

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 2008-09

TENNESSEE



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2009
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2010**

**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) 2008-09 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2008-09 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 18, 2009. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 12, 2010. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2008-09, 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 2008-09 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 2008-09 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

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, 2008-09

Part II, 2008-09

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

Friday, March 12, 2010, 5:26:39 PM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2008-09



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 18, 2009
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Tennessee's State Board of Education has adopted challenging content standards in science, reading/language arts, and math that are consistent with section 1111(b)(1). These standards can be found at the Department's website at <http://www.state.tn.us/education/ci/standards/>

Tennessee has developed Alternate Achievement Standards which are directly linked to general curriculum content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science. These Alternate Achievement Standards can be found at the Department's website at <http://www.state.tn.us/education/speced/seassessment.shtml#DISABILITY> Additionally, TNDOE reviewed and edited these Alternate Achievement Standards in January of 2009 to verify alignment with the new challenging content standards in science, reading/language arts, and math.

Tennessee's assessment system has been approved for reading, math and science through ED's peer review process as of the end of SY 2005-06 (defined as June 30, 2006 for this process). The State has revised its K-12 content standards in reading/language arts, math, and science. The new curriculum standards and assessments are being implemented during school year 2009-10. The new curriculum standards may be found at the Department's website at <http://www.state.tn.us/education/curriculum.shtml> Additional assessment options for grades 3-8 in reading/language arts, math, and science include a 2% (SpEd) Modified Assessment on grade level content and a simplified language form for ELL populations. Both are scheduled for inclusion in the assessment program for 2009-10.

Secondary assessments have been revised for the 2009-10 school year based on SBE approved 9-12 curriculum changes in reading/language arts, math, and science. Algebra I, English II, and Biology I have been updated to reflect these new curriculum standards.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Tennessee's assessment system has been approved for reading, math and science through ED's peer review process as of the end of SY 2005-06 (defined as June 30, 2006 for this process). The State has revised its K-12 content standards in reading/language arts, math, and science. The new curriculum standards and assessments are being implemented during school year 2009-10. The new curriculum standards may be found at the Department's website at <http://www.state.tn.us/education/curriculum.shtml> Additional assessment options for grades 3-8 in reading/language arts, math, and science include a 2% (SpEd) Modified Assessment on grade level content and a simplified language form for ELL populations. Both are scheduled for inclusion in the assessment program for 2009-10.

Secondary assessments have been revised for the 2009-10 school year based on SBE approved 9-12 curriculum changes in reading/language arts, math, and science. Algebra I, English II, and Biology I have been updated to reflect these new curriculum standards.

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Tennessee's assessment system has been approved for reading, math and science through ED's peer review process as of the end of SY 2005-06 (defined as June 30, 2006 for this process). The State has revised its K-12 content standards in reading/language arts, math, and science. The new curriculum standards and assessments are being implemented during school year 2009-10. The new curriculum standards may be found at the Department's website at <http://www.state.tn.us/education/curriculum.shtml> Additional assessment options for grades 3-8 in reading/language arts, math, and science include a 2% (SpEd) Modified Assessment on grade level content and a simplified language form for ELL populations. Both are scheduled for inclusion in the assessment program for 2009-10.

Secondary assessments have been revised for the 2009-10 school year based on SBE approved 9-12 curriculum changes in reading/language arts, math, and science. Algebra I, English II, and Biology I have been updated to reflect these new curriculum standards.

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities(IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	530,171		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,138		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,262		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	135,730		>97%
Hispanic	26,653		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	358,251		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	65,245		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,035		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	281,836		>97%
Migratory students	230		>97%
Male	273,245		>97%
Female	256,736		>97%
Comments:			

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	15,472	23.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	44,292	68.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,000	7.7
Total	64,764	
Comments:		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	519,856		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,119		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,558		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	128,408		>97%
Hispanic	25,907		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	355,767		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	61,283		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,391		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	272,278		>97%
Migratory students	226		>97%
Male	267,142		>97%
Female	252,572		>97%
Comments:			

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	13,328	21.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	42,649	70.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,826	7.9
Total	60,803	
Comments:		

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	523,210		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,112		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,625		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	129,528		>97%
Hispanic	26,177		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	357,670		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	61,329		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,659		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	274,150		>97%
Migratory students	227		>97%
Male	268,550		>97%
Female	254,499		>97%
Comments:			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	13,413	22.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	42,354	69.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,905	8.1
Total	60,672	
Comments:		

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	75,483	66,502	88.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	151	134	88.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,353	1,283	94.8
Black, non-Hispanic	18,146	14,411	79.4
Hispanic	4,477	3,916	87.5
White, non-Hispanic	51,352	46,756	91.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,244	6,335	68.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,250	1,833	81.5
Economically disadvantaged students	42,209	35,057	83.1
Migratory students	44	39	88.6
Male	38,693	33,757	87.2
Female	36,787	32,742	89.0
Comments: Tennessee's migrant population declined in 2008-09 as the recession and high unemployment affected the nursery, meat processing and other industries that attract migrant workers in better economic times.			

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

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	75,387	67,773	89.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	150	128	85.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,323	1,231	93.0
Black, non-Hispanic	18,136	14,889	82.1
Hispanic	4,427	3,706	83.7
White, non-Hispanic	51,347	47,817	93.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,244	7,217	78.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,230	1,555	69.7
Economically disadvantaged students	42,148	35,836	85.0
Migratory students	43	34	79.1
Male	38,649	33,955	87.8
Female	36,735	33,815	92.0
Comments: Tennessee's migrant population declined in 2008-09 as the recession and high unemployment affected the nursery, meat processing and other industries that attract migrant workers in better economic times.			

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

through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	75,404	60,821	80.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	151	125	82.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,348	1,192	88.4
Black, non-Hispanic	18,123	11,137	61.4
Hispanic	4,469	3,275	73.3
White, non-Hispanic	51,309	45,090	87.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,225	5,971	64.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,245	1,385	61.7
Economically disadvantaged students	42,154	30,113	71.4
Migratory students	44	30	68.2
Male	38,647	31,364	81.2
Female	36,754	29,454	80.1
Comments: Tennessee's migrant population declined in 2008-09 as the recession and high unemployment affected the nursery, meat processing and other industries that attract migrant workers in better economic times.			

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

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	75,023	67,640	90.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	146	132	90.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,275	1,226	96.2
Black, non-Hispanic	18,125	15,141	83.5
Hispanic	4,038	3,579	88.6
White, non-Hispanic	51,439	47,562	92.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,014	6,036	67.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,108	1,731	82.1
Economically disadvantaged students	41,720	35,717	85.6
Migratory students	41	29	70.7
Male	38,835	34,541	88.9
Female	36,184	33,095	91.5
Comments:			

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

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

	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 4			
All students	74,936	67,671	90.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	145	130	89.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,251	1,181	94.4
Black, non-Hispanic	18,114	14,756	81.5
Hispanic	3,997	3,415	85.4
White, non-Hispanic	51,429	48,189	93.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,012	6,763	75.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,091	1,520	72.7
Economically disadvantaged students	41,670	35,542	85.3
Migratory students	39	29	74.4
Male	38,780	34,176	88.1
Female	36,152	33,491	92.6
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 4			
All students	74,950	61,552	82.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	146	122	83.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,275	1,154	90.5
Black, non-Hispanic	18,104	11,111	61.4
Hispanic	4,035	3,074	76.2
White, non-Hispanic	51,390	46,091	89.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,993	5,650	62.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,106	1,309	62.2
Economically disadvantaged students	41,676	30,514	73.2
Migratory students	41	26	63.4
Male	38,788	32,058	82.6
Female	36,158	29,490	81.6
Comments:			

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

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	73,321	69,448	94.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	127	119	93.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,261		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	17,935	16,356	91.2
Hispanic	3,793	3,548	93.5
White, non-Hispanic	50,205	48,196	96.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,691	6,856	78.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,731	1,510	87.2
Economically disadvantaged students	39,928	36,782	92.1
Migratory students	30	27	90.0
Male	37,435	35,117	93.8
Female	35,884	34,329	95.7

Comments: Tennessee's migrant population declined in 2008-09 as the recession and high unemployment affected the nursery, meat processing and other industries that attract migrant workers in better economic times.

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

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	73,260	69,472	94.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	126	119	94.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,233		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	17,933	16,098	89.8
Hispanic	3,761	3,432	91.2
White, non-Hispanic	50,207	48,616	96.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,693	7,520	86.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,728	1,380	79.9
Economically disadvantaged students	39,884	36,734	92.1
Migratory students	30	26	86.7
Male	37,403	34,942	93.4
Female	35,855	34,528	96.3

Comments: Tennessee's migrant population declined in 2008-09 as the recession and high unemployment affected the nursery, meat processing and other industries that attract migrant workers in better economic times.

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

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	73,255	59,707	81.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	127	109	85.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,259	1,123	89.2
Black, non-Hispanic	17,923	10,922	60.9
Hispanic	3,786	2,767	73.1
White, non-Hispanic	50,160	44,786	89.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,675	5,007	57.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,729	878	50.8
Economically disadvantaged students	39,878	28,722	72.0
Migratory students	30	20	66.7
Male	37,384	30,614	81.9
Female	35,869	29,091	81.1

Comments: Tennessee's migrant population declined in 2008-09 as the recession and high unemployment affected the nursery, meat processing and other industries that attract migrant workers in better economic times.

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

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	71,383	64,499	90.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	136	126	92.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,147	1,099	95.8
Black, non-Hispanic	17,617	14,767	83.8
Hispanic	3,614	3,204	88.7
White, non-Hispanic	48,868	45,302	92.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,194	5,341	65.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,150	855	74.4
Economically disadvantaged students	38,135	32,750	85.9
Migratory students	33	28	84.8
Male	36,593	32,401	88.5
Female	34,787	32,095	92.3

Comments: Tennessee's migrant population declined in 2008-09 as the recession and high unemployment affected the nursery, meat processing and other industries that attract migrant workers in better economic times.

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

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	71,318	65,324	91.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	136	127	93.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,124	1,076	95.7
Black, non-Hispanic	17,611	14,776	83.9
Hispanic	3,584	3,154	88.0
White, non-Hispanic	48,862	46,190	94.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,189	6,146	75.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,141	766	67.1
Economically disadvantaged students	38,086	33,210	87.2
Migratory students	32	26	81.2
Male	36,556	32,558	89.1
Female	34,759	32,764	94.3
Comments: Tennessee's migrant population declined in 2008-09 as the recession and high unemployment affected the nursery, meat processing and other industries that attract migrant workers in better economic times.			

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

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	71,299	59,644	83.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	136	123	90.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,144	1,030	90.0
Black, non-Hispanic	17,601	11,574	65.8
Hispanic	3,606	2,785	77.2
White, non-Hispanic	48,811	44,131	90.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,177	4,981	60.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,141	551	48.3
Economically disadvantaged students	38,076	28,634	75.2
Migratory students	33	22	66.7
Male	36,546	30,915	84.6
Female	34,750	28,726	82.7
Comments: Tennessee's migrant population declined in 2008-09 as the recession and high unemployment affected the nursery, meat processing and other industries that attract migrant workers in better economic times.			

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

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	70,879	63,977	90.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	141	129	91.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,130	1,085	96.0
Black, non-Hispanic	17,394	14,520	83.5
Hispanic	3,434	3,000	87.4
White, non-Hispanic	48,777	45,240	92.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,014	5,018	62.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,175	843	71.7
Economically disadvantaged students	36,713	31,329	85.3
Migratory students	33	32	97.0
Male	36,489	32,105	88.0
Female	34,385	31,868	92.7
Comments:			

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

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	70,808	64,802	91.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	141	131	92.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,111	1,053	94.8
Black, non-Hispanic	17,398	14,764	84.9
Hispanic	3,373	2,934	87.0
White, non-Hispanic	48,782	45,917	94.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,014	5,909	73.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,167	762	65.3
Economically disadvantaged students	36,651	31,890	87.0
Migratory students	32	28	87.5
Male	36,460	32,358	88.8
Female	34,343	32,439	94.5
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	70,767	57,746	81.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	141	122	86.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,128	1,015	90.0
Black, non-Hispanic	17,350	11,280	65.0
Hispanic	3,421	2,570	75.1
White, non-Hispanic	48,724	42,757	87.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,991	4,112	51.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,169	566	48.4
Economically disadvantaged students	36,626	26,433	72.2
Migratory students	33	25	75.8
Male	36,419	29,455	80.9
Female	34,343	28,287	82.4

Comments: Tennessee's migrant population declined in 2008-09 as the recession and high unemployment affected the nursery, meat processing and other industries that attract migrant workers in better economic times.

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

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	71,628	64,547	90.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	147	141	95.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,079	1,035	95.9
Black, non-Hispanic	17,470	14,470	82.8
Hispanic	3,154	2,717	86.1
White, non-Hispanic	49,778	46,184	92.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,042	5,161	64.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,026	717	69.9
Economically disadvantaged students	36,281	30,877	85.1
Migratory students	23	19	82.6
Male	36,631	32,331	88.3
Female	34,995	32,214	92.0

Comments: Tennessee's migrant population declined in 2008-09 as the recession and high unemployment affected the nursery, meat processing and other industries that attract migrant workers in better economic times.

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

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	71,554	66,278	92.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	147	134	91.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,051	993	94.5
Black, non-Hispanic	17,470	15,114	86.5
Hispanic	3,111	2,707	87.0
White, non-Hispanic	49,775	47,330	95.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,055	6,026	74.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,018	619	60.8
Economically disadvantaged students	36,235	31,974	88.2
Migratory students	23	14	60.9
Male	36,595	32,867	89.8
Female	34,957	33,409	95.6
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	71,506	53,412	74.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	146	111	76.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,079	898	83.2
Black, non-Hispanic	17,420	9,139	52.5
Hispanic	3,142	1,939	61.7
White, non-Hispanic	49,719	41,325	83.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,022	3,433	42.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,021	254	24.9
Economically disadvantaged students	36,197	22,482	62.1
Migratory students	23	6	26.1
Male	36,559	27,493	75.2
Female	34,945	25,917	74.2
Comments: Tennessee's migrant population declined in 2008-09 as the recession and high unemployment affected the nursery, meat processing and other industries that attract migrant workers in better economic times.			

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

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	89,198	68,308	76.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	285	234	82.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	993	881	88.7
Black, non-Hispanic	27,594	17,036	61.7
Hispanic	4,030	3,088	76.6
White, non-Hispanic	56,168	46,976	83.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,565	7,211	53.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,551	997	64.3
Economically disadvantaged students	44,658	31,773	71.2
Migratory students	24	17	70.8
Male	46,736	35,002	74.9
Female	42,294	33,191	78.5

Comments: Tennessee's migrant population declined in 2008-09 as the recession and high unemployment affected the nursery, meat processing and other industries that attract migrant workers in better economic times.

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

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	79,352	75,961	95.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	261	248	95.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,267		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	20,842	19,158	91.9
Hispanic	3,281	3,064	93.4
White, non-Hispanic	53,615	52,175	97.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,596	7,862	81.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	910	735	80.8
Economically disadvantaged students	35,444	33,028	93.2
Migratory students	19	16	84.2
Male	40,886	38,576	94.4
Female	38,346		>97%

Comments: Tennessee's migrant population declined in 2008-09 as the recession and high unemployment affected the nursery, meat processing and other industries that attract migrant workers in better economic times.

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

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	82,142	78,641	95.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	255	242	94.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,341		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	21,638	19,673	90.9
Hispanic	3,542	3,336	94.2
White, non-Hispanic	55,277	53,998	>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,589	7,909	82.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,172	956	81.6
Economically disadvantaged students	36,937	34,478	93.3
Migratory students	21	18	85.7
Male	41,949	39,808	94.9
Female	40,055	38,706	96.6
Comments: Tennessee's migrant population declined in 2008-09 as the recession and high unemployment affected the nursery, meat processing and other industries that attract migrant workers in better economic times.			

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

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
Schools	1,662	1,324	79.7
Districts	136	113	83.1
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
All Title I schools	982	761	77.5
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	889	675	75.9
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	93	86	92.5
Comments:			

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09
139	113	81.3
Comments: Three of the LEAs that receive Title I funds are not required to calculate AYP status because they are not accountable to students for AYP purposes: Tennessee School for the Blind, Tennessee School for the Deaf and West Tennessee School for the Deaf.		

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

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

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY <> (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement û Year 1, School Improvement û Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (This column must be completed by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

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

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

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	6
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	3
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	0
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments:	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
Comments: None of the listed actions were taken by Title I schools in restructuring-year 2.	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2009-10 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (This column **must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement. This column is optional for States that list only** districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

Second, TN requires all districts to engage in comprehensive district improvement planning process that results in their submission of a consolidated application for their NCLB funds. This process is referred to as the Tennessee Comprehensive Systemwide Planning Process (TCSPP). All districts have been offered technical assistance on their TCSPPs in light of academic and non-academic data from school year 2007-2008. All LEAs in Improvement and Corrective Action submitted their TCSPPs for review and approval by the State in November 2008. LEAs that are identified as in improvement must ensure that they have addressed the additional components required in Title I1 for LEA Improvement.

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

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	3
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	2
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2008-09 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	28	9
Schools	78	18
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	07/20/09
---	----------

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA for SY 2008-09.

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

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09.

Instructions for States that during SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2008 (i.e., non fall-testing states):

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in SY 2008-09.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2008-09.
 - In SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2008-09.

States that in SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2008 (i.e., fall-testing states):

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
 - In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2008-09 column.

Category	SY 2008-09	SY 2007-08
Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	30,688	34,063
Total number of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	22,160	23,944
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	72.2	70.3
Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	27,374	29,660
Total number of students who were proficient or above in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	23,117	25,378
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	84.4	85.6
Comments:		

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

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that:

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

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	32
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2008-09	23
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	42
Comments:	

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2009. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2008-09.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy (s) was used	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
1		65	22	8	A	
2		66	20	8	A	
3		32	8	5	A	
4		65	19	8	A	

5	offered tutoring before/after school/ weekends; utilized family specialist, behavior specialist, district-level graduation coach, computer/tech hardware/training and ELL materials; greater collaboration with PTO; improved school climate with PD "Difficult Cultures, Common Grounds"; implemented professional learning communities to promote collaboration, common assessments and curriculum mapping; added 20 days to teacher contract time for planning and data analysis prior to/during school year.	55	15	6	D	decrease in disciplinary incidents; increase in attendance and student engagement; increase in graduation rate; improved school climate/culture; enhanced collaboration opportunities for teachers, including joint planning time for grade level teams and subject departments; increase in time devoted to student instruction; increase in staff morale and teacher retention; and increase in reading proficiency levels of Hispanic students.
6 = Combo 1	Strategies 1&2	63	20	8	A	
7 = Combo 2	Strategies 1&3	32	8	5	A	
8 = Combo 3	Strategies 2&3	31	7	5	A	

Comments:

Column 1 Response Options Box

1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.

4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box

A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

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

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

Second, all districts are assigned state NCLB field service consultants to work with individual districts and their schools to implement NCLB programs effectively. This includes working with districts that have schools receiving Title I school improvement funds. While working with their schools, they share effective strategies that other schools have implemented using school improvement funds. In addition, the State has provided two annual opportunities for districts with schools in improvement that receive funds to share their best practices with each other. First, the State annually provides an application and application process that districts with eligible schools complete to receive funds. To provide professional development to the districts on the application and the best use of the funds, the State holds a training in which the districts share the most promising strategies that they have utilized in previous years funded by Title I improvement funds. Second, as part of the reporting process on the use of these funds, the State holds a Webex for districts to understand how to report their performance and to share with each other again those strategies that have been most promising in improving student achievement that were funded by Title I school improvement funds.

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

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

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2008 (SY 2008-09) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of ESEA and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of ESEA: 4.0 %

Comments:

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

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

For SY 2008-09 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to EDFacts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to EDFacts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools -CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the EDFacts Reporting System.

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of ESEA allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2008-09.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Tennessee reserved 5 percent of Section 1003(g) funds from its grant. Tennessee targeted the 1003 'g' funds to improving struggling Title I high schools. In October 2008, a training for key stakeholders was held on High School Redesign to present innovative, effective techniques and to provide school districts with technical assistance regarding their grant application for SIG funds. Most 1003(g) grants for high school redesign were planned and written during 2008-09 and awarded in the summer of 2009. The state assisted grant facilitators in evaluating high school redesign grants. All of the grants necessitated the rewriting of identified weak sections of the grant proposal. The grant facilitator and NCLB consultant assisted the district with each of their Title I High School Redesign proposal rewrites. Milestone visits (to measure grant progress) occurred in the Fall of 2009 and monitored and evaluated progress in each of the school improvement grants.

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

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

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2008-09 that were supported by funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	57,254
Applied to transfer	3,194
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	2,465

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 2,009,234

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	3

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.
- In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.
- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	36,194
Applied for supplemental educational services	8,876
Received supplemental educational services	6,581
Comments:	

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

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 6,185,417
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	199,391	197,039	98.8	2,352	1.2
All elementary classes	119,382	118,615	99.4	767	0.6
All secondary classes	80,009	78,424	98.0	1,585	2.0

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

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

Yes

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Both -some LEAs count elementary as one class for all subjects. Other LEAs report each subject by a separate class code at the elementary level.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	12.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	83.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	5.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	33.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	61.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	6.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	34,373	34,155	99.4
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	26,719	26,522	99.3
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	19,862	19,399	97.7
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	19,246	18,900	98.2

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	83.5	52.1
Poverty metric used	Percentage of students eligible for free and reduced price meals.	
Secondary schools	70.8	41.6
Poverty metric used	Percentage of students eligible for free and reduced price meals.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- What is a "high-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.
- What is a "low-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.
- How are the poverty quartiles determined? Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.
- Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose? States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.**
2. **Other Language = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

TN also uses the push-in model and the laboratory setting for ESL instruction. The push-in model is used for intermediate and advanced LEP in some LEAs. The laboratory model allows mixed age/grade groups to be served at the same time and is seldom selected in TN as a model of ESL instruction.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	31,284
Comments:	

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	30,691
Comments:	

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

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	23,357
Arabic	1,541
Vietnamese	583
Somali	555
Chinese	420

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	25,043
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,762
Total	26,805
Comments: The State investigated this difference. TN uses a spring testing window. Due to the economy and several immigration raids in TN, the number of LEP enrolled during the testing period was lower than number of LEP students enrolled at any time during the year.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	6,455
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	25.8
Comments:	

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	24,568
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,727
Total	26,295
Comments: TN assesses in the spring for ELP. Due to the economy and several immigration raids, our numbers dipped during this period. TN has investigated LEA error in this matter.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III Students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/making progress(# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III LEP with one data point whose progress can not be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1.	6,730

1.6.3.2.2

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) = State targets for the percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.**
2. **Making Progress = Number of Title III LEP students that met the definition of Making Progress as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
3. **ELP Attainment = Number of Title III LEP students that meet the State defined English language proficiency submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
4. **Results = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of Making Progress and the number and percent that met the State definition of Attainment of English language proficiency.**

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percentage of States making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	13,261	59.8	15,928	60.00
ELP attainment	6,244	28.2	11,870	15.00

Comments: Tennessee's AMAO 1 cohort consists of the 15,298 Title III LEP students who were assessed in the state's English language proficiency exam in the current year and prior year. The AMAO 1 cohort is the sum of students who made progress (13,261) and those who did not make progress (2,037) compared to the prior year on the state's English language proficiency exam. The state surpassed its target of 60% for AMAO 1: 83.3% of Title III LEP students with test results for the current and prior year met AMAO 1. Tennessee's cohort for AMAO 2 is, 11,870, which consists of students who participated in the ELL program for three or more years and those who attained proficiency in fewer years. The state exceeded its 15% target for AMAO 2: 52.6% of the AMAO 2 cohort attained proficiency on the state's English language proficiency exam.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
2,787	1,903	4,690
Comments:		

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State NCLB mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
4,208	3,992	94.9	216
Comments:			

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
4,248	4,048	95.3	200
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

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

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
4,195	3,518	83.9	677
Comments:			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

	#
# -Total number of subgrantees for the year	86
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	84
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	86
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	86
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	84
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2007-08 and 2008-09)	0
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
# -Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09)	0
Comments:	

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
6,940	4,771	4

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

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

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	808
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	418

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

TN is showing about a 8.7% increase in ELL students this year. If that holds true for the next 5 years, then we can expect about 418 additional teachers to be needed for the LEP population.

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

1.6.6.2 Professional Development Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	56	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	44	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	45	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	32	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	40	
Other (Explain in comment box)	17	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	49	6,180
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	55	1,042
PD provided to principals	39	438
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	43	394
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	31	1,281
PD provided to community based organization personnel	19	255
Total	57	9,590

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

A few LEAs offered community training to bus drivers, cafeteria workers, board of education members, parent volunteers.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2008-09 funds July 1, 2008, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2008, for SY 2008-09 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/02/08	07/05/08	3
Comments: Tennessee makes funds available as soon as possible after receipt.		

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

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

We are vigilant with monitoring of how soon the funds are available. The State strives to make all federal funds available as soon as possible after grant receipt.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	
Comments: There were no persistently dangerous schools in Tennessee in 2008-09.	

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the previous school year (SY 2007-08). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	82.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	77.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	90.0
Black, non-Hispanic	72.1
Hispanic	76.1
White, non-Hispanic	86.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	78.9
Female	85.6
Comments: We could not submit IDEA, LEP, ED or Migrant grad rates because we do not yet have 4 years worth of data. We will have all or most of them by the 2009-10 school year.	

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

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

a. For 2007-08 we defined graduation rate as (# of on time regular graduates)/(All graduates + cohort dropouts). In 2007-08 we introduced a cleansing routine which counted in district transfers as dropouts if they didn't enroll in another school. We also counted as dropouts 12th graders who didn't receive a completion document but were promoted.

b. Tennessee started keeping individual student data for the graduation rate in 2006-07. This includes flags for all of the sub-groups. In 2009-10 we will have enough data to calculate graduation rates for those groups. Until then, we only have breakdowns by race and gender.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the previous school year (SY 2007-08). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	4.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	4.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.2
Black, non-Hispanic	9.1
Hispanic	5.7
White, non-Hispanic	2.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	5.0
Female	3.6
Comments: Rates are higher than last year for two reasons: (1) because we transferred calculation of rates to our new data which introduced two data cleansing routines which counted as dropouts students who in past years were counted as transfers or who were were promoted out of the database and (2) changed the denominator from net enrollment to October 1 membership which is a smaller number. We will be able to calculate rates for the missing demographic categories in 2009-10	

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	124	124
LEAs with subgrants	15	15
Total	139	139
Comments:		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	71	228
K	223	967
1	211	865
2	194	908
3	199	754
4	177	673
5	166	616
6	135	510
7	105	488
8	104	457
9	102	443
10	81	301
11	85	298
12	165	226
Ungraded	11	73
Total	2,029	7,807
Comments:		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths -LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths -LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	196	1,629
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1,614	5,460
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	75	153
Hotels/Motels	144	565
Total	2,029	7,807
Comments:		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	298
K	949
1	861
2	901
3	740
4	668
5	594
6	502
7	485
8	448
9	439
10	300
11	296
12	215
Ungraded	70
Total	7,766
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	254
Migratory children/youth	28
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	893
Limited English proficient students	354
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	14
Expedited evaluations	5
Staff professional development and awareness	12
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	12
Transportation	13
Early childhood programs	7
Assistance with participation in school programs	11
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	12
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	11
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	11
Coordination between schools and agencies	12
Counseling	9
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	9
Clothing to meet a school requirement	14
School supplies	15
Referral to other programs and services	11
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	8
Other (optional – in comment box below)	3
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	0
School Selection	0
Transportation	2
School records	1
Immunizations	1
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	4

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Accurate and timely identification of eligible students due to delays in disclosure of living situations Lack of knowledge concerning student living conditions Lack of available preschool space Staff development has improved but more improvement needed. Helping families with financial services for rental assistance Transportaion to school of origin is sometimes challenging. Affordable housing has a long waiting list and many stipulations. We have few emergency housing beds. Parents who choose not to enroll children in services for homeless Finding adequate transportation sources

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	498	412
4	467	373
5	405	349
6	352	297
7	357	300
8	355	302
High School		
Comments: High School: Grade level data are not available. However, aggregate data indicate that 484 homeless high school students served by McKinney-Vento took the reading assessment test; 156 scored below proficient and 328 scored at or above proficient.		

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

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	494	409
4	465	372
5	407	347
6	352	292
7	355	294
8	355	288
High School		
Comments: High School: Grade level data are not available. However, aggregate data indicate that 424 homeless high school students served by McKinney-Vento took the math assessment test; 59 scored below proficient and 365 scored at or above proficient.		

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

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	372
K	139
1	145
2	136
3	96
4	100
5	90
6	96
7	74
8	60
9	77
10	69
11	44
12	26
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	1,544
Total	3,072
Comments:	

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

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

not-applicable

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	176
K	65
1	67
2	55
3	31
4	42
5	43
6	33
7	30
8	25
9	38
10	35
11	26
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	526
Total	1,200
Comments:	

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

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We have almost doubled the number of services we have provided in the summer this program year. 1. We increased the number of students served by training our recruiters to not only recruit but also to provide services to families such as tutoring sessions, teaching ELL classes, and helping students receive free books through Reading is Fundamental. 2. As a way of increasing our numbers served in the summer, we hired more in-home tutors for students that couldn't attend summer programs. 3. We hired a Somali recruiter who worked specifically tutoring and servicing the Somali population. 4. We conducted Science Camps in several areas and served students from multiple counties to increase the number of students that had access to the program. These camps were in areas with less than the required level of migrant population density to qualify for a MEP grant. 5. We helped out-of-school youth by providing ELL books and CD's to help them learn in the home around their schedule and then followed up on their progress with these materials. All of these efforts along with our continued effort to provide instruction through our summer school programs lead to the increase in numbers.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We used MIS2000 to generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count. The same system was used for the last reporting period.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Interviews with migrant families and youth are conducted to gather information for Certificates of Eligibility (COE's). The COE is then sent in for approval. All COE's are reviewed for accuracy. Once approved they are sent into the data specialist. When they are received, school age (PK through 12) migrants are compared to lists of students from the State's student information database. This information is used to confirm grade and verify school enrollment information, and to verify accuracy of Qualifying Arrival Date given. The COE is entered into the MIS 2000 Database. In order to prevent duplications, the migrant's name is checked against the existing enrollment, and then the birth date is checked in case of spelling differences. Once the information has been entered, lists are printed that include all the enrolled migrants, by County and/or District. These lists are sorted alphabetically. Monthly, copies of the list are forwarded to the LEAs for confirmation of the data. Should there be differences in grade and/or school information, this is corrected within the database.

The child count data for the A2 count was collected through service logs submitted by the program areas regarding the services provided to migrant students. These logs were submitted for entry into the MIS 2000 database where the services were coded and recorded. We also collect data on services provided during the regular school year. Enrollments for the Regular School year are given a code of either R, P or G. Enrollments for Summer Term or Intersession are given a code of S, T or L.

For reporting purposes, MSEdD has created several reports that print out the information necessary for the CSPR. The information compiled in the report is checked on a monthly basis to ascertain accuracy (our reports are called an Overview for count accuracy and 12 Month Contact Report for a complete list by district). The report looks for Migrants between the ages of 3 and 22 years that have enrolled between the Start and End date of the program year. The list is then sorted by grade. Our checks and balance includes exporting the information to Excel and sorting the information.

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data entry specialist enters the COE information for migrant students into MIS2000 upon receipt of the COE. When we are informed by school districts or parents of information that needs to be updated, such as grade level, enrollment dates, address changes, etc... the changes are made in the database when the information is received. From this information, we are able to use existing reports or create new reports to organize child counts by district, county, or the state totals.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data collection for category 2 and category 1 are the same.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Child count was calculated using MIS2000.

The report is created that uses the start date of 9/1/08 and an end date of 8/31/09. (School history.withdrawdate is between Start Date and End Date or School History.enrolldate is between start date and end date. The Start date is 9/1/08 and the end date is 8/31/09)

The report only identifies children between the age of 3 and 21 based on their birth dates. (Students 22nd birthdate is greater than or equal to start date and the students' third birthday is less than or equal to the EndDate)

Their QAD is later than 9/1/05 and their enrollment has not been deemed null. (The students QAD3 date is greater than or equal to the Start Date.)

In order to ensure unduplicated counts, a variable is attached to the formatted report that looks for duplicated students (the same StudentSeq) and suppresses their count to one for the final count. The actual report contains two columns, on duplicated and one unduplicated.

For regular enrollment the report looks only for enrollment type of R, P or G (Resident, Participant [regular school year], or GED pursuer). For Summer Services, the database looks for a S enrollment or a "Served in Summer" tag that indicates the student received instructional, support, referral services.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There is no difference in the way the category 2 count was generated.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Student eligibility is based on data collected on our state COE, the verification and/or reinterview of that information, and the approval process for COE's. COE's are submitted weekly by recruiters. These are subsequently reviewed by the state ID&R Coordinator and entered in the pool for re-interviews. All of our reinterviews have been conducted before COEs are entered in the state database. After COEs have been entered into the Database, a report is run to ascertain accuracy of spelling and data. Monthly reports are forwarded to LEAs listing out all identified migrants in their districts. Errors are reported back to the data entry specialist and corrected. Twice a year an internal audit is completed. During the audit, a report is printed that contains every migrant enrolled in the program for the program year. This report is then compared against the physical COE. This procedure catches duplications, omissions and errors.

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

The supervisor of the data entry specialist also has a copy of the database and is always referring to it, thereby providing another source of internal audit.

The final steps taken by the staff to verify the child count, is an audit of the whole year just prior to the submission to ED. This audit is a comparison of each hard copy COE to the information stored in the database.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

log is kept of all re-interviews and their results. If a family is found to be in-eligible a discussion is held with the recruiter about the results of the re-interview. If a recruiter has additional information to provide regarding a specific eligibility case they are given the chance to submit the information. If they do not have additional information we consider the youth or family to be in-eligible for the program. During the training process for recruiters, they are given specific instruction regarding eligibility requirements through a thorough review of the eligibility section in the Draft Regulatory Guidance. Upon completion of this, training recruiters are given a 90-question recruitment test that lists 90 different situations that the guidance covers. The recruiters must take the test until they complete all 90 questions accurately. We have found this to be an effective way to ensure that the new recruiters understand how to apply all of the eligibility criteria to the different situations they can encounter when recruiting. During the training recruiters also are given 5 questionnaires developed through the ConQIR consortium that they use as eligibility scripts when they are conducting interviews to ensure that we all asking the same eligibility questions and assessing eligibility on the same criteria. A recruiter then is given in the field training by an experienced trainer. They spend 1-2 days observing the recruiter and then a least 1-day that the trainer observes the recruiter. The re-interviewers are given the same instruction as the recruiters and use a set of eligibility scripts very similar to what the recruiter uses. Recruiters are required to send in a daily email of what they accomplish each day. This includes what activities they did, where they went, and who they qualified etc. Recruiters are not assessed on the number of COE's they fill out but rather their accuracy in obtaining information, their ability to canvass a community find all eligible families, how well they can establish a rapport with families, and how well they can organize their time. A review of their emails each day helps our program ensure that we are working in a focused balanced way to find all of the eligible families in the state.

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

This year we prospectively re-interviewed 115 COE's containing anywhere from one student to five students on each COE. (Multiple students on one COE was a practice of a couple of our state recruiters prior to retraining and initiation of the national COE. This practice has now stopped.) Thirty-five of those reinterviewed could not be contacted. Fifteen were found to be ineligible. The remaining sixty-five were verified to be eligible. All of these re-interviews were conducted before students were enrolled into the database.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We conduct a thorough audit reviewing reports compiled from the MIS2000 database listing migrant student information with the COE hard copies we have in our files. Also, the data specialist checks for potential duplications in data with each data entry of a new COE. She also checks for duplicates before compiling reports. All data entry is conducted at one site for the whole state.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data entry specialist compiles the reports and it is then reviewed by the state coordinator/recruiter and then reviewed by the State Migrant Education Consultant. Each month reports regarding services provided to students are sent into the data specialist after being reviewed by the coordinator. Through the year data is entered regarding program services and COE counts are compared with data sent in from the field. Comparison of this is ongoing and is culminated with the review of the CSPR data submitted by the data specialist by both the state coordinator/recruiter and state consultant.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Our policy is whenever a youth or family is found to be in-eligible, we immediately review the situation and talk with the recruiter directly to best determine the cause for the inaccurate data. If it is a training issue, we directly address the information to the recruiter. If it is an issue of varying information from the family or youth, we try to examine our interview questions to ensure that both the recruiter and re-interviewer are asking the same questions. We realize that sometimes we will be given varying information even if the same, correct questions are used, but we try to ensure that this is not due to anything on our part. We believe re-interviews are an important part of recruitment efforts to ensure continuity. We have held this belief for years. It helps us better train, monitor, and ensure that all those we are serving should be receiving services.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No concerns at this time.