blue), the percent of students scoring “proficient and advanced” is plotted. K-PREP shows a much higher percent of proficient and distinguished than NAEP shows for proficient and advanced. Moreover, K-PREP displays substantial improvement until toward the end of the time period. NAEP scoring shows little change and even some decline. This same basic pattern is repeated for each of the other comparisons; grade 8 math (panel (b)) and grade 4 reading and math (panels (c) and (d)). Panel (e) of Figure 6 plots the statewide ACT average score. It shows a slight increase, followed by a decrease, over this period.

Overall, K-PREP scoring is considerably above than that of NAEP tests. Also, K-PREP test results show substantial increases over this time frame. However, NEAP test and ACT tests indicate very little change in student outcomes.


---

<sup>5</sup> Appendix Table A5 presents the underlying data.


**Figure 6: Grade 8 Reading, K-PREP Percent Proficient and Distinguished (orange),  
NAEP Percent Proficient and Advanced (blue)**  
Panel (a)




**Figure 6, Panel (b)**  
Grade 8 Math




**Figure 6, Panel (c)**  
Grade 4 Reading



**Figure 6, Panel (d)**  
Grade 4 Math




**Figure 6, Panel (e)**  
ACT Composite Score



## B .Poorly Performing Students

This section examines the percentages of students who score in the worst category on the K-PREP and NAEP reading and math tests in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grades. For K-PREP, the lowest scoring category is “Novice.” This is defined as: “A novice student has a minimal understanding of the Kentucky Academic Standards at grade level. . .”<sup>6</sup> NAEP’s lowest category is “Below Basic.” Basic is defined as: “”This level denotes partial mastery of prerequisite knowledge and skills . . . for . . . *NAEP Proficient* . . .”<sup>7</sup> Below Basic fails to attain this partial mastery. Naturally, high percentages in these categories are negative outcomes.

Figure 7 shows these percentages for the 2019 tests. For grade 4 reading, 19.2% of students are in the lowest K-PREP category and 33% score in the lowest NAEP category. This likely means that one-fifth to one-third of 4<sup>th</sup> graders cannot read.



Source: See appendix Table A6.

<sup>6</sup> Definitions and discussion of the scoring categories is at <https://www.kentuckyteacher.org/news/2019/10/lewis-addresses-myths-about-kentuckys-5-star-accountability-system/>.


<sup>7</sup> See <https://www.nagb.gov/news-and-events/news-releases/2018/release-20181119-naep-achievement-levels.html>.



For the other K-PREP tests, the percentages in the novice category are about the same, or a little below, as for grade 4 reading. Regarding NAEP tests, with the exception of grade 4 math, the percentages in the lowest category are much greater than for K-PREP.

**C. African Americans Students**

African American students fare even worse than average in these respects. Figure 8 shows the comparison of the percent of African Americans in the lowest category to all students for K-PREP. For grade 4 reading the percent of novice African American students is about double that for all students: 38.7% for African Americans compared to 19.2% for all students. The comparison for the other tests is very similar.



Source: See Appendix Table A7.

**IV. Inferences and Conclusions**

The cost of Kentucky’s public K-12 is high and has risen for decades. This increased cost has not been matched by improved student performance. Though there are surely some

good public schools and programs, the system as a whole has shown little progress for the past two to three decades and, of late, exhibits declining performance. The key question for any reform is how to develop a system that generates good outcomes at reasonable cost.

The present system is dominated by funding, initiatives, and rules from Frankfort and, to some extent, from Washington. Additionally, local school districts are often political bureaucracies that have their own sets of rules and mandates. The facts and trends documented above show that this system does not work. It is important to draw upon basic economic principles to understand why this is so and how to correct it.

To attain an effective system, parties with relevant knowledge need to have decision-making authority. Moreover, decision makers need to be held accountable for their decisions and incentivized to make good ones. In applying these principles to schools, it is critical to recognize the heterogeneity of students, families, communities, and personal circumstances that determine the appropriate educational approach. Though there are some basics of a good education and essentials of good pedagogy, there is no single “best practice” that works for all. Thus, the goal of a good system is to enable implementation of programs that work in their specific circumstances, not to mandate particular programs for all. Those with the best knowledge of the school children are parents, teachers, and local school personnel who deal with the children nearly every day and know them and their circumstances.

Enabling the use of this knowledge is accomplished by the following: (i) Individual schools (i.e., teachers and school personnel) determine the programs, curriculum, and educational approach to take, and (ii) parents choose among schools for their children’s education, with the funding following the student. Point (i) enables schools to tailor programs to various students’ and communities’ needs. Point (ii) empowers parents to use their knowledge

and love of their children to select among schools, and also serves as accountability and an incentive for schools to offer effective programs. Schools that fail to do so will not attract students and funding. Additionally, it is important to remove impediments to schools in opening to serve a clientele or community, and existing schools should not be artificially propped up if they cannot attract students. This helps ensure that parents have meaningful choices and that schools have to compete with one another.

This, to a large degree, is absent in the current system. Many local schools have little significant competition. Moreover, garnering more school funding typically entails lobbying Frankfort, or the local school board, rather than satisfying parents.

The forces of choice and competition noted above are powerful ones that have served us well in the provision of many critical goods and services including food, housing, clothing, fuel, automobiles, and numerous others. They also can serve us well in providing schooling. There are other items that can work to enhance choice and competition, such as increased transparency and educational-effectiveness research. However, they serve as complements to choice and competition, not substitutes for them.

There are a host of policy initiatives that move toward embracing choice and competition. They include voucher programs, educational savings accounts, charter schools, individual tax credits, and scholarship tax credits. Programs of this nature have been implemented elsewhere, have helped embrace choice and competition, and generally are shown to be effective.

**Appendix**

**Table A1: Data Underlying Per Pupil Funding**

Year	Tot. K-12 Funds (thousand \$)	Avg. Daily Attendance	Per Pupil Funding	Consumer Price Index	Per Pupil Funding (w/o inflation)
1990	\$ 2,287,158	569,795	\$ 4,014	130.7	\$ 7,852
1991	\$ 2,729,811	569,713	\$ 4,792	136.2	\$ 8,994
1992	\$ 2,939,351	574,226	\$ 5,119	140.3	\$ 9,328
1993	\$ 3,071,172	579,446	\$ 5,300	144.5	\$ 9,377
1994	\$ 3,194,404	578,020	\$ 5,526	148.2	\$ 9,534
1995	\$ 3,240,926	572,952	\$ 5,657	152.4	\$ 9,489
1996	\$ 3,492,890	571,934	\$ 6,107	156.9	\$ 9,951
1997	\$ 3,794,129	570,431	\$ 6,651	160.5	\$ 10,595
1998	\$ 3,932,068	569,694	\$ 6,902	163.0	\$ 10,826
1999	\$ 4,210,793	568,603	\$ 7,406	166.6	\$ 11,364
2000	\$ 4,330,619	565,693	\$ 7,655	172.2	\$ 11,366
2001	\$ 4,509,893	564,198	\$ 7,993	177.1	\$ 11,539
2002	\$ 4,650,146	566,451	\$ 8,209	179.9	\$ 11,666
2003	\$ 4,764,253	569,538	\$ 8,365	184.0	\$ 11,623
2004	\$ 5,077,772	570,911	\$ 8,894	188.9	\$ 12,037
2005	\$ 5,379,257	574,380	\$ 9,365	195.3	\$ 12,260
2006	\$ 5,909,930	580,937	\$ 10,173	201.6	\$ 12,901
2007	\$ 6,141,245	583,102	\$ 10,532	207.342	\$ 12,986
2008	\$ 6,561,268	585,775	\$ 11,201	215.303	\$ 13,300
2009	\$ 6,641,128	585,556	\$ 11,342	214.537	\$ 13,515
2010	\$ 6,873,286	587,102	\$ 11,707	218.056	\$ 13,726
2011	\$ 6,993,349	593,323	\$ 11,787	224.939	\$ 13,396
2012	\$ 7,086,717	594,440	\$ 11,922	229.594	\$ 13,275
2013	\$ 7,120,960	618,774	\$ 11,508	232.957	\$ 12,630
2014	\$ 7,137,145	622,088	\$ 11,473	236.736	\$ 12,390
2015	\$ 7,453,976	617,642	\$ 12,068	237.017	\$ 13,018
2016	\$ 7,634,758	618,606	\$ 12,342	240.007	\$ 13,147
2017	\$ 7,782,860	616,218	\$ 12,629	245.120	\$ 13,172
2018	\$ 8,433,367	614,301	\$ 14,068	251.107	\$ 13,977
2019	\$ 8,609,269	609,955	\$ 14,249	255.657	\$ 14,115

Sources: Funding and attendance data, 1987-2017: <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/>.

Funding data, 2018-2019:

<https://education.ky.gov/districts/FinRept/Pages/Fund%20Balances,%20Revenues%20and%20Expenditures,%20Chart%20of%20Accounts,%20Indirect%20Cost%20Rates%20and%20Key%20Financial%20Indicators.aspx>.

Attendance data, 2018-2019: [https://education.ky.gov/districts/enrol/Pages/Superintendents-Annual-Attendance-Report-\(SAAR\).aspx](https://education.ky.gov/districts/enrol/Pages/Superintendents-Annual-Attendance-Report-(SAAR).aspx).

Consumer Price Index: <https://www.bls.gov/data/>.

**Table A2: Kentucky 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading and Math Average NAEP Scores**

Year	NAEP Grade 4 Reading	NAEP Grade 4 Math	NAEP Grade 8 Reading	NAEP Grade 8 Math
1990				257
1991				
1992	213	215		262
1993				
1994	212			
1995				
1996		220		267
1997				
1998	218		262	
1999				
2000		219		270
2001				
2002	219		265	
2003	219	229	266	274
2004				
2005	220	231	264	274
2006				
2007	222	235	262	279
2008				
2009	226	239	267	279
2010				
2011	225	241	269	282
2012				
2013	224	241	270	281
2014				
2015	228	242	268	278
2016				
2017	224	239	265	278
2018				
2019	221	239	263	278

Source: <https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/ndecore/xplore/NDE>.

**Table A3: Source Websites for Private School Tuition Rates**

<b>School</b>	<b>Website</b>
Christian Academy of Carrollton	<a href="http://nebula.wsimg.com/e143cf9dfa15997df3ec9148fab43dd8?AccessKeyId=1343D5B4ADF35A2819A0&amp;disposition=0&amp;alloworigin=1">http://nebula.wsimg.com/e143cf9dfa15997df3ec9148fab43dd8?AccessKeyId=1343D5B4ADF35A2819A0&amp;disposition=0&amp;alloworigin=1</a>
Christian Fellowship School (Benton)	<a href="http://www.christianfellowshipschool.org/editoruploads/files/Fee_Schedule_20-21.pdf">http://www.christianfellowshipschool.org/editoruploads/files/Fee_Schedule_20-21.pdf</a>
Cornerstone Christian Academy (London)	<a href="https://www.cornerstoneky.com/tuition">https://www.cornerstoneky.com/tuition</a>
St. Joseph Academy (Walton)	<a href="https://sjawalton.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/2020-2021-Tuition-Rates.pdf">https://sjawalton.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/2020-2021-Tuition-Rates.pdf</a>
Foundation Christian Academy (Bowling Green)	<a href="http://www.fcafalcon.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/2020-2021-Tuition-Fees.jpg">http://www.fcafalcon.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/2020-2021-Tuition-Fees.jpg</a>
Highlands Latin School (Louisville)	<a href="https://thelatinsschool.org/admissions/tuitionandfees/">https://thelatinsschool.org/admissions/tuitionandfees/</a>
Christ the King (Lexington)	<a href="https://ctkschool.net/application/files/1015/8284/0250/CKS_Tuition_Information_2020-21.pdf">https://ctkschool.net/application/files/1015/8284/0250/CKS_Tuition_Information_2020-21.pdf</a>
Lexington Christian Academy	<a href="http://www.lexingtonchristian.org/admissions/tuition.cfm">http://www.lexingtonchristian.org/admissions/tuition.cfm</a>
Northern Kentucky Montessori Academy	<a href="https://drive.google.com/file/d/1jN5J5sO_1VuJ4qZINgBDh3A8aBII7_ur/view">https://drive.google.com/file/d/1jN5J5sO_1VuJ4qZINgBDh3A8aBII7_ur/view</a>
The Lexington School	<a href="https://www.thelexingtonschool.org/tuition-schedule">https://www.thelexingtonschool.org/tuition-schedule</a>
Somerset Christian School	<a href="https://someretchristian.com/tuition-and-financial-aid/">https://someretchristian.com/tuition-and-financial-aid/</a>
Lexington Latin School	<a href="http://www.lexingtonlatinschool.com/admissions.html">http://www.lexingtonlatinschool.com/admissions.html</a>
Frankfort Christian Academy	<a href="https://filecabinet9.eschoolview.com/A3358F45-40E0-4D3C-85F7-C9AE0867FBBE/2020_2021TuitionandFees.pdf">https://filecabinet9.eschoolview.com/A3358F45-40E0-4D3C-85F7-C9AE0867FBBE/2020_2021TuitionandFees.pdf</a>
Bethlehem High School (Bardstown)	<a href="https://www.bethlehemhigh.org/apps/pages/index.jsp?uREC_ID=1175215&amp;type=d&amp;pREC_ID=1423513">https://www.bethlehemhigh.org/apps/pages/index.jsp?uREC_ID=1175215&amp;type=d&amp;pREC_ID=1423513</a>
Newport Central Catholic High	<a href="https://static1.squarespace.com/static/586fb6c5414fb5bea0aa8fe5/t/5ecd31592dd571390ca7a028/1590505818029/2020-2021+Tuition.pdf">https://static1.squarespace.com/static/586fb6c5414fb5bea0aa8fe5/t/5ecd31592dd571390ca7a028/1590505818029/2020-2021+Tuition.pdf</a>
Calvary Christian School (Covington)	<a href="https://s3.amazonaws.com/media.cloversites.com/5a/5a66b655-92ba-4de6-a494-7c30cd6f3924/documents/Tuition_2020-21_9_month.pdf">https://s3.amazonaws.com/media.cloversites.com/5a/5a66b655-92ba-4de6-a494-7c30cd6f3924/documents/Tuition_2020-21_9_month.pdf</a>
Trinity Christian (Lexington)	<a href="https://www.trinitylex.org/tuition-financial-aid">https://www.trinitylex.org/tuition-financial-aid</a>
Lexington Catholic High School	<a href="https://www.lexingtoncatholic.com/apps/pages/tuitionassistance">https://www.lexingtoncatholic.com/apps/pages/tuitionassistance</a>
St. Xavier (Louisville)	<a href="https://www.saintx.com/admissions/tuition-information">https://www.saintx.com/admissions/tuition-information</a>
Sayre School (Lexington)	<a href="https://www.sayreschool.org/page.cfm?p=4415">https://www.sayreschool.org/page.cfm?p=4415</a>

**Table A4: 2018-2019 K-12 Expenditure Categories**

<b>Expenditure Category</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Instruction	\$4,513,569,932	53.27
Student Support Services	\$381,850,510	4.51
Instruction Staff Support Services	\$414,290,938	4.89
District Admin.	\$167,969,572	1.98
School Admin.	\$461,355,976	5.44
Business Support Services	\$212,709,902	2.51
Plant Operations	\$665,226,430	7.85
Pupil Transportation	\$476,292,863	5.62
Other Support Services	\$246,861	0.00
Food Service	\$480,986,580	5.68
Day Care Operations	\$68,797	0.00
Community Services	\$72,368,456	0.85
Adults Education Operations	\$324,852	0.00
Other Non-Instruction	\$20,703	0.00
Facilities Land/Site Acquisition	\$472,353	0.01
Facilities Land Improvement	\$485,833	0.01
Facilities Architecture And Engineering	\$4,815,799	0.06
Facilities Education Specification	\$20,591	0.00
Facilities Building Acquisition & Construction	\$3,500	0.00
Facilities Site Improvement	\$567,456	0.01
Facilities Building Improvement	\$473,051	0.01
Other Facilities Acquisition	\$0	0.00
Debt Service	\$619,238,826	7.31
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>\$8,473,359,767</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Source: <https://education.ky.gov/districts/FinRept/Pages/Fund%20Balances,%20Revenues%20and%20Expenditures,%20Chart%20of%20Accounts,%20Indirect%20Cost%20Rates%20and%20Key%20Financial%20Indicators.aspx>.

Note: Fund transfers are not included in table.

**Table A5: NAEP Percentages Proficient and Advances; K-PREP Percentages Proficient and Distinguished; ACT Scores**

Year	Grade 4 Reading		Grade 4 Math		Grade 8 Reading		Grade 8 Math		ACT Score
	NAEP Pct. Proficient & Adv.	K-PREP Pct. Proficient & Disting.	NAEP Pct. Proficient & Adv.	K-PREP Pct. Proficient & Disting.	NAEP Pct. Proficient & Adv.	K-PREP Pct. Proficient & Disting.	NAEP Pct. Proficient & Adv.	K-PREP Pct. Proficient & Disting.	
2011	36		39		36		30		
2012		47.1		39.6		46.7		41.6	19
2013	37	48.8	41	43.9	38	52.4	30	45.1	19.2
2014		54		49		52.2		45.2	19.4
2015	40	52.2	40	48.6	36	54.1	27	44.2	19.4
2016		56.3		51.7		53.6		45.5	19.5
2017	38	49.9	40	47.9	34	57.1	29	48.7	19.8
2018		53.7		47.2		62.9		46.1	19.3
2019	35	53	41	46.7	33	62.6	29	45.3	19

Sources: <https://applications.education.ky.gov/SRC/DataSets.aspx>,  
<https://openhouse.education.ky.gov/Home/SRCDData>  
<https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/ndecore/xplore/NDE>.

**Table A6: NAEP Percentages Below Basic; K-PREP Percentages Novice, All Students**

Year	Grade 4 Reading		Grade 4 Math		Grade 8 Reading		Grade 8 Math	
	NAEP Pct. Below Basic	K-PREP Pct. Novice	NAEP Pct. Below Basic	K-PREP Pct. Novice	NAEP Pct. Below Basic	K-PREP Pct. Novice	NAEP Pct. Below Basic	K-PREP Pct. Novice
2011	28		15		21		28	
2012		24.9		21.5		22.1		20.8
2013	29	26.9	16	23.2	20	24.4	29	15.9
2014		20.5		18.5		23.8		16.5
2015	25	18.8	16	20.4	22	21.8	32	15.1
2016		19.7		17.5		23.3		17.6
2017	30	21.7	20	17.9	25	25.8	35	18
2018		18.6		21.4		23		17
2019	33	19.2	19	21.7	27	21.5	33	17.7

Source: See Table A5.



**Table A7: NAEP Percentages Below Basic; K-PREP Percentages Novice, African Americans**

Year	<u>Grade 4 Reading</u>		<u>Grade 4 Math</u>		<u>Grade 8 Reading</u>		<u>Grade 8 Math</u>	
	NAEP Pct. Below Basic	K-PREP Pct. Novice	NAEP Pct. Below Basic	K-PREP Pct. Novice	NAEP Pct. Below Basic	K-PREP Pct. Novice	NAEP Pct. Below Basic	K-PREP Pct. Novice
2011	48		31		42		53	
2012		43.4		38.8		48.3		36.6
2013	52	48.7	35	38.9	44	43.4	51	31
2014		39.5		34.9		37.2		32.4
2015	41	36.3	32	35.2	42	38.5	57	30.2
2016		39.9		34.4		41.6		37
2017	53	43.4	45	35.7	46	45	63	37
2018		38		43.8		36.5		36
2019	57	38.7	37	42.1	51	36.3	57	38.6

Sources: See Table A5.