

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 ED Facts 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-HLP-EDEN (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 X 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

Tuesday, May 5, 2009, 3:55:12 PM

Signature Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART II**

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08



**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 27, 2009
5PM EST**

2.1 IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE I, PART A)

This section collects data on Title I, Part A programs.

2.1.1 Student Achievement in Schools with Title I, Part A Programs

The following sections collect data on student academic achievement on the State's NCLB assessments in schools that receive Title I, Part A funds and operate either Schoolwide programs or Targeted Assistance programs.

2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students in SWP schools who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, in grades 3 through 8 and high school, on the State's NCLB mathematics assessments under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Also, provide the number of those students who scored at or above proficient. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	44,051	37,615	85.4
4	42,541	37,351	87.8
5	39,398	36,252	92.0
6	28,386	25,234	88.9
7	26,184	22,726	86.8
8	25,761	22,221	86.3
High School	17,598	10,037	57.0
Total	223,919	191,436	85.5
Comments:			

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

2.1.1.2 Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

This section is similar to 2.1.1.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on performance on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment in SWP.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	44,001	39,394	89.5
4	42,470	37,646	88.6
5	39,340	36,925	93.9
6	28,332	25,946	91.6
7	26,149	22,906	87.6
8	25,716	23,538	91.5
High School	12,009	10,618	88.4
Total	218,017	196,973	90.3
Comments:			

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

2.1.1.3 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS)

In the table below, provide the number of all students in TAS who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, in grades 3 through 8 and high school, on the State's NCLB mathematics assessments under Section 1111(b) (3) of ESEA. Also, provide the number of those students who scored at or above proficient. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	6,307	5,778	91.6
4	6,054	5,558	91.8
5	5,092	4,812	94.5
6	3,781	3,546	93.8
7	3,627	3,304	91.1
8	3,739	3,423	91.5
High School	321	224	69.8
Total	28,921	26,645	92.1
Comments:			

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

2.1.1.4 Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS)

This section is similar to 2.1.1.3. The only difference is that this section collects data on performance on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment by all students in TAS.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	6,302	5,913	93.8
4	6,047	5,614	92.8
5	5,086	4,913	96.6
6	3,778	3,623	95.9
7	3,623	3,355	92.6
8	3,736	3,566	95.4
High School	250	228	91.2
Total	28,822	27,212	94.4
Comments:			

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

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

The following sections collect data on students participating in Title I, Part A by various student characteristics.

2.1.2.1 Student Participation in Public Title I, Part A by Special Services or Programs

In the table below, provide the number of public school students served by either Public Title I SWP or TAS programs at any time during the regular school year for each category listed. Count each student only once in each category even if the student participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State. Count each student in as many of the categories that are applicable to the student. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. Do not include the following individuals: (1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	63,462
Limited English proficient students	20,582
Students who are homeless	5,423
Migratory students	1,006
Comments:	

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X037 that is data group 548, category sets B, C, D and E.

2.1.2.2 Student Participation in Public Title I, Part A by Racial/Ethnic Group

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of public school students served by either public Title I SWP or TAS at any time during the regular school year. Each student should be reported in only one racial/ethnic category. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. The total number of students served will be calculated automatically.

Do not include: (1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	729
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,805
Black, non-Hispanic	160,208
Hispanic	26,388
White, non-Hispanic	224,784
Total	415,914
Comments:	

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X037 that is data group 548, category set A.

2.1.2.3 Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students participating in Title I, Part A programs by grade level and by type of program: Title I public targeted assistance programs (Public TAS), Title I schoolwide programs (Public SWP), private school students participating in Title I programs (private), and Part A local neglected programs (local neglected). The totals column by type of program will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age 0-2	0	0	0	0	0
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	2,171	7,740	40	0	9,951
K	1,616	46,339	103	N<10	48,059
1	2,204	46,577	155	0	48,936
2	1,843	44,556	126	N<10	46,526
3	1,652	44,266	138	N<10	46,062
4	1,344	42,839	115	N<10	44,305
5	980	39,620	106	N<10	40,712
6	524	28,614	103	12	29,253
7	548	26,536	81	62	27,227
8	506	26,008	20	109	26,643
9	18	13,882	N<10	277	14,184
10	43	11,590	N<10	184	11,822
11	10	10,008	N<10	109	10,128
12	N<10	9,224	N<10	100	9,330
Ungraded	0	4,652	0	22	4,674
TOTALS	13,463	402,451	1,002	896	417,812
Comments:					

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X134, that is data group 670, category set A.

2.1.2.4 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services

The following sections request data about the participation of students in TAS.

2.1.2.4.1 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional Services

In the table below, provide the number of students receiving each of the listed instructional services through a TAS program funded by Title I, Part A. Students may be reported as receiving more than one instructional service. However, students should be reported only once for each instructional service regardless of the frequency with which they received the service.

	# Students Served
Mathematics	6,267
Reading/language arts	11,288
Science	454
Social studies	454
Vocational/career	41
Other instructional services	465
Comments:	

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X036 that is data group 549, category set A.

2.1.2.4.2 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Support Services

In the table below, provide the number of students receiving each of the listed support services through a TAS program funded by Title I, Part A. Students may be reported as receiving more than one support service. However, students should be reported only once for each support service regardless of the frequency with which they received the service.

	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	226
Supporting guidance/advocacy	226
Other support services	383
Comments:	

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X036, that is data group 549, category set B.

2.1.3 Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs (TAS)

In the table below, provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff funded by a Title I, Part A TAS in each of the staff categories. For staff who work with both TAS and SWP, report only the FTE attributable to their TAS responsibilities.

For paraprofessionals only, provide the percentage of paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of ESEA.

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	319.30	
Paraprofessionals ¹	320.97	100.0
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ²	1.30	
Clerical support staff	28.50	
Administrators (non-clerical)	17.40	
Comments:		

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

FAQs on staff information

- a. *What is a "paraprofessional?" An employee of an LEA who provides instructional support in a program supported with Title I, Part A funds. Instructional support includes the following activities:*
 - (1) Providing one-on-one tutoring for eligible students, if the tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher;
 - (2) Providing assistance with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials;
 - (3) Providing assistance in a computer laboratory;
 - (4) Conducting parental involvement activities;
 - (5) Providing support in a library or media center;
 - (6) Acting as a translator; or
 - (7) Providing instructional services to students.
- b. *What is an "other paraprofessional?" Paraprofessionals who do not provide instructional support, for example, paraprofessionals who are translators or who work with parental involvement or computer assistance.*
- c. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional? A paraprofessional who has (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and been able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>.*

1 Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

2 Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(e).

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

In the table below, provide the number of FTE paraprofessionals who served in SWP and the percentage of these paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of ESEA. Use the additional guidance found below the previous table.

	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals3	2,323.80	97.0
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. 3 Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

2.2 WILLIAM F. GOODLING EVEN START FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAMS (TITLE I, PART B, SUBPART 3)

2.2.1 Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants

For the reporting program year July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008, please provide the following information:

2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants	16
Comments: FY2006-07 - 18 sites FY2005-06 - 30 sites	

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

2.2.1.2 Even Start Families Participating During the Year

In the table below, provide the number of participants for each of the groups listed below. The following terms apply:

1. "Participating" means enrolled and participating in all four core instructional components.
2. "Adults" includes teen parents.
3. For continuing children, calculate the age of the child on July 1, 2007. For newly enrolled children, calculate their age at the time of enrollment in Even Start.

4. Do not use rounding rules. The total number of participating children will be calculated automatically.

	# Participants
1. Families participating	263
2. Adults participating	267
3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (Adult English Learners)	22
4. Participating children	373
a. Birth through 2 years	129
b. Age 3 through 5	166
c. Age 6 through 8	78
c. Above age 8	0
Comments:	

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

2.2.1.3 Characteristics of Newly Enrolled Families at the Time of Enrollment

In the table below, provide the number of newly enrolled families for each of the groups listed below. The term "newly enrolled family" means a family who enrolls for the first time in the Even Start project or who had previously been in Even Start and re-enrolls during the year.

	#
1. Number of newly enrolled families	93
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	95
3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level at the time of enrollment	93
4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	90
5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade at the time of enrollment	59
Comments:	

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

2.2.1.4 Retention of Families

In the table below, provide the number of families who are newly enrolled, those who exited the program during the year, and those continuing in the program. For families who have exited, count the time between the family's start date and exit date. For families continuing to participate, count the time between the family's start date and the end of the reporting year (June 30, 2008). For families who had previously exited Even Start and then enrolled during the reporting year, begin counting from the time of the family's original enrollment date. Report each family only once in lines 1-4. Note enrolled families means a family who is participating in all four core instructional components. The total number of families participating will be automatically calculated.

Time in Program	#
1. Number of families enrolled 90 days or less	4
2. Number of families enrolled more than 90 but less than 180 days or less	18
3. Number of families enrolled more than 180 days but 365 days or less	73
4. Number of families enrolled more than 365 days	168
5. Total families enrolled	263
Comments:	

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

2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

This section collects data about the federal Even Start Performance Indicators.

In the space below, provide any explanatory information necessary for understanding the data provided in this section on performance indicators.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Further reduction of funding has imposed additional constraints on programs. All programs are represented in the data. However, we do realize improvements could be made in the percentage of participant outcomes data reported. All efforts will be made to improve the situation in 2008-09. In particular:

- 1) During the Spring 2009 state meeting, local evaluators and contracted database professionals will meet to more clearly define the performance indicators which are necessary and/or required for the FY 2008-09 CSPR.
- 2) Individual advisory sessions are scheduled with each site to re-define assessment and data entry requirements.
- 3) A goal has been set to achieve at least 70% representativeness of the outcome data for 2008-09

Adult attendance (some adults participated in more than one educational activity):

-Out of 267 adults served during 2007-08, 80 exited prior to June 30, 2008.

-96 adults attended ABE and/or ELL classes

-26 adults attended regular or adult high school

-26 adults attended postsecondary education programs (2-or 4-year colleges)

-58 adults attended job skills and/or vocational classes

-127 adults were employed (65 of them also participated in one or more educational activity)

-222 adults attended Parent Education and PACT classes

2.2.2.1 Adults Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

In the table below, provide the number of adults who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading. To be counted under "pre-and post-test", an individual must have completed both the pre-and post-tests.

The definition of "significant learning gains" for adult education is determined by your State's adult education program in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE).

These instructions/definitions apply to both 2.2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2. Note:

Do not include the Adult English Learners counted in 2.2.2.2.

	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE	52	28	Gain -1 NRS level
CASAS	0	0	
Other	0	0	
Comments:			

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

2.2.2.2 Adult English Learners Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

In the table below, provide the number of Adult English Learners who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading.

	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
BEST	16	12	Gain -1 NRS level
CASAS	0	0	
TABE	0	0	
Other	0	0	
Comments:			

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

2.2.2.3 Adults Earning a High School Diploma or GED

In the table below, provide the number of school-age and non-school age adults who earned a high school diploma or GED during the reporting year.

The following terms apply:

1. "School-age adults" is defined as any parent attending an elementary or secondary school. This also includes those adults within the State's compulsory attendance range who are being served in an alternative school setting, such as directly through the Even Start program.
2. "Non-school-age" adults are any adults who do not meet the definition of "school-age."
3. Include only the number of adult participants who had a realistic goal of earning a high school diploma or GED. Note that age limitations on taking the GED differ by State, so you should include only those adult participants for whom attainment of a GED or high school diploma is a possibility.

School-Age Adults	# with goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	18	10	
GED	N<10	0	
Other	0	0	
Comments:			

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

Non-School-Age Adults	# with goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	N<10	N<10	
GED	33	16	
Other	0	0	
Comments:			

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

2.2.2.4 Children Age-Eligible for Kindergarten Who Are Achieving Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Language Development

In the table below, provide the number of children who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development.

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year who have been in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took both a pre-and post-test with at least 6 months of Even Start service in between.
3. A "significant learning gain" is considered to be a standard score increase of 4 or more points.
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children who could not take the test (based on the practice items) due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.

	# Age-Eligible	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	69	31	24	N<10	
PPVT-IV	0	0	0	0	
TVIP	0	0	0	0	
Comments:					

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

2.2.2.4.1 Children Age-Eligible for Kindergarten Who Demonstrate Age-Appropriate Oral Language Skills

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year who have been in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took the PPVT-III or TVIP in the spring of the reporting year.
3. # who met goal includes children who score a Standard Score of 85 or higher on the spring PPVT-III
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children who could not take the test (based on the practice items) due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.

Note: Projects may use the PPVT-III or the PPVT-IV if the PPVT-III is no longer available, but results for the two versions of the assessment should be reported separately.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	69	23	21	N<10	Eleven children left various programs before January 1, 2008.
PPVT-IV	0	0	0	0	
TVIP	0	0	0	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.

2.2.2.5 The Average Number of Letters Children Can Identify as Measured by the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year who have been in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask in the spring of 2008.
3. The term "average number of letters" includes the average score for the children in your State who participated in this assessment. This should be provided as a weighted average (An example of how to calculate a weighted average is included in the program training materials) and rounded to one decimal.
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children exempted from testing due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Exempted	Average Number of Letters (Weighted Average)	Explanation (if applicable)
PALS PreK Upper Case	69	22	0	21.7	Eleven children left various programs before January 1, 2008.
Comments:					

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

2.2.2.6 School-Aged Children Reading on Grade Level

In the table below, provide the number of school-age children who read on or above grade level ("met goal"). The source of these data is usually determined by the State and, in some cases, by school district. Please indicate the source(s) of the data in the "Explanation" field.

Grade	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (include source of data)
K	31	30	Teacher and school reports
1	36	32	Teacher and school reports
2	16	14	Teacher and school reports
3	18	16	Teacher and school reports
Comments:			

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

2.2.2.7 Parents Who Show Improvement on Measures of Parental Support for Children's Learning in the Home, School Environment, and Through Interactive Learning Activities

In the table below, provide the number of parents who show improvement ("met goal") on measures of parental support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities.

While many states are using the PEP, other assessments of parenting education are acceptable. Please describe results and the source(s) of any non-PEP data in the "Other" field, with appropriate information in the Explanation field.

	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
PEP Scale I	75	38	Post-tested earlier than 6 months: 20/32
PEP Scale II	75	41	Post-tested earlier than 6 months: 23/33
PEP Scale III	72	34	Post-tested earlier than 6 months: 28/32
PEP Scale IV	73	40	Post-tested earlier than 6 months: 25/34
Other	0	0	
Comments: Score increase of 0.3 or more on PEP.			

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

2.3 EDUCATION OF MIGRANT CHILDREN (TITLE I, PART C)

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section is composed of the following subsections:

- Population data of eligible migrant children;
- Academic data of eligible migrant students;
- Participation data – migrant children served during either the regular school year, summer/intersession term, or program year;
- School data;
- Project data;
- Personnel data.

Where the table collects data by age/grade, report children in the highest age/grade that they attained during the reporting period. For example, a child who turns 3 during the reporting period would only be reported in the "Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)" row.

FAQs at 1.10 contain definitions of out-of-school and ungraded that are used in this section.

2.3.1 Population Data

The following questions collect data on eligible migrant children.

2.3.1.1 Eligible Migrant Children

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children by age/grade. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	109
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	356
K	167
1	175
2	138
3	123
4	112
5	113
6	93
7	88
8	81
9	97
10	83
11	41
12	28
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	1,692
Total	3,496
Comments:	

Source – All rows except for "age birth through 2" are populated with the data provided in Part I, Section 1.10, Question 1.10.1.

2.3.1.2 Priority for Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children who have been classified as having "Priority for Services." The total is calculated automatically. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	241
K	18
1	17
2	23
3	14
4	13
5	13
6	22
7	14
8	11
9	N<10
10	18
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	148
Total	574
Comments:	

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

FAQ on priority for services:

Who is classified as having "priority for service?" Migratory children who are failing, or most at risk of failing to meet the State's challenging academic content standards and student academic achievement standards, and whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year.

2.3.1.3 Limited English Proficient

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children who are also limited English proficient (LEP). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	16
K	100
1	119
2	103
3	82
4	88
5	65
6	52
7	54
8	44
9	46
10	52
11	31
12	13
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	866
Comments: TN uses a LEP assessment test to determine LEP status. Only one OSY took such a test and was classified as LEP based on the test results.	

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

2.3.1.4 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children who are also Children with Disabilities (IDEA) under Part B or Part C of the IDEA. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (IDEA)
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	N<10
1	N<10
2	0
3	N<10
4	N<10
5	N<10
6	N<10
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	31
Comments: The number of OSY reported as IDEA students is zero because OSY are not tested to determine a disability that would be included in this section.	

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

2.3.1.5 Last Qualifying Move

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children by when the last qualifying move occurred. The months are calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Last Qualifying Move Is within X months from the last day of the reporting period			
	12 Months	Previous 13 – 24 Months	Previous 25 – 36 Months	Previous 37 – 48 Months
Age birth through 2	67	38	N<10	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	95	94	69	98
K	43	35	42	47
1	34	34	51	56
2	30	35	26	47
3	25	34	28	36
4	27	29	24	32
5	20	25	35	33
6	27	16	25	25
7	16	22	23	27
8	20	18	20	23
9	24	17	23	33
10	16	14	22	31
11	N<10	N<10	12	15
12	N<10	N<10	N<10	11
Ungraded	0	0	0	0
Out-of-school	582	651	310	149
Total	1,036	1,074	723	663
Comments:				

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

2.3.1.6 Qualifying Move During Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children with any qualifying move during the regular school year within the previous 36 months calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Move During Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	100
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	187
K	98
1	94
2	103
3	83
4	81
5	60
6	67
7	54
8	48
9	53
10	56
11	32
12	25
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	917
Total	2,058
Comments:	

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

OMB NO. 1810-0614 Page 28

2.3.2 Academic Status

The following questions collect data about the academic status of eligible migrant students.

2.3.2.1 Dropouts

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant students who dropped out of school. The total is calculated automatically.

Grade	Dropped Out
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Total	0
Comments: Drop-out information is currently not reported on migrant. Tennessee will begin collecting drop-out information through a flag in the student information system beginning in the school year 2008-2009.	

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

FAQ on Dropouts:

How is "dropped out of school" defined? The term used for students, who, during the reporting period, were enrolled in a public or private school for at least one day, but who subsequently left school with no plans on returning to enroll in a school and continue toward a high school diploma. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2007-08 reporting period should be classified NOT as "dropped-out-of-school" but as "out-of-school youth."

2.3.2.2 GED

In the table below, provide the total unduplicated number of eligible migrant students who obtained a General Education Development (GED) Certificate in your state.

Obtained a GED in your state	0
Comments: GED information is currently not reported to the State Department of Education in TN. In order to produce an accurate report of the students in our public schools who receive GED diplomas, we will create a data sharing arrangement with the TN Dept. of Labor (which oversees GED data) which now asserts that it cannot share individual data with us for privacy reasons. The Labor Department's file includes many people who are not former students in the Tennessee public schools. This is going to be a complex merger since our business rules say that students must be enrolled in a public school on their completion dates, a condition which will probably not hold for any of these students. The problem will be overcome but it will be difficult. We expect to collect GED data on migrant students during the school year 2010-11.	

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

2.3.2.3 Participation in State NCLB Assessments

The following questions collect data about the participation of eligible migrant students in State NCLB Assessments.

2.3.2.3.1 Reading/Language Arts Participation

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant students enrolled in school during the State testing window and tested by the State NCLB reading/language arts assessment by grade level. The totals are calculated automatically.

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	87	48
4	87	42
5	85	42
6	60	24
7	64	21
8	60	22
9	75	22
10	65	17
11	30	10
12	26	N<10
Ungraded	0	0
Total	639	253

Comments: The increase in number of students both enrolled and tested that are reported here over last year's numbers is a result of improved data collection from the district as a result of information required by MSIX. The difference between the number enrolled and number tested can be attributed to the fact that approx. one-third of our migrant students are new each year. These students are almost exclusively ELLs. ELLs that have been here less than 365 days are exempt from the language arts portion of the standardized testing.

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

2.3.2.3.2 Mathematics Participation

This section is similar to 2.3.2.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on migrant students and the State's NCLB mathematics assessment.

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	87	50
4	87	44
5	85	42
6	60	25
7	64	23
8	60	27
9	75	30
10	65	24
11	30	10
12	26	N<10
Ungraded	0	0
Total	639	277

Comments: The increase in number of students both enrolled and tested that are reported here over last year's numbers is a result of improved data collection from the district as a result of information required by MSIX. The difference between number enrolled and number tested can be attributed to the fact that approx. one-third of our migrant students are new each year. These students are almost exclusively ELLs. These data suggest that a higher number of these students should have been tested. Tennessee is evaluating data collection systems, training methods and reporting mechanisms to correct this for future years.

2.3.3 MEP Participation Data

The following questions collect data about the participation of migrant students served during the regular school year, summer/intersession term, or program year.

Unless otherwise indicated, participating migrant children include:

- Children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.
- Children who received a MEP-funded service, even those children who continued to receive services (1) during the term their eligibility ended, (2) for one additional school year after their eligibility ended, if comparable services were not available through other programs, and (3) in secondary school after their eligibility ended, and served through credit accrual programs until graduation (e.g., children served under the continuation of services authority, Section 1304(e)(1–3)).

Do not include:

- Children who were served through a Title I SWP where MEP funds were consolidated with those of other programs.
- Children who were served by a "referred" service only.

2.3.3.1 MEP Participation – Regular School Year

The following questions collect data on migrant children who participated in the MEP during the regular school year. Do not include:

- Children who were only served during the summer/intersession term.

2.3.3.1.1 MEP Students Served During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the regular school year. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Served During Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	25
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	157
K	50
1	47
2	38
3	29
4	26
5	38
6	23
7	30
8	26
9	30
10	21
11	12
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	76
Total	634

Comments: The increase in number of students over last year is a result of both improved data collection through efforts to collect information required of MSIX and the increased number of students that are being provided tutoring during the school year and students in non-program areas that we have been able to serve.

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

2.3.3.1.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received instructional or support services during the regular school year. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	116
K	N<10
1	N<10
2	N<10
3	N<10
4	N<10
5	N<10
6	N<10
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	168
Comments: The increase of the number of priority for service students served comes primarily through our EXITO student participation. EXITO targets students ages 3-5.	

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

2.3.3.1.3 Continuation of Services – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received instructional or support services during the regular school year served under the continuation of services authority Sections 1304(e)(2)–(3). Do not include children served under Section 1304(e)(1), which are children whose eligibility expired during the school term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0
Comments:	

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

2.3.3.1.4 Services

The following questions collect data on the services provided to participating migrant children during the regular school year.

FAQ on Services:

What are services? Services are a subset of all allowable activities that the MEP can provide through its programs and projects. "Services" are those educational or educationally related activities that: (1) directly benefit a migrant child; (2) address a need of a migrant child consistent with the SEA's comprehensive needs assessment and service delivery plan; (3) are grounded in scientifically based research or, in the case of support services, are a generally accepted practice; and (4) are designed to enable the program to meet its measurable outcomes and contribute to the achievement of the State's performance targets. Activities related to identification and recruitment activities, parental involvement, program evaluation, professional development, or administration of the program are examples of allowable activities that are not considered services. Other examples of an allowable activity that would not be considered a service would be the one-time act of providing instructional packets to a child or family, and handing out leaflets to migrant families on available reading programs as part of an effort to increase the reading skills of migrant children. Although these are allowable activities, they are not services because they do not meet all of the criteria above.

2.3.3.1.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received any type of MEP-funded instructional service during the regular school year. Include children who received instructional services provided by either a teacher or a paraprofessional. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a service intervention. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	23
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	142
K	53
1	45
2	38
3	29
4	27
5	38
6	23
7	30
8	25
9	31
10	18
11	10
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	44
Total	579
<p>Comments: The increase in number over last year reflects an increase in the number of program areas that are providing tutoring services during the day as well as the expansion of our EXITO program which targets 3-5 age group.</p>	

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

2.3.3.1.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

In the table below, provide the number of participating migrant children reported in the table above who received reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the regular school year. Include children who received such instructional services provided by a teacher only. Children may be reported as having received more than one type of instructional service in the table. However, children should be reported only once within each type of instructional service that they received regardless of the frequency with which they received the instructional service. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	0	0	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	18	18	
K	21	21	
1	16	16	
2	16	16	
3	14	14	
4	16	16	
5	13	13	
6	14	14	
7	23	22	
8	18	18	
9	20	20	0
10	16	16	0
11	N<10	N<10	0
12	N<10	N<10	0
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	41	0	0
Total	255	213	0
<p>Comments: The increase in number over last year reflects an increase in the number of program areas that are providing tutoring services during the day as well as the expansion of our EXITO program which targets 3-5 age group. No students participated in high school credit accrual during the school year; credit accrual assistance is offered only in the summer through the MEP.</p>			

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

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

What is "high school credit accrual"? Instruction in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a teacher for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. Includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher.

2.3.3.1.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

In the table below, in the column titled Support Services, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received any MEP-funded support service during the regular school year. In the column titled Counseling Service, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received a counseling service during the regular school year. Children should be reported only once in each column regardless of the frequency with which they received a support service intervention. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	17	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	113	N<10
K	26	N<10
1	35	11
2	28	19
3	24	11
4	24	10
5	20	N<10
6	17	11
7	15	N<10
8	20	N<10
9	14	0
10	11	0
11	N<10	0
12	N<10	0
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	54	N<10
Total	430	89
<p>Comments: The increase in number over last year is a result of increase of participation in the EXITO program for 3-5 age group as well as the birth through 2 age group. All children listed for birth to 2 and for 3-5 (non-kindergarten) participated in EXITO. Our numbers increased in other grade levels as a result of increased home visits associated with the RIF programs. All program areas participated in this addition of support with students.</p>		

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

FAQs on Support Services:

- a. *What are support services? These MEP-funded services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migrant families; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. The one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.*
- b. *What are counseling services? Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counselees, between students and students, and between counselors and other staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy.*

2.3.3.1.4.4 Referred Service – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who, during the regular school year, received an educational or educationally related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. Include children who were served by a referred service only or who received both a referred service and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who were referred, but received no services. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	N<10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10
K	N<10
1	N<10
2	N<10
3	N<10
4	N<10
5	N<10
6	N<10
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	43
<p>Comments: The decrease from the 2006-07 is due to improved LEA data collection and a change in working definition. TN refined its understanding of Referred Service based on guidance received. In the past, TN counted all students who were referred for service. (123 of last year) This year we have only included the number of students who were referred for service for whom we could confirm actually received or participated in the service to which they were referred.</p>	

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

2.3.3.2 MEP Participation – Summer/Intersession Term

The questions in this subsection are similar to the questions in the previous section. There are two differences. First, the questions in this subsection collect data on the summer/intersession term instead of the regular school year. The second is the source for the table on migrant students served during the summer/intersession is ED Facts file N/X124 that includes data group 637, category set A.

2.3.3.2.1 MEP Students Served During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Served During Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	39
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	114
K	67
1	70
2	35
3	37
4	33
5	38
6	25
7	28
8	29
9	35
10	30
11	11
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	64
Total	660
Comments:	

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

2.3.3.2.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	80
K	15
1	17
2	N<10
3	10
4	N<10
5	N<10
6	N<10
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	13
Total	197
Comments: The increase in the number of priority for service students served during summer is do to the expansion of our EXITO program targeting the 3-5 age group.	

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

2.3.3.2.3 Continuation of Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term served under the continuation of services authority Sections 1304(e)(2)–(3). Do not include children served under Section 1304(e)(1), which are children whose eligibility expired during the school term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0
Comments: Decrease from last year is due to the fact that we had no students who qualified for continuation of services take advantage of summer programs.	

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

2.3.3.2.4 Services

The following questions collect data on the services provided to participating migrant children during the summer/intersession term.

FAQ on Services:

What are services? Services are a subset of all allowable activities that the MEP can provide through its programs and projects. "Services" are those educational or educationally related activities that: (1) directly benefit a migrant child; (2) address a need of a migrant child consistent with the SEA's comprehensive needs assessment and service delivery plan; (3) are grounded in scientifically based research or, in the case of support services, are a generally accepted practice; and (4) are designed to enable the program to meet its measurable outcomes and contribute to the achievement of the State's performance targets. Activities related to identification and recruitment activities, parental involvement, program evaluation, professional development, or administration of the program are examples of allowable activities that are NOT considered services. Other examples of an allowable activity that would not be considered a service would be the one-time act of providing instructional packets to a child or family, and handing out leaflets to migrant families on available reading programs as part of an effort to increase the reading skills of migrant children. Although these are allowable activities, they are not services because they do not meet all of the criteria above.

2.3.3.2.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received any type of MEP-funded instructional service during the summer/intersession term. Include children who received instructional services provided by either a teacher or a paraprofessional. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a service intervention. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	35
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	105
K	55
1	55
2	28
3	30
4	27
5	32
6	21
7	26
8	28
9	33
10	32
11	11
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	21
Total	542
Comments:	

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

2.3.3.2.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

In the table below, provide the number of participating migrant children reported in the table above who received reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the summer/intersession term. Include children who received such instructional services provided by a teacher only. Children may be reported as having received more than one type of instructional service in the table. However, children should be reported only once within each type of instructional service that they received regardless of the frequency with which they received the instructional service. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	0	0	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	22	0	
K	47	33	
1	43	29	
2	27	21	
3	24	17	
4	19	13	
5	29	22	
6	20	14	
7	20	16	
8	16	11	
9	22	16	0
10	12	N<10	0
11	N<10	N<10	N<10
12	N<10	N<10	0
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	10	N<10	0
Total	320	212	N<10

Comments: Lower number reported for math instruction in 07-08 is due to the emphasis/focus on language arts in our summer programs during the summer of 2008 based on the needs of the students attending programs.

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

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

What is "high school credit accrual"? Instruction in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a teacher for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. Includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher.

2.3.3.2.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

In the table below, in the column titled Support Services, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received any MEP-funded support service during the summer/intersession term. In the column titled Counseling Service, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received a counseling service during the summer/intersession term. Children should be reported only once in each column regardless of the frequency with which they received a support service intervention. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	27	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	94	N<10
K	46	N<10
1	52	N<10
2	24	N<10
3	28	N<10
4	27	N<10
5	36	N<10
6	15	0
7	18	0
8	26	N<10
9	32	N<10
10	18	N<10
11	N<10	N<10
12	N<10	0
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	58	N<10
Total	513	36
<p>Comments: The decrease in number for children receiving counseling services during the summer of 2008 is a reflection of the needs of the participants in the summer program.</p>		

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

FAQs on Support Services:

- a. *What are support services? These MEP-funded services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migrant families; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. The one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.*
- b. *What are counseling services? Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counselees, between students and students, and between counselors and other staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy.*

2.3.3.2.4.4 Referred Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who, during the summer/intersession term, received an educational or educationally related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. Include children who were served by a referred service only or who received both a referred service and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who were referred, but received no services. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	N<10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	15
K	15
1	11
2	10
3	10
4	N<10
5	10
6	N<10
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	103
Comments: The increase in referral services during the summer of 08 can be partially attributed to the downturn in the economy and the general needs of those participating in the summer program.	

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

2.3.3.3 MEP Participation – Program Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services at any time during the program year. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Served During the Program Year
Age Birth through 2	49
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	204
K	77
1	79
2	48
3	48
4	42
5	54
6	34
7	37
8	36
9	47
10	30
11	16
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	120
Total	929
Comments: Increase in number over last year can be attributed to improved data reporting from the LEAs and the expansion of the EXITO program targeting ages 3-5.	

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

2.3.4 School Data

The following questions are about the enrollment of eligible migrant children in schools during the regular school year.

2.3.4.1 Schools and Enrollment

In the table below, provide the number of public schools that enrolled eligible migrant children at any time during the regular school year. Schools include public schools that serve school age (e.g., grades K through 12) children. Also, provide the number of eligible migrant children who were enrolled in those schools. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child at some time during the year, the number of children may include duplicates.

	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	250
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	1,090
Comments:	

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

2.3.4.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs

In the table below, provide the number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in an SWP. Also, provide the number of eligible migrant children who were enrolled in those schools at any time during the regular school year. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child at some time during the year, the number of children may include duplicates.

	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	0
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	0
Comments:	

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

2.3.5 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

2.3.5.1 Type of MEP Project

In the table below, provide the number of projects that are funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. A MEP project is the entity that receives MEP funds by a subgrant from the State or through an intermediate entity that receives the subgrant and provides services directly to the migrant child. Do not include projects where MEP funds were consolidated in SWP.

Also, provide the number of migrant children participating in the projects. Since children may participate in more than one project, the number of children may include duplicates.

Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Participating in the Projects
Regular school year – school day only	0	0
Regular school year – school day/extended day	0	0
Summer/intersession only	4	875
Year round	6	1,557
Comments: The decrease in summer session only, increase in the year round and increase in children participating in the project for year round is due to the increased number of programs that are adding tutoring during the school year. We have fewer summer session only programs which has resulted in a decrease in the number of students participating in summer only programs.		

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

FAQs on type of MEP project:

- a. *What is a project? A project is any entity that receives MEP funds either as a subgrantee or from a subgrantee and provides services directly to migrant children in accordance with the State Service Delivery Plan and State approved subgrant applications. A project's services may be provided in one or more sites.*
- b. *What are Regular School Year – School Day Only projects? Projects where all MEP services are provided during the school day during the regular school year.*
- c. *What are Regular School Year – School Day/Extended Day projects? Projects where some or all MEP services are provided during an extended day or week during the regular school year (e.g., some services are provided during the school day and some outside of the school day; e.g., all services are provided outside of the school day).*
- d. *What are Summer/Intersession Only projects? Projects where all MEP services are provided during the summer/intersession term.*
- e. *What are Year Round projects? Projects where all MEP services are provided during the regular school year and summer/intersession term.*

2.3.6 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.6.1 Key MEP Personnel

The following questions collect data about the key MEP personnel.

2.3.6.1.1 MEP State Director

In the table below, provide the FTE amount of time the State director performs MEP duties (regardless of whether the director is funded by State, MEP, or other funds) during the reporting period (e.g., September 1 through August 31). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

State Director FTE	0.50
Comments: Also responsible for Title I participation in private schools and Title VI REAP	

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

FAQs on the MEP State director

- a. *How is the FTE calculated for the State director? Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked for the MEP. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE for the State director in your State for the reporting period. To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the State director worked for the MEP during the reporting period and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in the reporting period.*
- b. *Who is the State director? The manager within the SEA who administers the MEP on a statewide basis.*

2.3.6.1.2 MEP Staff

In the table below, provide the headcount and FTE by job classification of the staff funded by the MEP. Do not include staff employed in SWP where MEP funds were combined with those of other programs. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Teachers	24	5.50	42	38.90
Counselors	0	0.00	14	3.10
All paraprofessionals	7	5.30	22	20.50
Recruiters	4	3.50	6	6.00
Records transfer staff	1	1.00	2	1.90
Comments: Increase in school-year numbers is due to increase in tutoring offered by programs during the school year. Increase in the summer school program numbers reflects change in summer program design and scope in some of our programs.				

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

FAQs on MEP staff:

- a. *How is the FTE calculated? The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:*
 - 1. To calculate the FTE, in each job category, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
 - 2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE for each job classification in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked in a particular job classification for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.
- b. *Who is a teacher? A classroom instructor who is licensed and meets any other teaching requirements in the State.*
- c. *Who is a counselor? A professional staff member who guides individuals, families, groups, and communities by assisting them in problem-solving, decision-making, discovering meaning, and articulating goals related to personal, educational, and career development.*
- d. *Who is a paraprofessional? An individual who: (1) provides one-on-one tutoring if such tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher; (2) assists with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials; (3) provides instructional assistance in a computer laboratory; (4) conducts parental involvement activities; (5) provides support in a library or media center; (6) acts as a translator; or (7) provides instructional support services under the direct supervision of a teacher (Title I, Section 1119(g)(2)). Because a paraprofessional provides instructional support, he/she should not be providing planned direct instruction or introducing to students new skills, concepts, or academic content. Individuals who work in food services, cafeteria or playground supervision, personal care services, non-instructional computer assistance, and similar positions are not considered paraprofessionals under Title I.*
- e. *Who is a recruiter? A staff person responsible for identifying and recruiting children as eligible for the MEP and documenting their eligibility on the Certificate of Eligibility.*
- f. *Who is a record transfer staffer? An individual who is responsible for entering, retrieving, or sending student records from or to another school or student records system.*

2.3.6.1.3 Qualified Paraprofessionals

In the table below, provide the headcount and FTE of the qualified paraprofessionals funded by the MEP. Do not include staff employed in SWP where MEP funds were combined with those of other programs. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Qualified paraprofessionals	4	2.90	12	10.50
Comments: Our numbers are so small in this category that mathematically the increase or decrease naturally runs over or under 25%.				

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

FAQs on qualified paraprofessionals:

- a. *How is the FTE calculated? The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:*
 - i. To calculate the FTE, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
 - ii. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.
- b. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional? A qualified paraprofessional must have a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent and have (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Sections 1119(c) and (d) of ESEA).*

2.4 PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, OR AT RISK (TITLE I, PART D, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)

This section collects data on programs and facilities that serve students who are neglected, delinquent, or at risk under Title I, Part D, and characteristics about and services provided to these students.

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- • Use the definitions listed below:
 - **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
 - **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
 - **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
 - **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
 - **Multiple Purpose Facility:** An institution/facility/program that serves more than one programming purpose. For example, the same facility may run both a juvenile correction program and a juvenile detention program.
 - **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
 - **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

2.4.1 State Agency Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities.

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities -Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the average length of stay by program/facility type, for these students. Report only programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. Make sure to identify the number of multipurpose facilities that were included in the facility/program count in the second table. The total number of programs/facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	9	180
Adult corrections	2	228
Other	0	0
Total	11	192

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

How many of the programs listed in the table above are in a multiple purpose facility?

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	0
Comments:	

FAQ on Programs and Facilities -Subpart I:

How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit, for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported -Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency programs/facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected Programs	0
Juvenile Detention	0
Juvenile Corrections	9
Adult Corrections	2
Other	0
Total	11
Comments:	

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

2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 that are long-term. In the subsequent tables provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex and by age will be automatically calculated.

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	0	0	514	174	0
Long Term Students Served	0	0	278	122	0

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0	0	0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	N<10	0	0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	287	121	0
Hispanic	0	0	N<10	N<10	0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	219	51	0
Total	0	0	514	174	0

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male	0	0	454	159	0
Female	0	0	60	15	0
Total	0	0	514	174	0

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	0
11	0	0	0	0	0
12	0	0	0	0	0
13	0	0	N<10	0	0
14	0	0	51	0	0
15	0	0	69	0	0
16	0	0	221	N<10	0
17	0	0	139	16	0
18	0	0	24	38	0
19	0	0	N<10	37	0
20	0	0	0	73	0
21	0	0	0	N<10	0
Total	0	0	514	174	0

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain in comment box below. This

response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

What is an unduplicated count? An unduplicated count is one that counts students only once, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.

2.4.1.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of programs/facilities (not students) that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds and awarded at least one high school course credit, one high school diploma, and/or one GED within the reporting year. Include programs/facilities that directly awarded a credit, diploma, or GED, as well as programs/facilities that made awards through another agency. The numbers should not exceed those reported earlier in the facility counts.

# Programs That	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Awarded high school course credit(s)	0	9	0	0
Awarded high school diploma(s)	0	9	0	0
Awarded GED(s)	0	9	1	0
Comments:				

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

2.4.1.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 1

The following questions collect academic outcome data on students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 1.

2.4.1.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the State agency program/facility by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits	0	N<10	0	0
Enrolled in a GED program	0	395	168	0
Comments:				

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

2.4.1.4.2 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 30 Calendar Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the State agency program/facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	0	0	0	0
Earned a GED	0	104	21	0
Obtained high school diploma	0	29	0	0
Were accepted into post-secondary education	0	N<10	0	0
Enrolled in post-secondary education	0	N<10	N<10	0
Comments: Results for Juvenile Corrections/Detention Facilities are limited to those within the program. Tennessee Department of Children's Services' policy prohibits tracking youth after after exit.				

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

2.4.1.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on vocational outcomes of students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 1.

2.4.1.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the State agency program by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs	0	278	N<10	0
Comments: All youth served in educational programs in Juvenile Corrections facilities are enrolled in a job training course.				

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

2.4.1.5.2 Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 30 Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the State agency program/facility or within 30 days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education	0	N<10	0	0
Obtained employment	0	N<10	0	0
Comments: Results for Juvenile Corrections/Detention Facilities are limited to those within the program. Tennessee Department of Children's Services' policy prohibits tracking youth after exit.				

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

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 in reading and mathematics.

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in pre-and post-testing in reading. Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pretested prior to July 1, 2007, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	0	0	78	0
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	0	0	114	0

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams	0	0	N<10	0
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	0	N<10	0
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	0	56	0
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	0	22	0
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	0	21	0
Comments: The data for Juvenile Corrections/Detention facilities will be available for school year 2008-09.				

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

FAQ on long-term students:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

This section is similar to 2.4.1.6.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on mathematics performance.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	0	0	81	0
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	0	0	114	0

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams	0	0	N<10	0
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	0	10	0
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	0	43	0
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	0	33	0
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	0	20	0
Comments: The data for Juvenile Corrections/Detention facilities will be available for school year 2008-09.				

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

2.4.2 LEA Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities.

2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the yearly average length of stay by program/facility type for these students. Report only the programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. Make sure to identify the number of multipurpose facilities that were included in the facility/program count in the second table. The total number of programs/ facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs	0	0
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	2	4
Juvenile corrections	10	132
Other	0	0
Total	12	38

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

How many of the programs listed in the table above are in a multiple purpose facility?

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	0
Comments:	

FAQ on average length of stay:

How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported -Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	0
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	2
Juvenile corrections	10
Other	0
Total	12
Comments:	

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

2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables, provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age will be automatically calculated.

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	0	0	4,271	1,582	0
Total Long Term Students Served	0	0	10	1,033	0

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	N<10	10	0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0	N<10	0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	2,839	823	0
Hispanic	0	0	306	37	0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	1,125	708	0
Total	0	0	4,271	1,582	0

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	0	0	3,017	1,434	0
Female	0	0	1,254	148	0
Total	0	0	4,271	1,582	0

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	N<10	0
7	0	0	0	N<10	0
8	0	0	0	14	0
9	0	0	0	15	0
10	0	0	0	21	0
11	0	0	0	17	0
12	0	0	100	25	0
13	0	0	573	78	0
14	0	0	892	156	0
15	0	0	1,047	271	0
16	0	0	1,034	426	0
17	0	0	549	469	0
18	0	0	76	83	0
19	0	0	0	N<10	0
20	0	0	0	N<10	0
21	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	4,271	1,582	0

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

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

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

What is an unduplicated count? An unduplicated count is one that counts students only once, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.

2.4.2.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of programs/facilities (not students) that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds and awarded at least one high school course credit, one high school diploma, and/or one GED within the reporting year. Include programs/facilities that directly awarded a credit, diploma, or GED, as well as programs/facilities that made awards through another agency. The numbers should not exceed those reported earlier in the facility counts.

LEA Programs That	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention/ Corrections	Other Programs
Awarded high school course credit(s)	0	0	11	0
Awarded high school diploma(s)	0	0	9	0
Awarded GED(s)	0	0	11	0
Comments:				

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

2.4.2.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 2

The following questions collect academic outcome data on students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 2.

2.4.2.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the LEA program/facility by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits	0	0	684	0
Enrolled in a GED program	0	0	307	0
Comments:				

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

2.4.2.4.2 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 30 Calendar Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the LEA program/facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	0	0	1,048	0
Earned a GED	0	0	81	0
Obtained high school diploma	0	0	43	0
Were accepted into post-secondary education	0	0	N<10	0
Enrolled in post-secondary education	0	0	14	0
Comments:				

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

2.4.2.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on vocational outcomes of students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 2.

2.4.2.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the LEA program by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs	0	0	105	0
Comments:				

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

2.4.2.5.2 Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 30 Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the LEA program/facility or within 30 days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education	0	0	16	0
Obtained employment	0	0	33	0
Comments:				

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

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 in reading and mathematics.

2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

In the format of the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in pre-and post-testing in reading. Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2007, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	0	0	414	0
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	0	0	600	0

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams	0	0	118	0
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	0	113	0
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	0	80	0
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	0	116	0
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	0	173	0
Comments:				

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008.

2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

This section is similar to 2.4.2.6.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on mathematics performance.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	0	0	422	0
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	0	0	565	0

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams	0	0	88	0
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	0	136	0
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	0	95	0
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	0	85	0
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	0	161	0
Comments:				

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

2.7 SAFE AND DRUG FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT (TITLE IV, PART A)

This section collects data on student behaviors under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act.

2.7.1 Performance Measures

In the table below, provide actual performance data.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2005-06: 0	2005-06: 0		
The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State	Annual Report of Zero Tolerance Offenses/Unsafe School Choice Policy	Annual	2008	2006-07: 0		0	2003
				2007-08: 0			
Comments:							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2005-06: 18%	2005-06: 8.1%		
The percentage of students who carried a weapon (gun, knife, club) on school property (in the 30 days prior to the survey)	YRBS Tennessee High School Survey	Biannual	2007	2006-07: 5.6%		5.4%	2003
				2007-08: 5.6%			
Comments:							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2005-06: 25%	2005-06: 10.9%		
•••• 200607: 24%			2006-07: 24%	2006-07: 12.4%	12.2%	2003	
•••• 200708: 23%			2007-08: 23%	2007-08: 12.4%			

The percentage of students who engaged in a physical ●●●● 200809: 12.1%			2008-09: 12.1%				
			2009-10: 12.1%				
fight on school property (in the 12 months preceding the survey) • YRBS Tennessee High School Survey YRBS Tennessee High School Survey	Biannual	2007					

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
The percentage of students offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property (in the 12 months preceding the survey)	YRBS Tennessee High School Survey	Biannual	2007	2005-06: 21%	2005-06: 26.6%	24.3%	2003
				2006-07: 21.6%			
				2007-08: 21.6%			
Comments:							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
The incidents involving the possession or use of illegal drugs on a school campus or at a school sponsored event	Annual Report of Zero Tolerance Offenses	Annual	2008	2005-06: 2150	2005-06: 2960	2291	2003
				2006-07: 2919			
				2007-08: 2841			
Comments: Estimates for 2008-2009 are based upon the revamping of the collection of data that will yield more accurate results.							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
The number of incidents involving the possession of a firearm on a school campus or at a school spondored event	Annual Report of Zero Tolerance Offenses	Annual	2008	2005-06: 78	2005-06: 87		
				2006-07: 93			
				2007-08: 59			
Comments: Projections for SY 08-09 are based upon the recently overhauled data collection system that will capture more accurate data.						83	2003

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

2.7.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

The following questions collect data on the out-of-school suspension and expulsion of students by grade level (e.g., K through 5, 6 through 8, 9 through 12) and type of incident (e.g., violence, weapons possession, alcohol-related, illicit drug-related).

2.7.2.1 State Definitions

In the spaces below, provide the State definitions for each type of incident.

Incident Type	State Definition
Alcohol related	a. Possession or use of alcoholic beverages b. Distribution of alcoholic beverages (TN Attendance Manual)
Illicit drug related	a. Possession or use of illegal drugs b. Purchase, sale or distribution of illegal drugs c. Under the influence of drugs d. Possession of drug paraphernalia (TN Attendance Manual)
Violent incident without physical injury	Violence, threatened violence
Violent incident with physical injury	A combination of two state categories a. Fighting among students b. Battery against teacher or staff
Weapons possession	A combination of two state categories a. Possession or use of a firearm b. Possession or use of other dangerous weapons
Comments: These are the categories we used in 2007-08. For 2008-09 we have changed our cause categories to be more aligned with federal requirements	

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

2.7.2.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

The following questions collect data on violent incident without physical injury.

2.7.2.2.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for violent incident without physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident without physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	4,635	136
6 through 8	11,016	136
9 through 12	10,292	136
Comments: If you want breakdowns between suspensions and expulsions in CSPR, you should ask for that breakdown in EDEN. I had to rerun everything. Tennessee did not collect discipline data by cause and grade in 2006-07.		

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

2.7.2.2.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of school expulsions for violent incident without physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident without physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	136
6 through 8	76	136
9 through 12	137	136
Comments: If you want breakdowns between suspensions and expulsions in CSPR, you should ask for that breakdown in EDEN. Tennessee did not collect discipline data by cause and grade in 2006-07.		

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

2.7.2.3 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

The following questions collect data on violent incident with physical injury.

2.7.2.3.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for violent incident with physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident with physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	5,390	136
6 through 8	8,179	136
9 through 12	8,349	136
Comments: Tennessee did not collect discipline data by cause and grade in 2006-07.		

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

2.7.2.3.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of school expulsions for violent incident with physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident with physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	25	136
6 through 8	170	136
9 through 12	223	136
Comments: Tennessee did not collect discipline data by cause and grade in 2006-07.		

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

2.7.2.4 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Weapons Possession

The following sections collect data on weapons possession.

2.7.2.4.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Weapons Possession

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for weapons possession by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on weapons possession, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	540	136
6 through 8	401	136
9 through 12	477	136
Comments: Tennessee did not collect discipline data by cause and grade in 2006-07.		

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

2.7.2.4.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Weapons Possession

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for weapons possession by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on weapons possession, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	11	136
6 through 8	59	136
9 through 12	93	136
Comments: Tennessee did not collect discipline data by cause and grade in 2006-07.		

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

2.7.2.5 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

The following questions collect data on alcohol-related incidents.

2.7.2.5.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for alcohol-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on alcohol-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	136
6 through 8	92	136
9 through 12	308	136
Comments: Tennessee did not collect discipline data by cause and grade in 2006-07.		

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

2.7.2.5.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for alcohol-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on alcohol-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	136
6 through 8	N<10	136
9 through 12	22	136
Comments: Tennessee did not collect discipline data by cause and grade in 2006-07.		

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

2.7.2.6 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

The following questions collect data on illicit drug-related incidents.

2.7.2.6.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for illicit drug-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on illicit drug-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	57	136
6 through 8	426	136
9 through 12	1,390	136
Comments: Tennessee did not collect discipline data by cause and grade in 2006-07.		

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

2.7.2.6.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for illicit drug-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on illicit drug-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	136
6 through 8	161	136
9 through 12	567	136
Comments: Tennessee did not collect discipline data by cause and grade in 2006-07.		

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

2.7.3 Parent Involvement

In the table below, provide the types of efforts your State uses to inform parents of, and include parents in, drug and violence prevention efforts. Place a check mark next to the five most common efforts underway in your State. If there are other efforts underway in your State not captured on the list, add those in the other specify section.

Yes/No	Parental Involvement Activities
Yes	Information dissemination on Web sites and in publications, including newsletters, guides, brochures, and "report cards" on school performance
No	Training and technical assistance to LEAs on recruiting and involving parents
Yes	State requirement that parents must be included on LEA advisory councils
No	State and local parent training, meetings, conferences, and workshops
Yes	Parent involvement in State-level advisory groups
Yes	Parent involvement in school-based teams or community coalitions
No	Parent surveys, focus groups, and/or other assessments of parent needs and program effectiveness
Yes	Media and other campaigns (Public service announcements, red ribbon campaigns, kick-off events, parenting awareness month, safe schools week, family day, etc.) to raise parental awareness of drug and alcohol or safety issues
No	Other Specify 1
No	Other Specify 2

In the space below, specify 'other' parental activities. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

2.8 INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS (TITLE V, PART A)

This section collects information pursuant to Title V, Part A of ESEA.

2.8.1 Annual Statewide Summary

Section 5122 of ESEA, requires States to provide an annual Statewide summary of how Title V, Part A funds contribute to the improvement of student academic performance and the quality of education for students. In addition, these summaries must be based on evaluations provided to the State by LEAs receiving program funds.

Please attach your statewide summary. You can upload file by entering the file name and location in the box below or use the browse button to search for the file as you would when attaching a file to an e-mail. The maximum file size for this upload is 4 meg.

2.8.2 Needs Assessments

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that completed a Title V, Part A needs assessment that the State determined to be credible and the total number of LEAs that received Title V, Part A funds. The percentage column is automatically calculated.

	# LEAs	%
Completed credible Title V, Part A needs assessments	135	100.0
Total received Title V, Part A funds	135	
Comments: Total number of LEA's does not include four special schools. One LEA did not apply.		

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

2.8.3 LEA Expenditures

In the table below, provide the amount of Title V, Part A funds expended by the LEAs. The percentage column will be automatically calculated.

The 4 strategic priorities are: (1) support student achievement, enhance reading and mathematics, (2) improve the quality of teachers, (3) ensure that schools are safe and drug free, and (4) promote access for all students to a quality education.

Activities authorized under Section 5131 of the ESEA that are included in the four strategic priorities are 1-5, 7-9, 12, 14-17, 19-20, 22, and 25-27. Authorized activities that are not included in the four strategic priorities are 6, 10-11, 13, 18, 21, and 23-24.

	\$ Amount	%
Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs for the four strategic priorities	3,241,679	88.9
Total Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs	3,647,671	
Comments: Amount expended includes carry-over amounts.		

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

2.8.4 LEA Uses of Funds for the Four Strategic Priorities and AYP

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs:

1. That used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities above and the number of **these LEAs that met their State's definition of adequate yearly progress (AYP).**
2. That did not use at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of AYP.
3. For which you do not know whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of AYP.

The total LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds will be automatically calculated.

	# LEAs	# LEAs Met AYP
Used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	93	83
Did not use at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	42	41
Not known whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	0	0
Total LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds	135	124
Comments:		

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

2.9 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP) (TITLE VI, PART B, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)

This section collects data on the Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) Title VI, Part B, Subparts 1 and 2.

2.9.1 LEA Use of Alternative Funding Authority Under the Small Rural Achievement (SRSA) Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 1)

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that notified the State of their intent to use the alternative uses funding authority under Section 6211.

	# LEAs
# LEA's using SRSA alternative uses of funding authority	0
Comments:	

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

2.9.2 LEA Use of Rural Low-Income Schools Program (RLIS) (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2) Grant Funds

In the table below, provide the number of eligible LEAs that used RLIS funds for each of the listed purposes.

Purpose	# LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	6
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	19
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	19
Parental involvement activities	12
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	7
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	26
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	3
Comments:	

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

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

In the space below, describe the progress the State has made in meeting the goals and objectives for the Rural Low-Income Schools (RLIS) Program as described in its June 2002 Consolidated State application. Provide quantitative data where available.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State identifies specific measurable goals and objectives related to increasing student academic achievement as measured by the percentage of students' proficient or above on state assessments as well as a decrease in the student dropout rate as factors it will measure. Districts were asked to explain in what areas they plan to use RLIS funds and how those funds will be used to increase student achievement and/or reduce the dropout rate. The following paragraphs are submitted as a sampling of the progress our State has made in meeting the goals and objectives for the Rural Low-Income School Program as described in the June 2002 Consolidated State application.

ESEA Performance Goal #1

By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

Athens City

Athens City used RLIS funds to help them attain 96% proficient/advanced in K-8 math and 97% in HS math. Further, the district averaged 95% in K-8 and HS in language arts.

Bledsoe County

With approximately 83% of its students economically disadvantaged, Bledsoe County uses most of its RLIS money for educational technology to provide technologically rich learning opportunities to these students that make learning exciting and meaningful. With that strategy they have maintained a K-8, math 3-year average of 91% proficient and advanced and for 9-12 math, a 92% proficient and advanced. Language Arts for 9-12 saw strong gains this year, 94% this year up from 81 % last year.

Clay County

Clay County chose to enhance the use of computers and computer programs to increase student performance in all areas. Specifically, in grades 9-12 Clay County uses computer programs for credit recovery and to improve Gateway scores. This year 88% of the 9-12 graders scored proficient or advanced in math, up from 76% the previous year. This year 94% of 9-12 graders scored proficient or advanced in Language Arts up from 76% the previous year.

Cocke County

Title VI funds were used to develop curriculum, provide professional development, and purchase reading materials have helped to increase K-8 math proficient and advanced scores from 90% last year to 93% proficient and advanced this year. For K-8 language arts, proficient and advanced is up to 92% this year from 90% last year.

Etowah City

In using its funds to target increased academic achievement in the areas of reading and math, Etowah City was able to increase its percent of students proficient or advanced in math to 90% this year up from 87% last year. They were also able to increase the percent of students proficient in language arts to 93% up from 89% last year.

Fayetteville City

Funding from Title VI assist in meeting the goals of increasing student performance by financing a portion of a teacher's salary employed to work with below proficient students in reading. By targeting reading with RLIS funds, Fayetteville City has been able to maintain a 3-year average of 93% proficient or above in Language Arts.

Grundy County

RLIS funds were used for professional development training so that teachers can be more productive in classrooms. Funds were also used to update technology to help increase student scores to meet state standards. Increased communication with parents and parent participation in the learning process were also targeted. The results: 88% proficient and advanced in K-8

math, exceeding the State target of 86%. High School proficient and advanced was 95% this year up from 87% last year. High School proficient and advanced was 90% this year up from 87% last year in Language Arts.

Hardin County

Funds mainly support K-8 programs and activities in Hardin County. A school improvement facilitator works with teachers, principals, and parents at all grade levels. Activities related to this position include teacher training and parent training and interpretation of test results for their child. Math manipulatives/calculators are used to develop a deeper understanding of the standards and objectives taught at each grade level. Hardin County has a 90% proficient and advanced in K-8 math, and a 90% proficient and advance for K-8 language arts. Grades 9-12 have maintained a 92% proficient and advanced in math and a 91% proficient and advanced in language arts.

Johnson County

Title VI funds were used in Johnson County to enhance the technological offerings available in classrooms. A major PreK-12 initiative to provide teachers with interactive white boards and extensive professional development was totally focused on student engagement, further opportunities to interact with curriculum, and increased student achievement. A marked improvement in teacher integration of technology, student use, and increased achievement has been seen. Johnson Co. has seen improvement across the board in test scores. K-8 math proficient and advanced is 94% this year up from 91% last year. K-8 language arts is 93% this year up from 89% last year. Grades 9-12 math is 95% this year up from 92% last year. Grades 9-12 language art is 89% this year up from 87% last year.

ESEA Performance Goal #2

All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

Greenville city

Greenville City applied RLIS funds to the salary of a supplemental ESL teaching position. They have been able to maintain an 83% 3-year average in proficient and above in K-8 math and a 95% 3-year average in proficient and above in K-8 language arts for ELL students.

Newport City

Monies from Title VI were used to pay the ESL teacher who works daily with ESL children after school.

ESEA Performance Goal #3

By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

Overall, LEAs receiving Title VI funds are doing well when it comes to having core subjects taught by highly qualified teachers. The average is 97% highly qualified teachers in core subjects.

Athens City

RLIS funds are used to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers. They have 98.5 % of core courses taught by highly qualified.

Benton County used part of its Title VI funds to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers and has 100% of core subjects taught by highly qualified.

ESEA Performance Goal #5

All students will graduate from high school.

Dyersburg City

Dyersburg City has been using it RLIS funds to steadily grow their graduation by providing academic support for students. The

graduation rate in Dyersburg City has climbed from 78.6 in the 05-06 school year to 89.2% in 07-08.

Greenville City

Professional development activities, Compass Learning, United Streaming, and the supplemental ESL position all affect student performance in the manner of increased student ability to earn credits toward graduation and to pass the Gateway tests. Greenville City has seen an increase of 3% in its graduation rate from last year up from 93.7% to 96.9%.

Johnson County

With the help of RLIS funds Johnson County has seen its graduation rate climb from 87.9% last year to 90.3%, reaching the State goal for the first time

Pickett County

By providing high quality professional development in Pickett County with Title VI funds, teachers are trained to help meet the needs of at-risk students, thereby assisting the LEA in meeting the state goal of increasing the graduation rate. Pickett County's graduation rate last year was 88.5% and is 96.2% this year.

VanBuren

Efforts to improve technology are aimed at keeping more students actively engaged in their education so that they will stay enrolled until graduation. Involving more parents also encourages children to stay in school until they graduate. 93.5% graduation rate this year up from 90.2% last year.

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

2.10 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE VI, PART A, SUBPART 2)

2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2007-08?	No
Comments:	

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

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	36
Comments:	

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

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

In the tables below, provide the total number of LEAs that transferred funds from and to each eligible program and the total amount of funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	35	0
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	2	2
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	7	5
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0	34
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		4

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

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	2,623,254.00	0.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	894.00	42,215.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	43,110.00	127,277.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0.00	2,219,814.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		277,952.00
Comments:		

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

The Department plans to obtain information on the use of funds under both the State and LEA Transferability Authority through evaluation studies.