

# CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:

Parts I and II

for  
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS  
under the  
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT  
As amended by the  
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

For reporting on  
**School Year 2007-08**

**TENNESSEE**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008**  
**PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**  
**WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple ESEA programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

- Title I, Part A – Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs
- Title I, Part C – Education of Migratory Children (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- Title II, Part A – Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)
- Title III, Part A – English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)
- Title V, Part A – Innovative Programs
- Title VI, Section 6111 – Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities
- Title VI, Part B – Rural Education Achievement Program
- Title X, Part C – Education for Homeless Children and Youths

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2007-08 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

### PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1: By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- **Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- **Performance Goal 3: By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.**
- **Performance Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.**
- **Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.**

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

### PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required EDFacts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 19, 2008. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 27, 2009. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

### TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2007-08 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2007-08 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLPEDEN (1-877-457-3336).

OMB Number: 1810-0614

Expiration Date: 10/31/2010

Consolidated State Performance Report  
For  
State Formula Grant Programs  
under the  
Elementary And Secondary Education Act  
as amended by the  
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

Part I, 2007-08

Part II, 2007-08

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:

Tennessee Department of Education

Address:

710 James Robertson Pkwy, 5th Floor  
Nashville, TN 37243

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Trish Kelly

Telephone: 615-253-3168

Fax: 615-253-5706

e-mail: Trish.Kelly@state.tn.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):

Julie McCargar

Thursday, March 12, 2009, 2:44:48 PM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2007-08**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 19, 2008  
5PM EST**

## 1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the NCLB academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA.

### 1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Tennessee's State Board of Education has adopted challenging content standards in science, reading/language arts, and math that are consistent with section 1111(b)(1). These standards can be found at the Department's website at <http://www.state.tn.us/education/ci/standards/> Tennessee has developed Alternate Achievement Standards which are directly linked to general curriculum content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science. These Alternate Achievement Standards can be found at the Department's website at <http://www.state.tn.us/education/speced/seassessment.shtml#DISABILITY> Additionally, a review and edit to these Alternate Achievement Standards to verify alignment to the new challenging content standards in science, reading/language arts, and math is scheduled for January 2009.

Tennessee's assessment system has been approved for reading, math and science through ED's peer review process as of the end of SY 2005-06 (defined as June 30, 2006 for this process). The State has revised its K-12 content standards in reading/language arts, math, and science. The State has issued an Request for Proposal and signed a contract with a test vendor to produce a new assessment for its newly revised content standards with the intention that both K-8 and new high school assessments that are aligned with the newly revised content standards will be piloted in school year 2008-09 and implemented during school year 2009-10.

Content standards for K-8 and 9-12 science, K-8 and 9-12 reading/language arts, and K-8 and 9-12 math have been revised and approved by the State Board of Education at its meeting on January 25, 2008. Tennessee's K-12 content standards are available at <http://www.state.tn.us/sbe/2008Januarypdfs/January%202008%20Agenda.pdf>.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

### 1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The TN Comprehensive Assessment Program (TCAP) assessment system was implemented in Spring 2004 for all content areas: reading/language arts, math, science, and social studies. The high school test for mathematics, Gateway Math, and the high school tests for language arts, Gateway English and 11th grade writing assessment have already been implemented. Information about those tests can be found on the Department's website at <http://www.state.tn.us/education/assessment/>.

Local educational agencies are involved with the development and implementation of our assessments in the following ways:

1. they approve and revise all of our criterion-referenced items;
2. they review all criterion-referenced items for bias; and,
3. they participate in the standards setting process.

The Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program (TCAP) is the statewide assessment program developed for all students. The TCAP Alternate Assessment (TCAP-Alt) was developed to include students with the most significant cognitive/adaptive disabilities in the statewide assessment and accountability program. The TCAP-Alt consists of one type of assessment: the portfolio assessment (PA). The IEP Team must ensure that the student meets the TCAP-Alt Participation Guidelines prior to the student's participation in the PA. In the 2005-2006 school year the PA option was revised to include alignment with academic content standards and assess the student's progress on alternate achievement standards for the student's grade level. A new RFP was released in 2008 and a contract has been signed for the TN alternate assessment for 2008-09.

In the 2004-2005 school year, an Alternate Writing Assessment (TCAP-Alt Writing) was developed and used through 2007-08. This assessment has been removed from the assessment system beginning in 2008-09.

Tennessee's assessment system has been approved for reading/language arts and math through ED's peer review process as of the end of SY 2005-06 (defined as June 30, 2006 for this process).

The TN Comprehensive Assessment Program (TCAP) Achievement Assessment for Grades 3-8 meeting the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA will be repurposed for the 2010 assessment. Revised curriculum and achievement standards for mathematics and reading/language arts will be the basis for this repurposed grades 3-8 assessment. Additionally, two new alternate assessments will be developed. An alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards will be operational in 2010. An alternate assessment based on grade level standards for ESL students will be operational in 2010 as well.

The TCAP Secondary Assessment Program will be repurposed from a diploma requirement in the three Gateway Assessments (Language Arts, Math, and Science) to an End of Course (EOC) program with ten assessments as the final outcome. Algebra I, English II (with 11th grade writing) and Biology I will be the new assessments meeting the ESEA requirements for high school. Algebra II, English I, English III, Physics, Chemistry and US History will be added over the course of the new contract which will go out January 2009 using the TN RFP process. A new contract should be in place for development of these new assessments by May 2009. TN uses an embedded field test item model on its operational assessments and will have new assessments ready by Fall 2009 in Algebra I and English II. Additionally, English I, Biology I, and US History will be implemented using the same model.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

### 1.1.4 Assessments in Science

If your State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have been approved through ED's peer review process, provide in the space below a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

If the State's assessments in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have not been approved through ED's peer review process, respond "State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Tennessee's assessment system has been approved for science through ED's peer review process as of the end of SY 2005-06 (defined as June 30, 2006 for this process). All science assessments in grades 3-8 and high school are implemented and approved.

The TN Comprehensive Assessment Program (TCAP) assessment system was implemented in Spring 2004 for all content areas: reading/language arts, math, science, and social studies. The high school test for mathematics, Gateway Math, and the high school tests for language arts, Gateway English and 11th grade writing assessment, and the high school test for science, Gateway Science have already been implemented. Information about those tests can be found on the Department's website at <http://www.state.tn.us/education/assessment/>.

The TN Comprehensive Assessment Program (TCAP) Achievement Assessment for Grades 3-8 meeting the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA will be repurposed for the 2010 assessment. Revised curriculum and achievement standards for science will be the basis for this repurposed grades 3-8 assessment. Additionally, two new alternate assessments will be developed. An alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards will be operational in 2010. An alternate assessment based on grade level standards for ESL students will be operational in 2010 as well.

The TCAP Secondary Assessment Program will be repurposed from a diploma requirement in the three Gateway Assessments (Language Arts, Math, and Science) to an End of Course (EOC) program with ten assessments as the final outcome. Algebra I, English II (with 11th grade writing) and Biology I will be the new assessments meeting the ESEA requirements for high school. Algebra II, English I, English III, Physics, Chemistry and US History will be added over the course of the new contract which will go out January 2009 using the TN RFP process. A new contract should be in place for development of these new assessments by May 2009. TN uses an embedded field test item model on its operational assessments and will have new assessments ready by Fall 2009 in Biology I.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State NCLB assessments.

### 1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for NCLB mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with NCLB. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

| Student Group                             | # Students Enrolled | # Students Participating | Percentage of Students Participating |
|---|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| All students                              | 527,614             | 524,194                  | 99.4                                 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native          | 1,273               | 1,266                    | 99.4                                 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander                 | 7,878               | 7,852                    | 99.7                                 |
| Black, non-Hispanic                       | 138,100             | 136,607                  | 98.9                                 |
| Hispanic                                  | 25,177              | 25,033                   | 99.4                                 |
| White, non-Hispanic                       | 354,226             | 352,541                  | 99.5                                 |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA)         | 65,330              | 64,649                   | 99.0                                 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 11,130              | 11,054                   | 99.3                                 |
| Economically disadvantaged students       | 267,201             | 264,990                  | 99.2                                 |
| Migratory students                        | 289                 | 288                      | 99.6                                 |
| Male                                      | 271,180             | 269,237                  | 99.3                                 |
| Female                                    | 256,120             | 254,673                  | 99.4                                 |
| <b>Comments:</b>                          |                     |                          |                                      |

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, and subtotal 1. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) participating will also be calculated automatically.

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

| Type of Assessment  | # Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating | Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment |
|---|---|--|
| Regular Assessment without Accommodations                       | 15,839  | 24.5   |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations                          | 43,769  | 67.7   |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards | 0   | 0.0  |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards    | 0   | 0.0  |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards   | 5,041   | 7.8  |

|  |        |  |
|--|--------|--|
| Total  | 64,649 |  |
| <b>Comments: The number of Children with Disabilities participating in the Math assessments is lower than the number of Children with Disabilities with a proficiency level based on TN's accountability requirement for Out of Level testing. TN allowed LEAs/schools to test some Children with Disabilities by providing an Out of Level test to meet IDEA requirements. These students were not counted as participants (invalid assessment) and would receive a performance level and be counted as below proficient for performance.</b> |        |  |

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

### 1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment.

| Student Group  | # Students Enrolled | # Students Participating | Percentage of Students Participating |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| All students   | 518,509             | 515,272                  | 99.4                                 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native   | 1,259               | 1,249                    | 99.2                                 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander  | 8,143               | 8,089                    | 99.3                                 |
| Black, non-Hispanic  | 129,685             | 128,548                  | 99.1                                 |
| Hispanic   | 24,364              | 24,162                   | 99.2                                 |
| White, non-Hispanic  | 354,160             | 352,378                  | 99.5                                 |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA)  | 62,241              | 61,593                   | 99.0                                 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students  | 10,543              | 10,363                   | 98.3                                 |
| Economically disadvantaged students  | 258,758             | 256,667                  | 99.2                                 |
| Migratory students   | 284                 | 282                      | 99.3                                 |
| Male   | 266,383             | 264,527                  | 99.3                                 |
| Female   | 251,815             | 250,465                  | 99.5                                 |
| <b>Comments: Limited English proficient (LEP) students were counted as participants but had an exclusion that did not provide for a valid performance level.</b> |                     |                          |                                      |

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

### 1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

| Type of Assessment  | # Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating | Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment |
|---|---|--|
| Regular Assessment without Accommodations   | 13,916  | 22.6   |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations  | 42,820  | 69.5   |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards   | 0   | 0.0  |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards  | 0   | 0.0  |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards   | 4,857   | 7.9  |
| Total   | 61,593  |  |
| <b>Comments: The number of Children with Disabilities participating in the Reading/Language Arts assessments is lower than the number of Children with Disabilities with a proficiency level based on TN's accountability requirement for Out of Level testing. TN allowed LEAs/schools to test some Children with Disabilities by providing an Out of Level test to meet IDEA requirements. These students were not counted as participants (invalid assessment) and would receive a performance level and be counted as below proficient for performance.</b> |   |  |

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

### 1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment.

| Student Group                             | # Students Enrolled | # Students Participating | Percentage of Students Participating |
|---|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| All students                              | 521,166             | 517,055                  | 99.2                                 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native          | 1,245               | 1,232                    | 99.0                                 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander                 | 8,174               | 8,118                    | 99.3                                 |
| Black, non-Hispanic                       | 131,005             | 129,497                  | 98.8                                 |
| Hispanic                                  | 24,638              | 24,444                   | 99.2                                 |
| White, non-Hispanic                       | 355,202             | 352,918                  | 99.4                                 |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA)         | 61,938              | 61,099                   | 98.6                                 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 10,785              | 10,678                   | 99.0                                 |
| Economically disadvantaged students       | 260,085             | 257,461                  | 99.0                                 |
| Migratory students                        | 290                 | 287                      | 99.0                                 |
| Male                                      | 267,141             | 264,802                  | 99.1                                 |
| Female                                    | 253,702             | 251,967                  | 99.3                                 |
| <b>Comments:</b>                          |                     |                          |                                      |

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

### 1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

| Type of Assessment  | # Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating | Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment |
|---|---|--|
| Regular Assessment without Accommodations   | 13,851  | 22.7   |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations  | 42,270  | 69.2   |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards   | 0   | 0.0  |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards  | 0   | 0.0  |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards   | 4,978   | 8.1  |
| Total   | 61,099  |  |
| <b>Comments: The number of Children with Disabilities participating in the Science assessments is lower than the number of Children with Disabilities with a proficiency level based on TN's accountability requirement for Out of Level testing. TN allowed LEAs/schools to test some Children with Disabilities by providing an Out of Level test to meet IDEA requirements. These students were not counted as participants (invalid assessment) and would receive a performance level and be counted as below proficient for performance.</b> |   |  |

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

### **1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

This section collects data on student academic achievement on the State NCLB assessments.

#### **1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics**

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who completed the State NCLB assessment(s) in mathematics implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and the number of these students who scored at or above proficient, in grades 3 through 8 and high school. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

#### **1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts**

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

#### **1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science**

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment administered at least one in each of the following grade spans 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

### 1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

| <b>Grade 3</b>                            | <b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b> | <b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> | <b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> |
|---|--|--|--|
| All students                              | 75,012   | 66,526   | 88.7   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native          | 138  | 126  | 91.3   |
| Asian or Pacific Islander                 | 1,220  | 1,169  | 95.8   |
| Black, non-Hispanic                       | 18,206   | 14,159   | 77.8   |
| Hispanic                                  | 4,046  | 3,437  | 84.9   |
| White, non-Hispanic                       | 51,267   | 47,513   | 92.7   |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA)         | 8,911  | 6,036  | 67.7   |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,308  | 1,753  | 76.0   |
| Economically disadvantaged students       | 40,377   | 33,537   | 83.1   |
| Migratory students                        | 56   | 40   | 71.4   |
| Male                                      | 38,790   | 34,116   | 88.0   |
| Female                                    | 36,179   | 32,371   | 89.5   |
| <b>Comments:</b>                          |  |  |  |

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.1 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 3

| <b>Grade 3</b>                            | <b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b> | <b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> | <b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> |
|---|--|--|--|
| All students                              | 74,934   | 68,982   | 92.1   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native          | 138  | 124  | 89.9   |
| Asian or Pacific Islander                 | 1,192  | 1,140  | 95.6   |
| Black, non-Hispanic                       | 18,193   | 15,598   | 85.7   |
| Hispanic                                  | 3,997  | 3,384  | 84.7   |
| White, non-Hispanic                       | 51,279   | 48,618   | 94.8   |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA)         | 8,915  | 7,153  | 80.2   |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,204  | 1,570  | 71.2   |
| Economically disadvantaged students       | 40,322   | 35,454   | 87.9   |
| Migratory students                        | 56   | 36   | 64.3   |
| Male                                      | 38,752   | 34,976   | 90.3   |
| Female                                    | 36,138   | 33,967   | 94.0   |
| <b>Comments:</b>                          |  |  |  |

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

|   | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Grade 3</b>                            |   |   |   |
| All students                              | 74,924  | 61,109                                    | 81.6  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native          | 137   | 111                                       | 81.0  |
| Asian or Pacific Islander                 | 1,213   | 1,094                                     | 90.2  |
| Black, non-Hispanic                       | 18,192  | 11,026                                    | 60.6  |
| Hispanic                                  | 4,043   | 2,998                                     | 74.2  |
| White, non-Hispanic                       | 51,204  | 45,769                                    | 89.4  |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA)         | 8,900   | 5,803                                     | 65.2  |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,299   | 1,368                                     | 59.5  |
| Economically disadvantaged students       | 40,331  | 29,098                                    | 72.1  |
| Migratory students                        | 55  | 28  | 50.9  |
| Male                                      | 38,739  | 31,595                                    | 81.6  |
| Female                                    | 36,142  | 29,479                                    | 81.6  |
| <b>Comments:</b>                          |   |   |   |

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.**

### 1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

|   | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Grade 4</b>                            |   |   |   |
| All students                              | 73,645  | 66,548                                    | 90.4  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native          | 126   | 114                                       | 90.5  |
| Asian or Pacific Islander                 | 1,225   | 1,172                                     | 95.7  |
| Black, non-Hispanic                       | 18,197  | 15,099                                    | 83.0  |
| Hispanic                                  | 3,847   | 3,364                                     | 87.4  |
| White, non-Hispanic                       | 50,113  | 46,677                                    | 93.1  |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA)         | 8,883   | 6,010                                     | 67.7  |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,185   | 1,735                                     | 79.4  |
| Economically disadvantaged students       | 38,997  | 33,394                                    | 85.6  |
| Migratory students                        | 47  | 38  | 80.9  |
| Male                                      | 37,588  | 33,394                                    | 88.8  |
| Female                                    | 36,016  | 33,121                                    | 92.0  |
| <b>Comments:</b>                          |   |   |   |

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 4

|   | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Grade 4</b>                            |   |   |   |
| All students                              | 73,534  | 67,044                                    | 91.2  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native          | 126   | 112                                       | 88.9  |
| Asian or Pacific Islander                 | 1,190   | 1,122                                     | 94.3  |
| Black, non-Hispanic                       | 18,176  | 15,545                                    | 85.5  |
| Hispanic                                  | 3,791   | 3,128                                     | 82.5  |
| White, non-Hispanic                       | 50,115  | 47,014                                    | 93.8  |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA)         | 8,888   | 6,757                                     | 76.0  |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,060   | 1,386                                     | 67.3  |
| Economically disadvantaged students       | 38,926  | 33,715                                    | 86.6  |
| Migratory students                        | 47  | 34  | 72.3  |
| Male                                      | 37,515  | 33,384                                    | 89.0  |
| Female                                    | 35,977  | 33,626                                    | 93.5  |
| <b>Comments:</b>                          |   |   |   |

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

|   | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Grade 4</b>                            |   |   |   |
| All students                              | 73,545  | 59,607                                    | 81.0  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native          | 125   | 109                                       | 87.2  |
| Asian or Pacific Islander                 | 1,212   | 1,062                                     | 87.6  |
| Black, non-Hispanic                       | 18,175  | 10,971                                    | 60.4  |
| Hispanic                                  | 3,839   | 2,666                                     | 69.4  |
| White, non-Hispanic                       | 50,057  | 44,688                                    | 89.3  |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA)         | 8,872   | 5,474                                     | 61.7  |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,177   | 1,096                                     | 50.3  |
| Economically disadvantaged students       | 38,946  | 27,741                                    | 71.2  |
| Migratory students                        | 47  | 29  | 61.7  |
| Male                                      | 37,524  | 30,782                                    | 82.0  |
| Female                                    | 35,980  | 28,796                                    | 80.0  |
| <b>Comments:</b>                          |   |   |   |

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.**

### 1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

| <b>Grade 5</b>                            | <b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b> | <b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> | <b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> |
|---|--|--|--|
| All students                              | 71,709   | 67,255   | 93.8   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native          | 148  | 141  | 95.3   |
| Asian or Pacific Islander                 | 1,145  | 1,113  | 97.2   |
| Black, non-Hispanic                       | 17,718   | 15,700   | 88.6   |
| Hispanic                                  | 3,696  | 3,416  | 92.4   |
| White, non-Hispanic                       | 48,907   | 46,800   | 95.7   |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA)         | 8,539  | 6,437  | 75.4   |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,553  | 1,317  | 84.8   |
| Economically disadvantaged students       | 37,126   | 33,625   | 90.6   |
| Migratory students                        | 50   | 43   | 86.0   |
| Male                                      | 36,676   | 33,992   | 92.7   |
| Female                                    | 35,002   | 33,241   | 95.0   |
| <b>Comments:</b>                          |  |  |  |

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 5

| <b>Grade 5</b>                            | <b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b> | <b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> | <b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> |
|---|--|--|--|
| All students                              | 71,619   | 68,277   | 95.3   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native          | 147  | 143  | 97.3   |
| Asian or Pacific Islander                 | 1,118  | 1,089  | 97.4   |
| Black, non-Hispanic                       | 17,707   | 16,298   | 92.0   |
| Hispanic                                  | 3,650  | 3,283  | 89.9   |
| White, non-Hispanic                       | 48,902   | 47,374   | 96.9   |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA)         | 8,546  | 7,233  | 84.6   |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,454  | 1,111  | 76.4   |
| Economically disadvantaged students       | 37,057   | 34,362   | 92.7   |
| Migratory students                        | 49   | 39   | 79.6   |
| Male                                      | 36,626   | 34,366   | 93.8   |
| Female                                    | 34,962   | 33,885   | 96.9   |
| <b>Comments:</b>                          |  |  |  |

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

|   | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Grade 5</b>                            |   |   |   |
| All students                              | 71,644  | 59,420                                    | 82.9  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native          | 148   | 135                                       | 91.2  |
| Asian or Pacific Islander                 | 1,139   | 1,015                                     | 89.1  |
| Black, non-Hispanic                       | 17,705  | 11,088                                    | 62.6  |
| Hispanic                                  | 3,690   | 2,769                                     | 75.0  |
| White, non-Hispanic                       | 48,867  | 44,338                                    | 90.7  |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA)         | 8,518   | 5,211                                     | 61.2  |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,548   | 797                                       | 51.5  |
| Economically disadvantaged students       | 37,080  | 27,341                                    | 73.7  |
| Migratory students                        | 50  | 30  | 60.0  |
| Male                                      | 36,637  | 30,615                                    | 83.6  |
| Female                                    | 34,976  | 28,786                                    | 82.3  |
| <b>Comments:</b>                          |   |   |   |

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.**

### 1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

|   | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Grade 6</b>                            |   |   |   |
| All students                              | 70,972  | 65,185                                    | 91.8  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native          | 194   | 181                                       | 93.3  |
| Asian or Pacific Islander                 | 1,080   | 1,036                                     | 95.9  |
| Black, non-Hispanic                       | 17,509  | 15,032                                    | 85.9  |
| Hispanic                                  | 3,405   | 3,015                                     | 88.5  |
| White, non-Hispanic                       | 48,671  | 45,837                                    | 94.2  |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA)         | 8,276   | 5,701                                     | 68.9  |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,281   | 928                                       | 72.4  |
| Economically disadvantaged students       | 35,922  | 31,480                                    | 87.6  |
| Migratory students                        | 43  | 39  | 90.7  |
| Male                                      | 36,441  | 32,825                                    | 90.1  |
| Female                                    | 34,521  | 32,354                                    | 93.7  |
| <b>Comments:</b>                          |   |   |   |

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 6

|   | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Grade 6</b>                            |   |   |   |
| All students                              | 70,864  | 66,610                                    | 94.0  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native          | 194   | 185                                       | 95.4  |
| Asian or Pacific Islander                 | 1,050   | 1,008                                     | 96.0  |
| Black, non-Hispanic                       | 17,485  | 15,700                                    | 89.8  |
| Hispanic                                  | 3,346   | 2,982                                     | 89.1  |
| White, non-Hispanic                       | 48,677  | 46,645                                    | 95.8  |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA)         | 8,284   | 6,466                                     | 78.1  |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,160   | 807                                       | 69.6  |
| Economically disadvantaged students       | 35,846  | 32,503                                    | 90.7  |
| Migratory students                        | 43  | 35  | 81.4  |
| Male                                      | 36,383  | 33,401                                    | 91.8  |
| Female                                    | 34,471  | 33,200                                    | 96.3  |
| <b>Comments:</b>                          |   |   |   |

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

|   | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Grade 6</b>                            |   |   |   |
| All students                              | 70,874  | 59,934                                    | 84.6  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native          | 194   | 170                                       | 87.6  |
| Asian or Pacific Islander                 | 1,077   | 972                                       | 90.3  |
| Black, non-Hispanic                       | 17,474  | 12,246                                    | 70.1  |
| Hispanic                                  | 3,399   | 2,599                                     | 76.5  |
| White, non-Hispanic                       | 48,618  | 43,872                                    | 90.2  |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA)         | 8,249   | 4,898                                     | 59.4  |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,278   | 594                                       | 46.5  |
| Economically disadvantaged students       | 35,861  | 27,334                                    | 76.2  |
| Migratory students                        | 43  | 34  | 79.1  |
| Male                                      | 36,391  | 30,755                                    | 84.5  |
| Female                                    | 34,474  | 29,174                                    | 84.6  |
| <b>Comments:</b>                          |   |   |   |

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.**

### 1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

|   | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Grade 7</b>                            |   |   |   |
| All students                              | 72,469  | 65,529                                    | 90.4  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native          | 177   | 165                                       | 93.2  |
| Asian or Pacific Islander                 | 1,048   | 1,017                                     | 97.0  |
| Black, non-Hispanic                       | 18,134  | 15,108                                    | 83.3  |
| Hispanic                                  | 3,260   | 2,818                                     | 86.4  |
| White, non-Hispanic                       | 49,753  | 46,346                                    | 93.2  |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA)         | 8,443   | 5,379                                     | 63.7  |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,240   | 854                                       | 68.9  |
| Economically disadvantaged students       | 36,084  | 30,816                                    | 85.4  |
| Migratory students                        | 31  | 21  | 67.7  |
| Male                                      | 37,162  | 32,732                                    | 88.1  |
| Female                                    | 35,288  | 32,781                                    | 92.9  |
| <b>Comments:</b>                          |   |   |   |

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 7

|   | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Grade 7</b>                            |   |   |   |
| All students                              | 72,383  | 66,086                                    | 91.3  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native          | 177   | 163                                       | 92.1  |
| Asian or Pacific Islander                 | 1,022   | 972                                       | 95.1  |
| Black, non-Hispanic                       | 18,126  | 15,379                                    | 84.8  |
| Hispanic                                  | 3,190   | 2,683                                     | 84.1  |
| White, non-Hispanic                       | 49,771  | 46,814                                    | 94.1  |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA)         | 8,440   | 6,093                                     | 72.2  |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,122   | 630                                       | 56.1  |
| Economically disadvantaged students       | 36,030  | 31,136                                    | 86.4  |
| Migratory students                        | 31  | 19  | 61.3  |
| Male                                      | 37,106  | 32,832                                    | 88.5  |
| Female                                    | 35,258  | 33,237                                    | 94.3  |
| <b>Comments:</b>                          |   |   |   |

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

|   | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Grade 7</b>                            |   |   |   |
| All students                              | 72,359  | 58,960                                    | 81.5  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native          | 177   | 153                                       | 86.4  |
| Asian or Pacific Islander                 | 1,048   | 944                                       | 90.1  |
| Black, non-Hispanic                       | 18,093  | 11,748                                    | 64.9  |
| Hispanic                                  | 3,251   | 2,321                                     | 71.4  |
| White, non-Hispanic                       | 49,694  | 43,728                                    | 88.0  |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA)         | 8,414   | 4,536                                     | 53.9  |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,235   | 541                                       | 43.8  |
| Economically disadvantaged students       | 36,012  | 25,888                                    | 71.9  |
| Migratory students                        | 30  | 11  | 36.7  |
| Male                                      | 37,093  | 30,184                                    | 81.4  |
| Female                                    | 35,247  | 28,763                                    | 81.6  |
| <b>Comments:</b>                          |   |   |   |

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.**

### 1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

|   | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Grade 8</b>                            |   |   |   |
| All students                              | 71,993  | 64,809                                    | 90.0  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native          | 177   | 163                                       | 92.1  |
| Asian or Pacific Islander                 | 1,101   | 1,061                                     | 96.4  |
| Black, non-Hispanic                       | 18,317  | 15,148                                    | 82.7  |
| Hispanic                                  | 3,091   | 2,681                                     | 86.7  |
| White, non-Hispanic                       | 49,227  | 45,701                                    | 92.8  |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA)         | 8,397   | 5,188                                     | 61.8  |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,127   | 797                                       | 70.7  |
| Economically disadvantaged students       | 34,747  | 29,357                                    | 84.5  |
| Migratory students                        | 30  | 26  | 86.7  |
| Male                                      | 36,995  | 32,430                                    | 87.7  |
| Female                                    | 34,978  | 32,362                                    | 92.5  |
| <b>Comments:</b>                          |   |   |   |

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 8

|   | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Grade 8</b>                            |   |   |   |
| All students                              | 71,883  | 67,725                                    | 94.2  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native          | 178   | 170                                       | 95.5  |
| Asian or Pacific Islander                 | 1,075   | 1,039                                     | 96.7  |
| Black, non-Hispanic                       | 18,315  | 16,455                                    | 89.8  |
| Hispanic                                  | 3,022   | 2,672                                     | 88.4  |
| White, non-Hispanic                       | 49,214  | 47,323                                    | 96.2  |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA)         | 8,394   | 6,630                                     | 79.0  |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,015   | 674                                       | 66.4  |
| Economically disadvantaged students       | 34,662  | 31,447                                    | 90.7  |
| Migratory students                        | 27  | 22  | 81.5  |
| Male                                      | 36,931  | 34,081                                    | 92.3  |
| Female                                    | 34,932  | 33,625                                    | 96.3  |
| <b>Comments:</b>                          |   |   |   |

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

|   | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Grade 8</b>                            |   |   |   |
| All students                              | 71,857  | 54,307                                    | 75.6  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native          | 176   | 142                                       | 80.7  |
| Asian or Pacific Islander                 | 1,099   | 933                                       | 84.9  |
| Black, non-Hispanic                       | 18,260  | 10,185                                    | 55.8  |
| Hispanic                                  | 3,081   | 1,945                                     | 63.1  |
| White, non-Hispanic                       | 49,161  | 41,053                                    | 83.5  |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA)         | 8,352   | 3,650                                     | 43.7  |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,120   | 333                                       | 29.7  |
| Economically disadvantaged students       | 34,646  | 21,930                                    | 63.3  |
| Migratory students                        | 30  | 10  | 33.3  |
| Male                                      | 36,921  | 27,887                                    | 75.5  |
| Female                                    | 34,916  | 26,407                                    | 75.6  |
| <b>Comments:</b>                          |   |   |   |

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.**

### 1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

|   | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| <b>High School</b>                        |   |   |   |
| All students                              | 88,364  | 66,168                                    | 74.9  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native          | 305   | 248                                       | 81.3  |
| Asian or Pacific Islander                 | 1,017   | 901                                       | 88.6  |
| Black, non-Hispanic                       | 28,526  | 16,848                                    | 59.1  |
| Hispanic                                  | 3,661   | 2,756                                     | 75.3  |
| White, non-Hispanic                       | 54,600  | 45,240                                    | 82.9  |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA)         | 13,241  | 6,707                                     | 50.7  |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,353   | 818                                       | 60.5  |
| Economically disadvantaged students       | 41,703  | 28,236                                    | 67.7  |
| Migratory students                        | 30  | 17  | 56.7  |
| Male                                      | 45,567  | 33,570                                    | 73.7  |
| Female                                    | 42,675  | 32,520                                    | 76.2  |
| <b>Comments:</b>                          |   |   |   |

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -High School

|   | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| <b>High School</b>                        |   |   |   |
| All students                              | 79,529  | 75,288                                    | 94.7  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native          | 288   | 274                                       | 95.1  |
| Asian or Pacific Islander                 | 1,297   | 1,250                                     | 96.4  |
| Black, non-Hispanic                       | 20,468  | 18,437                                    | 90.1  |
| Hispanic                                  | 2,895   | 2,620                                     | 90.5  |
| White, non-Hispanic                       | 54,374  | 52,521                                    | 96.6  |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA)         | 10,165  | 7,932                                     | 78.0  |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 791   | 569                                       | 71.9  |
| Economically disadvantaged students       | 33,442  | 30,584                                    | 91.5  |
| Migratory students                        | 27  | 21  | 77.8  |
| Male                                      | 40,916  | 37,956                                    | 92.8  |
| Female                                    | 38,497  | 37,237                                    | 96.7  |
| <b>Comments:</b>                          |   |   |   |

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

| <b>High School</b>                        | <b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b> | <b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> | <b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b> |
|---|--|--|--|
| All students                              | 81,857   | 78,348   | 95.7   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native          | 274  | 264  | 96.4   |
| Asian or Pacific Islander                 | 1,318  | 1,292  | 98.0   |
| Black, non-Hispanic                       | 21,606   | 19,646   | 90.9   |
| Hispanic                                  | 3,126  | 2,912  | 93.2   |
| White, non-Hispanic                       | 55,326   | 54,048   | 97.7   |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA)         | 9,831  | 8,172  | 83.1   |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,017  | 820  | 80.6   |
| Economically disadvantaged students       | 34,580   | 32,170   | 93.0   |
| Migratory students                        | 32   | 27   | 84.4   |
| Male                                      | 41,501   | 39,419   | 95.0   |
| Female                                    | 40,231   | 38,825   | 96.5   |
| <b>Comments:</b>                          |  |  |  |

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.**

#### 1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

##### 1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of schools and districts and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

| Entity           | Total # | Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007-08 | Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08 |
|------------------|---------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Schools          | 1,643   | 1,317                               | 80.2                                   |
| Districts        | 136     | 124                                 | 91.2                                   |
| <b>Comments:</b> |         |                                     |  |

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in N/X103 for data group 32.

##### 1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

| Title I School                            | # Title I Schools | # Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08 | Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08 |
|---|-------------------|---|---|
| All Title I schools                       | 941               | 764   | 81.2  |
| Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools          | 837               | 668   | 79.8  |
| Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools | 104               | 96  | 92.3  |
| <b>Comments:</b>                          |                   |   |   |

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in N/X129 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

##### 1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

| # Districts That Received Title I Funds   | # Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08 | Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08 |
|---|--|--|
| 139   | 124  | 89.2   |
| <b>Comments: Three of the 139 schools that received Title I funds are not required to calculate an AYP status because they are not accountable for students for AYP purposes: Tennessee School for the Blind, Tennessee School for the Deaf and West Tennessee School for the Deaf.</b> |  |  |

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

Note: DG 582 is not collected from the SEA, rather it comes from the Title I funding data.

## 1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

### 1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
  
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (This column must be completed by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

<sup>1</sup> The school improvement statuses are defined in LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

#### 1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

| <b>Corrective Action</b>  | <b># of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08</b> |
|---|---|
| Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program | 0   |
| Extension of the school year or school day  | 0   |
| Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance               | 0   |
| Significant decrease in management authority at the school level                    | 0   |
| Replacement of the principal  | 0   |
| Restructuring the internal organization of the school                               | 0   |
| Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school                               | 18  |
| <b>Comments:</b>  |   |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### 1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

| <b>Restructuring Action</b>  | <b># of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented</b> |
|--|---|
| Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal) | 0   |
| Reopening the school as a public charter school                                  | 0   |
| Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school             | 0   |
| Take over the school by the State  | 0   |
| Other major restructuring of the school governance                               | 0   |
| <b>Comments:</b>   |   |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

## 1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

### 1.4.5.1 List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
  
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action )
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (This column **must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement. This column is optional for States that list only** districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

<sup>2</sup> The district improvement statuses are defined in LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

#### 1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the space below, briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Tennessee is providing technical assistance to the 5 districts identified for improvement in a variety of ways.

First, the districts that are identified as in LEA Improvement and Corrective Action are assigned System Targeted Assistance Team (STAT) consultants to work at the district level with the district staff on improvement efforts.

Second, Tennessee requires all districts to engage in a comprehensive district improvement planning process that results in their submission of a consolidated application for their NCLB funds. This process is referred to as the Tennessee Comprehensive Systemwide Planning Process (TCSPP). All districts have been offered technical assistance on their TCSPPs in light of academic and non-academic data from school year 2007-2008. All LEAs in Improvement and Corrective Action submitted their TCSPPs for review and approval by the State in November 2008. LEAs that are identified as in improvement must ensure that they have addressed the additional components required in Title IA of NCLB for LEA Improvement.

In addition, the State monitors district expenditures to ensure that the required setaside of 10% of Title I for professional development is budgeted and expended for activities which will help the LEAs meet adequate yearly progress.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

| Corrective Action  | # of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08 |
|--|--|
| Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards   | 0  |
| Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district                                     | 0  |
| Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds  | 2  |
| Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP  | 1  |
| Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district  | 0  |
| Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district  | 0  |
| Restructured the district  | 1  |
| Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action) | 0  |
| <b>Comments:</b>   |  |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on 2007-08 data and the results of those appeals.

|                  | # Appealed Their AYP Designations | # Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| Districts        | 45                                | 5   |
| Schools          | 104                               | 42  |
| <b>Comments:</b> |                                   |   |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete | 07/25/08 |
|---|----------|

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### 1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA for SY 2007-08.

##### 1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.

- In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2007-08 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
  - Total number of schools for which the data in this table are reported. This should be the total number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.
- In the SY 2006-07 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2007-08. No total is requested for schools in SY 2006-07.

| Category   | SY 2007-08 | SY 2006-07 |
|--|------------|------------|
| Total number of students who were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003 (a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08   | 31,549     | 33,560     |
| Total number of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08   | 24,011     | 23,742     |
| Percentage of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08   | 76.1       | 70.7       |
| Total number of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08   | 24,921     | 25,414     |
| Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08   | 79.0       | 75.7       |
| Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08  | 75         |            |
| <b>Comments: Reporting for schools receiving assistance through Section 1003 (a) and 1003 (g) funds are accurate and complete. The student n-count totals are different in that the schools are matched from 2007-08 back to 2006-07. In the school year 2007-08, school closings, grade configuration changes, and consolidation have been verified by the State.</b> |            |            |

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

##### 1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress;
- Exited improvement status;
- Did not make adequate yearly progress.

| Category  | # of Schools |
|---|--------------|
| Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08         | 56           |
| Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2007-08             | 23           |
| Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08 | 19           |
| <b>Comments:</b>  |              |

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

### 1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

In the table below, indicate the effective school improvement strategies used that were supported through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds.

| Column 1   | Column 2   | Column 3   | Column 4  | Column 5  | Column 6  | Column 7   |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| <b>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.</b>  | <b>Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.</b>   | <b>Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used</b> | <b>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status</b> | <b>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status</b> | <b>Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)</b> | <b>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.</b> |
| 1  |  | 54   | 18  | 22  | A   |  |
| 2  |  | 59   | 20  | 25  | A   |  |
| 3  |  | 27   | 9   | 11  | C   |  |
| 4  |  | 73   | 23  | 32  | A   |  |
| 5  | Other strategies included: a) offered tutoring before and after school and on weekends; b) 4 week summer session on reading, language arts and math; c) improved student behaviors through school-wide positive behavioral supports and the addition of behavioral and family specialist positions; d) greater parent involvement including creation of a PTO, more collaboration with PTOs, and monthly curriculum workshops for parents; and e) improved school climate by upgrading facilities. | 66   | 22  | 30  | A   |  |
| 6 = Combo 1  | Strategies 1 and 2   | 43   | 15  | 19  | A   |  |
| 7 = Combo 2  | Strategies 1 and 3   | 27   | 9   | 11  | A   |  |
| 8 = Combo 3  | Strategies 2 and 3   | 26   | 9   | 11  | A   |  |
| <b>Comments: Although the most common positive outcome resulting from these strategies was Outcome A --improvement by at least 5 percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells--other positive outcomes reported by districts included decrease in disciplinary incidents, decrease in office referrals, increase in attendance, improvement in technology education, enhanced collaboration with public library, increase in the number of community partners and increase in teacher retention due to model classrooms.</b> |  |  |   |   |   |  |

Column 1 Response Options Box

- 1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
- 2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
- 3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.
- 5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
- 6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.
- 7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.
- 8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box

- A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells
- B = Increased teacher retention
- C = Improved parental involvement
- D = Other

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

#### 1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

In the space below, describe how your State shared the effective strategies identified in item 1.4.8.3 with its LEAs and schools. Please exclude newsletters and handouts in your description.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Tennessee shares the effective strategies listed in item 1.4.8.3 with the state's LEAs and schools in various ways. First, the state assigns one of its Exemplary Educators (EEs) through the statewide system of support to every school identified as in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. These external providers are provided specific training by the state's contractor, Edvantia, to provide technical assistance to the schools and districts. In addition, EEs meet frequently to discuss the strategies that are producing results in their assigned schools. They also have a special listserve in which they discuss these strategies with each and seek input from their fellow EEs.

Second, all districts are assigned state NCLB field service consultants to work with individual districts and their schools to implement NCLB programs effectively. This includes working with districts that have schools receiving Title I school improvement funds. While working with their schools, they share effective strategies that other schools have implemented using school improvement funds.

In addition, the State has provided two annual opportunities for districts with schools in improvement that receive funds to share their best practices with each other. First, the State annually provides an application and application process that districts with eligible schools complete to receive funds. To provide professional development to the districts on the application and the best use of the funds, the State holds a webex in which the districts share the most promising strategies that they have utilized in previous years funded by Title I improvement funds. Second, as part of the reporting process on the use of these funds, the State holds a webex for districts to understand how to report their performance and to share with each other again those strategies that have been most promising in improving student achievement that were funded by Title I school improvement funds.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

#### **1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds**

Note: New section for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

##### **1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2007 (SY 2007-08) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of ESEA and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of ESEA: 4.0 %

**Comments:**

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

#### 1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools

In the tables below, provide the requested information for FY 2007 (SY 2007-08).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter allocation data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.8.5.2 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

#### 1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of ESEA allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2007-08.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Tennessee reserved 5 percent of Section 1003(g) funds from its FY 07 grant; however, because the State did not receive the grant award for this program until January 2008, it did not utilize any of these funds until school year 2008-09. The current school year, the State is utilizing these funds for consolidated administration of NCLB programs. This includes the support of administering the Section 1003(g) funds and providing technical assistance to LEAs that receive these funds.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

**1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).**

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2007-08 that were supported by funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All identified schools in improvement, corrective action, and restructuring provided with intensive support (up to 100 days) from Tennessee's Statewide System of Support through its state-funded Exemplary Educator (EEs) program. EEs are specially trained retired educators that have been selected to provide the identified schools support in areas such as: revision of their school improvement plans, input on the use of Title I school improvement funds, professional development, parental involvement, data analysis, use of time, and curriculum.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB

83l.

#### 1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

##### 1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

##### 1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

- (1) Students currently enrolled in a school identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
- (2) Students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
- (3) Students who previously transferred under Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

|   | # Students |
|---|------------|
| Eligible for public school choice   | 63,894     |
| Applied to transfer   | 3,398      |
| Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions | 2,857      |

Indicate in the table below the categories of students that are included in the count of eligible students.

|   | Yes/No |
|---|--------|
| Enrolled in a school identified for improvement     | Yes    |
| Transferred in the current school year, only        | Yes    |
| Transferred in a prior year and in the current year | Yes    |
| <b>Comments:</b>                                    |        |

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

### 1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

|  | Amount       |
|--|--------------|
| Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice | \$ 2,064,279 |
| <b>Comments:</b>   |              |

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

### 1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice options to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice
3. LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable.

|   | # LEAs |
|---|--------|
| LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice   | 1      |
| <b>Comments: LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice.</b> |        |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### FAQs about public school choice:

*a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?*

An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:

- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
- Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
- Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.<sup>3</sup>

*b. How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)? For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.*

<sup>3</sup> Adapted from OESE/OII policy letter of August 2004. The policy letter may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/stateletters/choice/choice081804.html>.

### 1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

#### 1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA.

|  | # Students |
|--|------------|
| Eligible for supplemental educational services | 35,809     |
| Applied for supplemental educational services  | 4,539      |
| Received supplemental educational services     | 3,671      |
| <b>Comments:</b>                               |            |

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

#### 1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA.

|  | Amount       |
|--|--------------|
| Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services | \$ 3,327,958 |
| <b>Comments:</b>   |              |

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

## 1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA.

### 1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA) and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data. The percentages used for high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

| School Type            | # of Core Academic Classes (Total) | # of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified | Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified | # of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified | Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| All schools            | 187,787                            | 183,608  | 97.8  | 4,179  | 2.2   |
| Elementary level       |                                    |  |   |  |   |
| High-poverty schools   | 15,504                             | 15,209   | 98.1  | 295  | 1.9   |
| Low-poverty schools    | 28,826                             | 28,650   | 99.4  | 176  | 0.6   |
| All elementary schools | 95,235                             | 94,188   | 98.9  | 1,047  | 1.1   |
| Secondary level        |                                    |  |   |  |   |
| High-poverty schools   | 19,658                             | 18,517   | 94.2  | 1,141  | 5.8   |
| Low-poverty schools    | 27,130                             | 26,660   | 98.3  | 470  | 1.7   |
| All secondary schools  | 92,552                             | 89,420   | 96.6  | 3,132  | 3.4   |
| <b>Comments:</b>       |                                    |  |   |  |   |

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.

Yes

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Both... Some LEA's list each subject at the elementary level by a separate course code and others use a single course code for all subjects at a given grade level. This varies from one LEA to another and varies by grade level. (Upper elementary grades tend to be departmentalized more often than lower elementary grades.)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:**

- a. *What are the core academic subjects? English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.*
- b. *How is a teacher defined? An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]*
- c. *How is a class defined? A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].*
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category? States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.*
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes? States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.*
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes? Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.*
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*

**1.5.2 Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified**

In the table below, estimate the percentages for each of the reasons why teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided at each grade level are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes at a particular grade level are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, use the row labeled "other" and explain the additional reasons. The total of the reasons is calculated automatically for each grade level and must equal 100% at the elementary level and 100% at the secondary level.

**Note: Use the numbers of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified from 1.5.1 for both elementary school classes (1.5.2.1) and for secondary school classes (1.5.2.2) as your starting point.**

|  | Percentage |
|--|------------|
| Elementary School Classes  |            |
| Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE | 22.0       |
| Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE               | 70.0       |
| Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)  | 8.0        |
| Other (please explain in comment box below)  | 0.0        |
| Total  | 100.0      |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No comments...

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

|  | Percentage |
|--|------------|
|--|------------|

| Secondary School Classes   |       |
|--|-------|
| Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers) | 38.0  |
| Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects                              | 55.0  |
| Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)   | 7.0   |
| Other (please explain in comment box below)  | 0.0   |
| Total  | 100.0 |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No comments...

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

|                     | High-Poverty Schools (more than what %) | Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %) |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Elementary schools  | 79.3                                    | 47.0                                   |
| Poverty metric used | Free or Reduced Price Lunch Eligible    |  |
| Secondary schools   | 67.8                                    | 36.6                                   |
| Poverty metric used | Free or Reduced Price Lunch Eligible    |  |
| <b>Comments:</b>    |   |  |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *How are the poverty quartiles determined? Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.*
- b. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose? States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.*

## 1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

This section collects annual performance and accountability data on the implementation of Title III programs.

### 1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

#### Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>.**
2. **Other Language = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.**

| Check Types of Programs | Type of Program  | Other Language |
|-------------------------|--|----------------|
| No                      | Dual language  |                |
| No                      | Two-way immersion  |                |
| No                      | Transitional bilingual   |                |
| No                      | Developmental bilingual  |                |
| Yes                     | Heritage language  | Spanish        |
| Yes                     | Sheltered English instruction  |                |
| Yes                     | Structured English immersion   |                |
| Yes                     | Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE) |                |
| Yes                     | Content-based ESL  |                |
| Yes                     | Pull-out ESL   |                |
| Yes                     | Other (explain in comment box below)                                 |                |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

A few LEAs also use a push-in or inclusion model for ELLs.

TN is an English only state and does not have bilingual education for the ELLs.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

## 1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

### 1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State. LEP students are defined as all students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State ELP assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined in Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| Number of ALL LEP students in the State | 25,449 |
| <b>Comments:</b>                        |        |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of the number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

|  | #      |
|--|--------|
| LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year. | 28,244 |
| <b>Comments:</b>   |        |

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group ID 648, category set A.

### 1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

| Language   | # LEP Students |
|------------|----------------|
| Spanish    | 19,993         |
| Arabic     | 1,055          |
| Vietnamese | 547            |
| Kurdish    | 363            |
| Chinese    | 335            |

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Taken from the spring 2008 ELDA census provided through assessment contractor, Measurement Inc.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(b)(1).

#### 1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

|   | #      |
|---|--------|
| Number tested on State annual ELP assessment  | 25,449 |
| Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment  | 656    |
| Total   | 26,105 |
| <b>Comments: Because of migrant student fluctuation, incomplete assessments, student enrollment changes, student migration, the entire ELL population was not assessed during the testing window.</b> |        |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

#### 1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

|  | #     |
|--|-------|
| Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment  | 6,073 |
| Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment | 23.3  |
| <b>Comments:</b>   |       |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students participating in the annual State English language proficiency assessment.

|  |          |
|--|----------|
|  | <b>#</b> |
| Number tested on State annual ELP assessment   | 25,256   |
| Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment   | 651      |
| Total  | 25,907   |
| <b>Comments: The discrepancy relates to different reporting periods. The reporting period was school year for N116, which provided the count for 1.6.2.2. The reporting period for 1.6.3.2.1 was the ELDA test period during March 2008.</b> |          |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

In the table below, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

#### **Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

1. **Making Progress = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
2. **ELP Attainment = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
3. **Results = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.**

|  | <b>Results</b> |          |
|--|----------------|----------|
|  | <b>#</b>       | <b>%</b> |
| Making progress  | 10,700         | 78.3     |
| ELP attainment   | 5,997          | 52.5     |
| <b>Comments: For AMAO 1 (making progress), the calculation includes only students for whom we could match scores from the 2007 Spring ELP assessment with the 2006 Spring ELP assessment. For AMAO 2 (attainment), TN's cohort for the calculation includes only those students who were in ESL for 3 or more years or those who attained proficiency in fewer than three years.</b> |                |          |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

#### 1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

In the table below, check "yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

|   |    |
|---|----|
| State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s). | No |
| State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).           | No |
| State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).               | No |
| <b>Comments: TN is an English only state. All State assessments are in English.</b>             |    |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

#### 1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for NCLB accountability determinations for mathematics.

| Language(s)   |
|---|
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
| <b>Comments: TN is an English only state. All State assessments are in English.</b> |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for NCLB accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

| Language(s)   |
|---|
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
| <b>Comments:</b> TN is an English only state. All State assessments are in English. |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for NCLB accountability determinations for science.

| Language(s)   |
|---|
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
| <b>Comments:</b> TN is an English only state. All State assessments are in English. |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 83I.

### 1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

#### 1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

#### **Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **# Year One = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.**
2. **# Year Two = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.**
3. **Total = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.**

| # Year One       | # Year Two | Total |
|------------------|------------|-------|
| 5,845            | 3,933      | 9,778 |
| <b>Comments:</b> |            |       |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### 1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Mathematics

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

#### **Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

| # Tested         | # At or Above Proficient | % Results | # Below Proficient |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| 4,010            | 3,680                    | 91.8      | 330                |
| <b>Comments:</b> |                          |           |                    |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

#### Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

| # Tested         | # At or Above Proficient | % Results | # Below Proficient |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| 6,518            | 6,204                    | 95.2      | 314                |
| <b>Comments:</b> |                          |           |                    |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

#### Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

| # Tested         | # At or Above Proficient | % Results | # Below Proficient |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| 6,018            | 4,822                    | 80.1      | 1,196              |
| <b>Comments:</b> |                          |           |                    |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

#### 1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

**Note: Do not** include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) from funds reserved for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

|  | #  |
|--|----|
| Total number of subgrantees for the year   | 60 |
| Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs   | 36 |
| Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1   | 59 |
| Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2   | 39 |
| Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3   | 58 |
| Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs  | 0  |
| Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)                    | 4  |
| Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs                           | 4  |
| Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08) | 2  |
| <b>Comments:</b>   |    |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### 1.6.4.2 State Accountability

In the table below, indicate whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs.

**Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each** State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

| State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs   | Yes |
|--|-----|
| <p><b>Comments:</b> TN made all three Title III AMAOs. TN's 2007-08 benchmark for AMAO 1 was 58% - as indicated in 1.6.3.2.2, 78.3 % of LEP students made progress in acquiring English language proficiency. TN's 2007-08 benchmark for AMAO 2 was 47.8% - as indicated in 1.6.3.2.2, 52.5% of LEP students attained proficiency. (See 1.6.3.2.2 for an explanation of these calculations.) TN's benchmarks for AMAO 3, making AYP in RLA differ by grade span: 89% at the elementary/middle school level and 93% at the high school level. While LEP students fell short in both grade spans (57.4% at the elementary-middle level and 45.9% at the high school level), TN accountability rules provide that AYP is met when the percentage of students with below proficient scores decreases by 10% from the previous year. The LEP elementary-middle school subgroup made AYP in 2007-08 in RLA on this basis. Under TN accountability rules, all grade spans (elementary-middle and high school) must miss AYP in the same subject(RLA)for the state to fail to make AYP. Thus, TN made AMAO 3 in 2007-08.</p> <p>Applying the same benchmarks to Title III subgrantees yielded 36 meeting all three Title III AMAOs in 2007-08.</p> |     |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### 1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

| Were any Title III language instruction educational programs or activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?          | No |
|--|----|
| If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated. |    |

**Comments:**

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

## 1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

### 1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

#### **Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.**
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program = Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).**
3. **3114(d)(1) Subgrants = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III LIEP subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.**

| # Immigrant Students Enrolled | # Students in 3114(d)(1) Program | # of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 15,815                        | 5,997                            | 2                         |

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

## 1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

### 1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

**Note: Section 3301(8) – The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course – (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English and a second language.**

|   | #   |
|---|-----|
| Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.   | 725 |
| Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*. | 363 |

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

TN is growing with the ELL population about 10% per year. It is assumed that the teacher pool will need to grow accordingly.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

\* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

### 1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the table below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meets the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

#### **Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **Professional Development Topics = Subgrantee activities for professional development topics required under Title III.**
2. **# Subgrantees = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)**
3. **Total Number of Participants = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development (PD) activities reported.**
4. **Total = Number of all participants in PD activities.**

| <b>Type of Professional Development Activity</b>  | <b># Subgrantees</b> |                       |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Instructional strategies for LEP students   | 61                   |                       |
| Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students                                    | 54                   |                       |
| Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students | 51                   |                       |
| Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards         | 35                   |                       |
| Subject matter knowledge for teachers   | 47                   |                       |
| Other (Explain in comment box)  | 18                   |                       |
| <b>Participant Information</b>  | <b># Subgrantees</b> | <b># Participants</b> |
| PD provided to content classroom teachers   | 56                   | 8,308                 |
| PD provided to LEP classroom teachers   | 53                   | 1,828                 |
| PD provided to principals   | 44                   | 757                   |
| PD provided to administrators/other than principals   | 50                   | 796                   |
| PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative  | 38                   | 1,075                 |
| PD provided to community based organization personnel   | 24                   | 885                   |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>61</b>            | <b>13,649</b>         |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other professional development topics included data management, data collection, SIOP, Special Education issues for ELLs, site visits, differentiation, teaching strategies.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

## 1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

### 1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

#### **Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:**

1. **Date State Received Allocation = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).**
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees = Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.**
3. **# of Days/\$\$ Distribution = Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.**

Example: State received SY 2007-08 funds July 1, 2007, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2007, for SY 2007-08 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

| <b>Date State Received Allocation</b>  | <b>Date Funds Available to Subgrantees</b> | <b># of Days/\$\$ Distribution</b> |
|--|--|------------------------------------|
| 07/07/08   | 07/18/08                                   | 11                                 |
| <b>Comments: The State awards the money when received. When the money is set up on TN's Federal Accounting Consolidated Tracking System (FACTS), it is available to the LEAs within 7-11 days.</b> |  |                                    |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State of TN is working to move the money quicker than the expected 7-11 days. Occassionally the money reaches the LEA quicker than the expected 7 day minimum.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

|                                | # |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Persistently Dangerous Schools | 0 |
| <b>Comments:</b>               |   |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

## 1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

### 1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the previous school year (SY 2006-07). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

| Student Group                     | Graduation Rate |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|
| All Students                      | 81.8            |
| American Indian or Alaska Native  | 76.7            |
| Asian or Pacific Islander         | 90.4            |
| Black, non-Hispanic               | 71.6            |
| Hispanic                          | 73.1            |
| White, non-Hispanic               | 85.6            |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) |                 |
| Limited English proficient        |                 |
| Economically disadvantaged        |                 |
| Migratory students                |                 |
| Male                              | 78.2            |
| Female                            | 85.5            |

**Comments: We cannot yet send graduation rates for Children with Disabilities, LEP student, disadvantaged students or migratory students because we don't yet have 4 years of individual student data. We should have it by 2009-10. Our Native American population is very small. Because of this the graduation rate bounces around a bit.**

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

#### FAQs on graduation rates:

- a. *What is the graduation rate? Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:*
  - The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
  - Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
  - Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates? For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.*

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Starting in 2006-07 we started collecting individual data on student progress through high school, compiling a 2009-10 cohort, which we will use as the denominator of the graduation rate in 2009-10.

### 1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the previous school year (SY 2006-07). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

| Student Group  | Dropout Rate |
|--|--------------|
| All Students   | 3.0          |
| American Indian or Alaska Native   | 3.7          |
| Asian or Pacific Islander  | 2.1          |
| Black, non-Hispanic  | 5.3          |
| Hispanic   | 4.7          |
| White, non-Hispanic  | 2.1          |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA)  |              |
| Limited English proficient   |              |
| Economically disadvantaged   |              |
| Migratory students   |              |
| Male   | 3.5          |
| Female   | 2.5          |
| <b>Comments: We did not divide out Disabled, LEP, Disadvantaged or Migratory students in 2006-07. We will have breakouts for LEP and disabled students for 2008-09</b> |              |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### FAQ on dropout rates:

*What is a dropout? A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State-or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State-or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.*

### 1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

In the table below, provide the following information about the number of LEAs in the State who reported data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be will be automatically calculated.

|                        | #   | # LEAs Reporting Data |
|------------------------|-----|-----------------------|
| LEAs without subgrants | 125 | 125                   |
| LEAs with subgrants    | 15  | 15                    |
| Total                  | 140 | 140                   |
| <b>Comments:</b>       |     |                       |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants)

The following questions collect data on homeless children and youths in the State.

#### 1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

| Age/Grade                          | # of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants | # of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 41  | 261  |
| K                                  | 162   | 829  |
| 1                                  | 158   | 748  |
| 2                                  | 145   | 763  |
| 3                                  | 130   | 580  |
| 4                                  | 108   | 534  |
| 5                                  | 107   | 501  |
| 6                                  | 97  | 417  |
| 7                                  | 75  | 407  |
| 8                                  | 85  | 342  |
| 9                                  | 72  | 441  |
| 10                                 | 55  | 293  |
| 11                                 | 59  | 211  |
| 12                                 | 60  | 189  |
| Ungraded                           | 10  | 151  |
| Total                              | 1,364   | 6,667  |
| <b>Comments:</b>                   |   |  |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### 1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

|   | # of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants | # of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants |
|---|--|---|
| Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care                                    | 147  | 1,516   |
| Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)   | 1,046  | 4,416   |
| Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings) | 69   | 159   |
| Hotels/Motels   | 102  | 576   |
| Total   | 1,364  | 6,667   |
| <b>Comments:</b>  |  |   |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

#### 1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

| Age/Grade                          | # Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 262  |
| K                                  | 815  |
| 1                                  | 744  |
| 2                                  | 669  |
| 3                                  | 582  |
| 4                                  | 537  |
| 5                                  | 505  |
| 6                                  | 407  |
| 7                                  | 394  |
| 8                                  | 330  |
| 9                                  | 434  |
| 10                                 | 290  |
| 11                                 | 200  |
| 12                                 | 167  |
| Ungraded                           | 51   |
| Total                              | 6,387  |
| <b>Comments:</b>                   |  |

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

#### 1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

|                                     | # Homeless Students Served |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Unaccompanied youth                 | 205                        |
| Migratory children/youth            | 22                         |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA)   | 742                        |
| Limited English proficient students | 238                        |
| <b>Comments:</b>                    |                            |

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

### 1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

|   | # McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer |
|---|---|
| Tutoring or other instructional support                       | 14                                      |
| Expedited evaluations   | 6                                       |
| Staff professional development and awareness                  | 12                                      |
| Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services      | 12                                      |
| Transportation  | 13                                      |
| Early childhood programs                                      | 6                                       |
| Assistance with participation in school programs              | 12                                      |
| Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs             | 12                                      |
| Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment    | 12                                      |
| Parent education related to rights and resources for children | 12                                      |
| Coordination between schools and agencies                     | 14                                      |
| Counseling  | 9                                       |
| Addressing needs related to domestic violence                 | 11                                      |
| Clothing to meet a school requirement                         | 14                                      |
| School supplies   | 15                                      |
| Referral to other programs and services                       | 13                                      |
| Emergency assistance related to school attendance             | 11                                      |
| Other (optional – in comment box below)                       |   |
| Other (optional – in comment box below)                       |   |
| Other (optional – in comment box below)                       |   |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual input by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youths.

|                                       | # Subgrantees Reporting |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Eligibility for homeless services     | 0                       |
| School Selection                      | 0                       |
| Transportation                        | 4                       |
| School records                        | 1                       |
| Immunizations                         | 1                       |
| Other medical records                 | 0                       |
| Other Barriers – in comment box below | 5                       |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of homeless children and youths served by McKinney-Vento subgrants.

#### 1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths served who were tested on the State NCLB reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for NCLB.

| Grade            | # Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test | # Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient |
|------------------|--|---|
| 3                | 447  | 340   |
| 4                | 399  | 309   |
| 5                | 385  | 322   |
| 6                | 321  | 257   |
| 7                | 306  | 236   |
| 8                | 264  | 201   |
| High School      | 454  | 255   |
| <b>Comments:</b> |  |   |

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

#### 1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State NCLB mathematics assessment.

| Grade            | # Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test | # Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient |
|------------------|--|---|
| 3                | 450  | 316   |
| 4                | 399  | 297   |
| 5                | 386  | 291   |
| 6                | 323  | 238   |
| 7                | 304  | 226   |
| 8                | 264  | 177   |
| High School      | 466  | 218   |
| <b>Comments:</b> |  |   |

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

## 1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them in Section 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes.

**Note: In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false Statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.**

### FAQs on Child Count:

*How is "out-of-school" defined? Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.*

*How is "ungraded" defined? Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)*

### 1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

| <b>Age/Grade</b>                   | <b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes</b> |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 316  |
| K                                  | 148  |
| 1                                  | 167  |
| 2                                  | 151  |
| 3                                  | 125  |
| 4                                  | 121  |
| 5                                  | 94   |
| 6                                  | 115  |
| 7                                  | 90   |
| 8                                  | 82   |
| 9                                  | 86   |
| 10                                 | 94   |
| 11                                 | 54   |
| 12                                 | 42   |
| Ungraded                           | 0  |
| Out-of-school                      | 1,693  |
| Total                              | 3,378  |
| <b>Comments:</b>                   |  |

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

### 1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Several areas of TN continued to experience drought in the summer months for a second year in a row. This has affected our farmers' choices of crops and harvesting methods. The continued drought as well as farmers' choices have resulted in a decrease in the number of migrant farm workers needed. For example, one of our largest tomato farms in East TN, has now chosen to harvest only green tomatoes rather than only red. Harvesting of green tomatoes can be done mechanically without additional farm hands and can be accomplished prior to full effects of drought setting in.

Our numbers were also decreased as a result of two separate immigration raids in our poultry processing plants, one in Chattanooga and another in Springfield. These raids resulted in the displacement of many of our migrant families.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

| <b>Age/Grade</b>                   | <b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b> |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 116  |
| K                                  | 60   |
| 1                                  | 72   |
| 2                                  | 35   |
| 3                                  | 36   |
| 4                                  | 28   |
| 5                                  | 38   |
| 6                                  | 25   |
| 7                                  | 31   |
| 8                                  | 30   |
| 9                                  | 36   |
| 10                                 | 31   |
| 11                                 | 11   |
| 12                                 | N<10   |
| Ungraded                           | 0  |
| Out-of-school                      | 67   |
| Total                              | 621  |
| <b>Comments:</b>                   |  |

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

### 1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In TN we have tried to focus on increasing the number of services provided to migrant families during the summer. This direct focus has helped our programs to design coordinated services for more of our migrant population. Tennessee has limited resources to meet the needs of our migrant families. Across the state, we have traditionally offered summer programs in areas with larger concentrations of migrant families to best use our migrant funds. We have always tried to offer intensive programs that last throughout the school year or for 4 or more weeks in the summer. The challenge comes when, regardless of the efforts the program makes, some of the students will not come to summer school. In the 2007-2008 program year we initiated more efforts to bring the program to the children. We spent more time working with parents and children together by doing more outreach type services. For example, we 1)held ELL night classes for parents, children, and out of school youth and provided impromptu ELL classes for the whole family and/or youth as we made home visits. 2) This year we held a health fair in one area to get more information about pre-natal screenings-and health and nutrition. 3)We began working with iPods. We put English classes on iPods and set up an iPod exchange program. 4)We held more RIF book distributions across the state. 5) We encouraged recruiters to follow up on referrals made to families regarding available resources to see if our efforts to inform families were also leading to more families enrolling in community programs. 6)Finally, we asked our districts to try to expand their services to reach more students than they were typically reaching. All of these efforts helped us increase the number of students that received educational services.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following question requests information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

#### 1.10.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

TN state count for both Category 1 and Category 2 were generated from MIS2000 as in years past.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

In the space below, respond to the following questions: How was the child count data collected? What data were collected? What activities were conducted to collect the data? When were the data collected for use in the student information system? If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For Category I, when approved Certificates of Eligibility are received, school age (pK-12) migrants are compared to lists of students from the State's student information database. This information is used to confirm grade and verify school enrollment information and to verify accuracy of Qualifying Arrival Date. This data is collected throughout the year. The COE is entered into the MIS 2000 Database. In order to prevent duplications, the migrant's name is checked against the existing enrollment and then the birth date is checked in case of spelling differences. Once the information has been entered, lists are printed that include all the enrolled migrants by county and/or district. These lists are sorted alphabetically. Monthly, copies of the lists are forwarded to the district for confirmation of the data. Should there be differences in grade and/or school information, this is corrected within the database. Data is collected throughout the program year.

Both face-to-face and phone interviews are conducted to collect information for the COE. It is often more cost effective in rural areas that are long distances from a regional recruiter for COE's to be filled out over the phone. The interview questions and process are the same for both situations. If a recruiter has direct access to a family and is close enough to visit them, they will fill out the COE face-to-face. When direct access to a family is not practical, it is filled out over the phone. The COE is still sent in for approval. All COE's are reviewed for accuracy and a portion of the certificates are re-interviewed over the phone. The text and characters listed in Box 3 show the specific filters that are in the reporting process to ensure that only those eligible to be counted in Category I are listed. Category 2 counts are collected by service log information. All programs and recruiters must document services provided to migrant families or youth on a service log. These logs are collected and then entered into the database as previously mentioned.

The child count data for the Category 2 count is collected through service logs submitted by the program areas regarding the services provided to migrant students. These logs were submitted for entry into the MIS 2000 database where the services are coded and recorded. We also collect data on services provided during the regular school year. Enrollments for the regular school year are given a code of R, P or G. Enrollments for summer term or intersession are given a code of S, T or L. Data is collected throughout the program year.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data entry specialist enters the COE information for migrant students into MIS 2000 upon receipt of the COE. When we are informed by school districts or parents of information that needs to be updated such as grade level, enrollment dates, address, etc., the changes are made in the database. From this information, we are able to use existing reports or create new reports to organize child counts by district, county, or state totals.

For reporting purposes, MSED has created several reports that print out information necessary for the CSPR. The information compiled in the report is checked monthly to maintain accuracy (our reports are called an Overview for Count Accuracy and 12 Month Contact Report for a complete list by district). The report looks for migrants between the ages of 3 and 22 years that have enrolled between the start and end date of the program year. The list is then sorted by grade. Our checks and balances include exporting the information to Excel and manually sorting the information.

If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Category I and Category 2 counts are collected and maintained in the same manner.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, respond to the following question: How was each child count calculated? Please describe the compilation process and edit functions that are built into your student information system(s) specifically to produce an accurate child count. In particular, describe how your system includes and counts only:

- children who were between age 3 through 21;
- children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);
- children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31);
- children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term; and
- children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The following has been copied directly from MIS2000's to show what filters and mechanisms are in place to ensure that only eligible children are calculated in the child count.

First the database looks specifically at the qualifying arrival date to ensure that it is after the program year startdate of Sept 1.

School History.QA3Date >= !StartDate

It then selects students that have a 22nd birthday after the start date and a 3rd birthday after the startdate.

((Student.TwentySecondBDay >= !StartDate) and(Student.ThirdBDay <= !EndDate))

It then checks to ensure that if the student had a withdrawal date since they have moved that it is between the program start date (Sept 1) and the end date (Aug 31st) of the program year.

((School History.WithdrawDate is between !StartDate and !EndDate) or (School History.EnrollDate is between !StartDate and !EndDate))

The !StartDate is 9/1/2007 and the !EndDate is 8/31/2008.

We run a query report to ensure that there are no duplicates. We use the same criteria for category 2 students except the database pulls data regarding what type of enrollment the student has.

The School History.TermType <> N indicates that only qualifying migrants are selected. P, G and R, are considered regular year enrollment

types and S, T, and L are Summer or Intersession enrollments. This letter is assigned based on the types of enrollment and service the student has recieved.

The above report specifically selects "P, G or R" enrollment types and omits "S, T and L" enrollment types. For Summer Intersession the report looks only for those students that have an enrollment type of S, T or L (which are students who have recieved services in the summer)

((School History.Type <> S) and (School History.Type <> T) and (School History.Type <> L) and (((School History.Type = P) or (School History.Type = R) or (School History.Type = G))))

((School History.TermType <> N) or (SchoolHistory.TermType is null))

In order to ensure unduplicated counts, a Variable is attached to the formatted report that looks for duplicated students (it specifically looks for students with the same student sequence) and suppresses their count to one for the final count. The actual report contains two columns, one duplicated and one unduplicated. We use the unduplicated data for the CSPR.

If your State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please describe each system separately.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

State category 2 count was generated using the same system as for Category 1 students.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following question: What steps are taken to ensure your State properly determines and verifies the eligibility of each child included in the child counts for the reporting period of September 1 through August 31 before that child's data are included in the student information system(s)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Student eligibility is based on data collected on our state COE, the verification and or re-interview of that information, and the approval process for COE's. COE's are submitted weekly by recruiters. These are subsequently reviewed by the state ID&R coordinator and entered in the pool for re-interviews. All of our re-interviews have been conducted before COE's are entered into the state database, thus trying to ensure the accuracy of the information before the student is entered in the program files.

COE's are checked when they are entered into the database for duplication. A search is conducted before entering the COE to determine if information for a specific child has already been entered. A duplication report is used to ensure that child count information in the database is un-duplicated. Any duplication is corrected before the report is submitted. Also at the end of the year, a hand review is conducted of all counties. This review looks at all lists of migrant students compared with the COE's in file. We also review all students that moved intrastate to ensure that they are only counted once in the child count.

After COEs have been entered into the database, a report is run to ascertain accuracy of spelling and data. Monthly reports are forwarded to LEAs listing all identified migrants in their districts. Errors are reported back to the data entry specialist and corrected. Twice a year an internal audit is completed. During the audit, a report is printed that contains every migrant enrolled in the program for the program year. This report is then compared against the physical COE. This procedure catches duplications, omissions, and errors.

Monthly reports are exported to Excel and the information is analyzed for priority, duplication, and accuracy of entering. All of the newly enrolled migrants are highlighted allowing further inspection of the entry.

The supervisor of the data entry specialist also has a copy of the database and refers to it frequently, providing another source of audit.

Another step taken by the staff to verify the child count is an audit of the whole year just prior to the submission to USDOE. This audit is a comparison of each hard copy COE to the information stored in the database.

Finally, during the preparation of the figures for reporting, not only does the database produce the count of students per grade but a complete listing of enrolled migrants is sorted in Excel and compared to the computer-generated count.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

When COE's are sent to the state recruiter coordinator for weekly review, she reviews each one to look for anything that could be considered a "red flag". She looks at the QAD and birthdates of children, the type of activity listed, where families came from, addresses, birthdates etc. She pulls every COE that has anything that doesn't look totally correct. She also pulls 10% of all COE's for the re-interview process. If during the process a COE is found to be in-eligible, all COE's submitted by the recruiter at that time are also re-interviewed.

Before COE's are approved and sent to the data entry specialist, a re-interview is conducted on 10% of the COE's. This involves re-contacting migrant families by phone or face-to-face and conducting a re-interview. If errors are found, these COE's are not submitted for entry into the database until the errors are corrected. In the event that the family or youth is deemed not eligible, the information is not entered into the database.

For the re-interview process the information of the COE such as name, address, phone number and student names are sent to the re-interviewer in an excel file. The re-interviewer then recontacts the family and conducts an interview over the phone. The information obtained from the re-interviewer is then compared to the original information submitted on the COE. If discrepancies are found the recruiter is notified and the COE is pulled from the list of eligible COE's. Once this process has been completed on at least 10 percent of the COE's they are again reviewed and approved and submitted to the data entry specialist. When new recruiters start more than 25-30 percent of their COE's are re-interviewed to ensure they understand the eligibility requirements.

A log is kept of all re-interviews and their results. If a family is found to be in-eligible, a discussion is held with the recruiter about the results of the re-interview. If a recruiter has additional information to provide regarding a specific eligibility case, they are given the chance to submit that information. If they do not have additional information, we consider the youth or family to be in-eligible for the program.

During the training process for recruiters, they are given specific instruction regarding eligibility requirements through a thorough review of the eligibility section in the Draft Regulatory Guidance. Upon completion of this, training recruiters are given a 90-question recruitment test that lists 90 different situations that the guidance covers. The recruiters must take the test until they complete all 90 questions accurately. We have found this to be an effective way to ensure that the new recruiters understand how to apply all of the eligibility criteria to the different situations they can encounter when recruiting. During the training recruiters also are given 5 questionnaires developed through the ConQIR consortium that they use as eligibility scripts when they are conducting interviews to ensure that we all asking the same eligibility questions and assessing eligibility on the same criteria. A recruiter then is given in-the-field training by an experienced trainer. They spend 1-2 days The re-interviewers are given the same instruction as the recruiters and use a set of eligibility scripts very similar to those used by the initial recruiters.

All recruiters are required to send in a daily email of what they accomplish each day. This includes what activities they did, where they went, who they qualified, etc. Recruiters are not assessed on the number of COE's they fill out but rather their accuracy in obtaining information, their ability to canvass a community to find all eligible families, how well they can establish a rapport with families, and how well they can organize their time. A review of their emails each day helps our program ensure that we are working in a focused and balanced way to find all of the eligible families in the state.

Due to the daily email, recruiters have contact with their supervisor on a daily basis. Any questions they have are addressed and training is ongoing through that contact to ensure that all are aware of the program requirements and their responsibilities.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and—for systems that merge data—consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Audits are conducted at various times of the year comparing lists of migrant students with the COE's on file. In addition, districts are asked to review the accuracy of the data on their student lists when the monthly reports are distributed to the districts and report any discrepancies to the data entry specialist.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED? The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For the A1 count a final audit is completed at the end of the year comparing report information generated from MIS 2000 and the actual paper COE's contained in program files.

All service log data with information regarding program services is reviewed by the state coordinator and the data entry specialist before entry into the database for the A2 count. Information is then reviewed again after it has been entered into the database.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We will continue to work to design training for program staff and recruiters that meets their needs to ensure that correct eligibility determinations are made upon recruitment of migrant families.

A monthly list of new migrant students is currently submitted to the State. In conjunction with this, we will begin submission of a list that

reflects the entire migrant population of the State each month. This statewide list will be compared to the list of migrant students flagged in our State database for accuracy.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.