# 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 2009-10

## TENNESSEE

**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2010**
**PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2011**

**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) 2009-10 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 2013-2014, 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 2005-2006, 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 2009-10 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 17, 2010**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 18, 2011**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2009-10, 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 2009-10 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 2009-10 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/).

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

| | |
|---|---|
| | OMB Number: 1810-0614 |
| | Expiration Date: 10/31/2010 |

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
_X_Part I, 2009-10 ___Part II, 2009-10

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@tn.gov

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

_____ _____Thursday, April 28, 2011, 9:27:52 AM
Signature

# CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
# PART I

For reporting on

## School Year 2009-10

**PART I DUE DECEMBER 17, 2010**
**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 were 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 with Modified academic achievement standards and a simplified language form for ELL populations. Both were included 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 and implemented in the 2009-10 SY. The achievement levels for all new assessments are as follows: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, and Below Basic.

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

**1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science**

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, reading/language arts and/or 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 the most 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 were 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 with Modified Academic Standards and a simplified language form for ELL populations. Both were included 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 for the 2009-10 SY.

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

### 1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

#### 1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes

For funds your State had available under ESEA section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

| Purpose | Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent) |
|---|---|
| To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b) | 30.0 |
| To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results | 70.0 |
| **Comments:** | |

#### 1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development

For funds your State had available under ESEA 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

| Purpose | Used for Purpose (yes/no) |
|---|---|
| Administering assessments required by section 1111(b) | Yes |
| Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b) | No |
| Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7) | Yes |
| Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials | Yes |
| Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems | No |
| Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments | No |
| Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (IDEA) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments | No |
| Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time | No |
| Other | No |
| **Comments:** | |

## 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 Sates for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.*

| Student Group | # Students Enrolled | # Students Participating | Percentage of Students Participating |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 522,727 | | >97 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1,195 | | >97 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 8,629 | | >97 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 127,872 | | >97 |
| Hispanic | 28,447 | | >97 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 356,393 | | >97 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 61,040 | 58,919 | 96.5 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 11,343 | | >97 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 296,260 | | >97 |
| Migratory students | 239 | | >97 |
| Male | 269,748 | | >97 |
| Female | 252,852 | | >97 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

### 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 | 11,738 | 19.9 |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations | 31,595 | 53.6 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards | 10,536 | 17.9 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards | 5,063 | 8.6 |
| Total | 58,932 | |
| **Comments:** The discrepancy is under investigation. | | |

### 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 | 515,996 | | >97 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1,147 | | >97 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 8,907 | | >97 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 126,336 | | >97 |
| Hispanic | 27,560 | | >97 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 351,880 | | >97 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 59,480 | 57,310 | 96.4 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 10,524 | | >97 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 287,272 | | >97 |
| Migratory students | 227 | | >97 |
| Male | 265,398 | | >97 |
| Female | 250,479 | | >97 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

### 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 | 10,810 | 18.9 |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations | 31,101 | 54.3 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards | 10,444 | 18.2 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards | 4,968 | 8.7 |
| Total | 57,323 | |
| **Comments:** The discrepancy is under investigation. | | |

### 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 | 522,132 | | >97 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1,161 | | >97 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 9,140 | | >97 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 127,592 | | >97 |
| Hispanic | 28,106 | | >97 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 355,962 | | >97 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 60,222 | 57,945 | 96.2 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 10,908 | | >97 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 291,075 | | >97 |
| Migratory students | 234 | | >97 |
| Male | 268,669 | | >97 |
| Female | 253,334 | | >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 | 10,935 | 18.9 |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations | 31,530 | 54.4 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards | 10,487 | 18.1 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards | 5,006 | 8.6 |
| Total | 57,958 | |
| **Comments:** The discrepancy is under investigation. | | |

## 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 | 75,546 | 36,063 | 47.7 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 170 | 70 | 41.2 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1,467 | 990 | 67.5 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 18,026 | 5,313 | 29.5 |
| Hispanic | 4,973 | 1,836 | 36.9 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 50,899 | 27,847 | 54.7 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 8,995 | 2,575 | 28.6 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,474 | 538 | 21.7 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 44,845 | 16,148 | 36.0 |
| Migratory students | 42 | 13 | 31.0 |
| Male | 39,152 | 18,843 | 48.1 |
| Female | 36,385 | 17,218 | 47.3 |
| **Comments:** Tennessee implemented new curriculum and assessment standards in 2009-10. | | | |

**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 | 75,462 | 31,777 | 42.1 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 170 | 59 | 34.7 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1,429 | 880 | 61.6 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 18,028 | 4,392 | 24.4 |
| Hispanic | 4,931 | 1,407 | 28.5 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 50,893 | 25,034 | 49.2 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 9,002 | 2,325 | 25.8 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,466 | 275 | 11.2 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 44,793 | 13,313 | 29.7 |
| Migratory students | 42 | 10 | 23.8 |
| Male | 39,116 | 14,930 | 38.2 |
| Female | 36,337 | 16,844 | 46.4 |
| **Comments:** Tennessee implemented new curriculum and assessment standards in 2009-10. | | | |

**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 | 75,479 | 46,066 | 61.0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 169 | 104 | 61.5 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1,466 | 1,085 | 74.0 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 18,006 | 6,350 | 35.3 |
| Hispanic | 4,970 | 2,368 | 47.6 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 50,857 | 36,151 | 71.1 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 8,986 | 3,849 | 42.8 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,474 | 739 | 29.9 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 44,797 | 21,862 | 48.8 |
| Migratory students | 42 | 16 | 38.1 |
| Male | 39,107 | 24,464 | 62.6 |
| Female | 36,363 | 21,595 | 59.4 |
| **Comments:** Tennessee implemented new curriculum and assessment standards in 2009-10. | | | |

**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 | 74,924 | 25,695 | 34.3 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 169 | 51 | 30.2 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1,380 | 808 | 58.6 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 17,652 | 3,431 | 19.4 |
| Hispanic | 4,406 | 1,115 | 25.3 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 51,309 | 20,288 | 39.5 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 8,951 | 1,768 | 19.8 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,172 | 294 | 13.5 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 43,271 | 10,147 | 23.4 |
| Migratory students | 43 | 11 | 25.6 |
| Male | 38,323 | 13,567 | 35.4 |
| Female | 36,587 | 12,126 | 33.1 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

**1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - 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 | 74,827 | 31,471 | 42.1 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 169 | 63 | 37.3 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1,346 | 783 | 58.2 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 17,644 | 4,260 | 24.1 |
| Hispanic | 4,365 | 1,260 | 28.9 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 51,295 | 25,103 | 48.9 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 8,953 | 2,243 | 25.1 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,164 | 223 | 10.3 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 43,202 | 12,696 | 29.4 |
| Migratory students | 42 | 11 | 26.2 |
| Male | 38,281 | 14,930 | 39.0 |
| Female | 36,532 | 16,539 | 45.3 |
| **Comments:** Tennessee implemented new curriculum and assessment standards in 2009-10. | | | |

**1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - 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 | 74,867 | 33,577 | 44.8 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 169 | 74 | 43.8 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1,380 | 813 | 58.9 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 17,640 | 3,463 | 19.6 |
| Hispanic | 4,401 | 1,292 | 29.4 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 51,269 | 27,932 | 54.5 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 8,944 | 2,309 | 25.8 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,168 | 278 | 12.8 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 43,233 | 13,333 | 30.8 |
| Migratory students | 43 | 14 | 32.6 |
| Male | 38,298 | 18,613 | 48.6 |
| Female | 36,555 | 14,960 | 40.9 |
| **Comments:** Tennessee implemented new curriculum and assessment standards in 2009-10. | | | |

**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 | 74,715 | 26,445 | 35.4 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 147 | 55 | 37.4 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1,273 | 809 | 63.6 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 17,981 | 3,683 | 20.5 |
| Hispanic | 4,072 | 1,119 | 27.5 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 51,231 | 20,775 | 40.6 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 8,739 | 1,516 | 17.3 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,763 | 200 | 11.3 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 42,920 | 10,400 | 24.2 |
| Migratory students | 40 | N<10 | |
| Male | 38,610 | 13,562 | 35.1 |
| Female | 36,095 | 12,882 | 35.7 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

**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 | 74,619 | 35,754 | 47.9 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 147 | 73 | 49.7 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1,233 | 848 | 68.8 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 17,974 | 5,096 | 28.4 |
| Hispanic | 4,030 | 1,474 | 36.6 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 51,224 | 28,259 | 55.2 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 8,744 | 2,584 | 29.6 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,755 | 179 | 10.2 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 42,851 | 14,766 | 34.5 |
| Migratory students | 39 | N<10 | |
| Male | 38,558 | 16,947 | 44.0 |
| Female | 36,052 | 18,805 | 52.2 |
| **Comments:** Tennessee implemented new curriculum and assessment standards in 2009-10. | | | |

**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 | 74,658 | 38,337 | 51.4 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 147 | 81 | 55.1 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1,272 | 876 | 68.9 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 17,971 | 4,456 | 24.8 |
| Hispanic | 4,066 | 1,429 | 35.1 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 51,191 | 31,491 | 61.5 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 8,732 | 2,706 | 31.0 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,762 | 221 | 12.5 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 42,886 | 15,878 | 37.0 |
| Migratory students | 40 | 12 | 30.0 |
| Male | 38,582 | 20,766 | 53.8 |
| Female | 36,066 | 17,569 | 48.7 |
| **Comments:** Tennessee implemented new curriculum and assessment standards in 2009-10. | | | |

**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 | 73,102 | 22,541 | 30.8 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 142 | 41 | 28.9 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1,256 | 706 | 56.2 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 17,947 | 2,553 | 14.2 |
| Hispanic | 3,821 | 811 | 21.2 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 49,924 | 18,427 | 36.9 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 8,266 | 1,175 | 14.2 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,326 | 79 | 6.0 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 41,275 | 7,946 | 19.3 |
| Migratory students | 38 | 10 | 26.3 |
| Male | 37,387 | 11,628 | 31.1 |
| Female | 35,707 | 10,913 | 30.6 |
| **Comments:** Tennessee implemented new curriculum and assessment standards in 2009-10. | | | |

**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 | 73,033 | 37,313 | 51.1 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 142 | 70 | 49.3 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1,221 | 848 | 69.5 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 17,945 | 5,470 | 30.5 |
| Hispanic | 3,781 | 1,528 | 40.4 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 49,932 | 29,390 | 58.9 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 8,268 | 1,909 | 23.1 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,319 | 93 | 7.1 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 41,236 | 15,317 | 37.1 |
| Migratory students | 37 | 12 | 32.4 |
| Male | 37,347 | 17,516 | 46.9 |
| Female | 35,678 | 19,793 | 55.5 |
| **Comments:** Tennessee implemented new curriculum and assessment standards in 2009-10. | | | |

**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 | 73,020 | 35,595 | 48.7 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 142 | 70 | 49.3 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1,255 | 823 | 65.6 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 17,917 | 4,195 | 23.4 |
| Hispanic | 3,820 | 1,405 | 36.8 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 49,874 | 29,095 | 58.3 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 8,250 | 1,920 | 23.3 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,326 | 115 | 8.7 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 41,209 | 14,128 | 34.3 |
| Migratory students | 38 | 10 | 26.3 |
| Male | 37,335 | 19,159 | 51.3 |
| Female | 35,677 | 16,434 | 46.1 |
| **Comments:** Tennessee implemented new curriculum and assessment standards in 2009-10. | | | |

**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 | 71,660 | 20,342 | 28.4 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 148 | 36 | 24.3 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1,176 | 658 | 56.0 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 17,807 | 2,184 | 12.3 |
| Hispanic | 3,663 | 735 | 20.1 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 48,854 | 16,725 | 34.2 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 8,068 | 918 | 11.4 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,090 | 76 | 7.0 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 39,690 | 6,711 | 16.9 |
| Migratory students | 33 | N<10 | |
| Male | 36,653 | 10,366 | 28.3 |
| Female | 34,996 | 9,973 | 28.5 |
| **Comments:** Tennessee implemented new curriculum and assessment standards in 2009-10. | | | |

**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 | 71,626 | 30,252 | 42.2 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 148 | 66 | 44.6 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1,149 | 718 | 62.5 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 17,802 | 3,882 | 21.8 |
| Hispanic | 3,629 | 1,101 | 30.3 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 48,886 | 24,479 | 50.1 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 8,072 | 1,405 | 17.4 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,083 | 28 | 2.6 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 39,652 | 11,150 | 28.1 |
| Migratory students | 34 | N<10 | |
| Male | 36,643 | 13,681 | 37.3 |
| Female | 34,972 | 16,566 | 47.4 |
| **Comments:** Tennessee implemented new curriculum and assessment standards in 2009-10. | | | |

**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 | 71,610 | 35,318 | 49.3 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 148 | 77 | 52.0 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1,175 | 814 | 69.3 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 17,792 | 4,581 | 25.7 |
| Hispanic | 3,659 | 1,353 | 37.0 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 48,824 | 28,485 | 58.3 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 8,050 | 1,785 | 22.2 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,090 | 88 | 8.1 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 39,652 | 13,833 | 34.9 |
| Migratory students | 34 | N<10 | |
| Male | 36,637 | 18,529 | 50.6 |
| Female | 34,962 | 16,784 | 48.0 |
| **Comments:** Tennessee implemented new curriculum and assessment standards in 2009-10. | | | |

**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 | 70,553 | 18,218 | 25.8 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 157 | 34 | 21.7 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1,143 | 627 | 54.9 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 17,097 | 1,783 | 10.4 |
| Hispanic | 3,420 | 611 | 17.9 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 48,724 | 15,160 | 31.1 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 7,627 | 855 | 11.2 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 940 | 52 | 5.5 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 37,889 | 5,628 | 14.9 |
| Migratory students | 21 | N<10 | |
| Male | 36,230 | 9,182 | 25.3 |
| Female | 34,312 | 9,035 | 26.3 |
| **Comments:** Tennessee implemented new curriculum and assessment standards in 2009-10. | | | |

**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 | 70,505 | 29,738 | 42.2 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 156 | 61 | 39.1 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1,124 | 686 | 61.0 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 17,099 | 3,672 | 21.5 |
| Hispanic | 3,378 | 958 | 28.4 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 48,736 | 24,355 | 50.0 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 7,635 | 1,300 | 17.0 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 936 | 16 | 1.7 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 37,841 | 10,389 | 27.5 |
| Migratory students | 21 | N<10 | |
| Male | 36,210 | 13,762 | 38.0 |
| Female | 34,285 | 15,974 | 46.6 |
| **Comments:** Tennessee implemented new curriculum and assessment standards in 2009-10. | | | |

**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 | 70,465 | 38,297 | 54.3 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 157 | 93 | 59.2 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1,146 | 858 | 74.9 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 17,070 | 5,175 | 30.3 |
| Hispanic | 3,414 | 1,422 | 41.7 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 48,666 | 30,741 | 63.2 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 7,606 | 1,824 | 24.0 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 940 | 81 | 8.6 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 37,820 | 14,963 | 39.6 |
| Migratory students | 21 | N<10 | |
| Male | 36,171 | 19,915 | 55.1 |
| Female | 34,283 | 18,379 | 53.6 |
| **Comments:** Tennessee implemented new curriculum and assessment standards in 2009-10. | | | |

**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 | 77,537 | 10,670 | 13.8 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 260 | 33 | 12.7 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 890 | 232 | 26.1 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 19,608 | 878 | 4.5 |
| Hispanic | 3,854 | 379 | 9.8 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 52,807 | 9,138 | 17.3 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 8,273 | 162 | 2.0 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,470 | 53 | 3.6 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 42,843 | 3,291 | 7.7 |
| Migratory students | 19 | N<10 | |
| Male | 40,501 | 5,437 | 13.4 |
| Female | 36,975 | 5,226 | 14.1 |
| **Comments:** Tennessee implemented new curriculum and assessment standards in 2009-10. | | | |

**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 | 70,865 | 41,745 | 58.9 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 208 | 136 | 65.4 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1,171 | 856 | 73.1 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 18,108 | 6,744 | 37.2 |
| Hispanic | 2,967 | 1,407 | 47.4 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 48,313 | 32,544 | 67.4 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 6,636 | 1,543 | 23.3 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 665 | 82 | 12.3 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 33,943 | 14,609 | 43.0 |
| Migratory students | N<10 | N<10 | |
| Male | 36,151 | 19,581 | 54.2 |
| Female | 34,664 | 22,133 | 63.9 |
| **Comments:** Tennessee implemented new curriculum and assessment standards in 2009-10. | | | |

**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 | 76,595 | 40,900 | 53.4 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 225 | 132 | 58.7 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1,405 | 960 | 68.3 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 19,101 | 5,842 | 30.6 |
| Hispanic | 3,537 | 1,548 | 43.8 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 52,227 | 32,371 | 62.0 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 7,377 | 1,640 | 22.2 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,055 | 142 | 13.5 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 37,352 | 14,301 | 38.3 |
| Migratory students | 16 | N<10 | |
| Male | 39,238 | 21,177 | 54.0 |
| Female | 37,294 | 19,696 | 52.8 |
| **Comments:** Tennessee implemented new curriculum and assessment standards in 2009-10. | | | |

## 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 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

| Entity | Total # | Total # that Made AYP in SY 2009-10 | Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Schools | 1,771 | 1,250 | 70.6 |
| Districts | 136 | 106 | 77.9 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

### 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 2009-10 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 2009-10 | Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|---|
| All Title I schools | 1,162 | 841 | 72.4 |
| Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools | 1,112 | 797 | 71.7 |
| Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools | 50 | 44 | 88.0 |
| **Comments:** The large increase in Title I schools in 2009-10 is associated with the availability of ARRA funds. The increase in Title I schools that made AYP resulted from the large increase in Title I schools. | | | |

### 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 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

| # Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2009-10 | # Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10 | Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| 139 | 106 | 76.3 |
| **Comments:** Three of the LEAs that received Title I funds are not required to calculate AYP status because they are not accountable for students for AYP purposes: Tennessee School for the Blind, Tennessee School for the Deaf and West Tennessee School for the Deaf. | | |

### 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 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. 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 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement - Year 1, School Improvement - Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)[1]
- 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).

[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 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

| Corrective Action | # of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10 |
|---|---|
| Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program | 9 |
| Extension of the school year or school day | |
| Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance | |
| Significant decrease in management authority at the school level | |
| Replacement of the principal | |
| Restructuring the internal organization of the school | |
| Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school | 9 |
| **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 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 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 | |
| Takeover the school by the State | |
| Other major restructuring of the school governance | |
| **Comments:** | |

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.

None of the actions listed above was taken by Title I schools in Restructuring - Year 2.

### 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 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. 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'ts 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 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action[2])
- 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).

[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 proving 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 set aside 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 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 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 2009-10 |
|---|---|
| Implemented 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 | 1 |
| Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP | 0 |
| 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 2008-09 and beginning of SY 2009-10 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 2009-10 data and the results of those appeals.

| | # Appealed Their AYP Designations | # Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation |
|---|---|---|
| Districts | 17 | 13 |
| Schools | 77 | 48 |
| **Comments:** Eleven of the 13 changes in district AYP status and 36 of the 48 changes in school AYP status were approved under ESEA S1116(b)(7)(D)'s natural disaster delay provisions. | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete | 02/15/11 |

### 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 2009-10.
Note: With the exception of 1.4.8.5.3, in section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean refers to FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10.

#### 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 2009-10.

Note: In section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10

*Instructions for States that during SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2009 (i.e., non fall-testing states):*

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 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 2009-10.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2009-10.
  - In SY 2008-09 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2009-10.

*States that in SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2009 (i.e., fall-testing states):*

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 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 2010.
  - 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 2010.
  - In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2009-10 column.

| Category | SY 2009-10 | SY 2008-09 |
|---|---|---|
| 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 2009-10 | 8,010 | 11,856 |
| 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 2009-10 | 374 | 7,011 |
| 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 2009-10 | 4.7 | 59.1 |
| 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 2009-10 | 7,226 | 8,930 |
| 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 2009-10 | 2,406 | 8,047 |
| 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 2009-10 | 33.3 | 90.1 |
| **Comments:** | | |

#### 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 2009-10 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 2009-10 that **made adequate yearly progress** based on testing in SY 2009-10 | 6 |
| Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that **exited improvement status** based on testing in SY 2009-10 | 3 |

| |
|---|
| Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that **did not make adequate yearly progress** based on testing in SY 2009-10 |
| **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 2010. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2009-10.

| Column 1 | Column 2 | Column 3 | Column 4 | Column 5 | Column 6 | Column 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used**<br><br>(See response options in *"Column 1 Response Options Box"* below.)<br><br>If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2. | **Description of "Other Strategies"**<br><br>This response is limited to 500 characters. | **Number of schools in which the strategy (strategies) was(were) used** | **Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies) and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance** | **Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies), 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 (strategies)**<br><br>(See response options in *"Column 6 Response Options Box"* below) | **Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"**<br><br>This response is limited to 500 characters. |
| 1 | | 31 | 3 | 3 | D | |
| 2 | | 30 | 2 | 3 | D | |
| 3 | | 25 | 0 | 2 | D | |
| 4 | | 20 | 2 | 0 | D | |
| 5 | Improved school culture/climate; offered tutoring after school; focused on Supplemental Educational Services; implemented a Learning Enrichment Block; provided additional technology resources and offered AVID Courses; offered extended after-school hours and ACT Prep classes; strengthened instruction through establishment of five smaller learning communities; redesigned instructional delivery and school structure. | 29 | 2 | 2 | D | Increased graduation rates, attendance rates, and teacher effectiveness; decreased failure rate in core courses; increased GPA; improved test scores; increased rigor across curriculum; increased student collaboration and problem-solving skills; improved writing assessment scores; decreased suspension rate; increased number of students taking ACT; increased leadership and math skills for Title I consulting teachers; increased credits recovered by students; improved school climate. |
| 6 = Combo 1 | Strategies 1&2 | 30 | 2 | 3 | D | |
| 7 = Combo 2 | Strategies 1&3 | 25 | 0 | 2 | D | |
| 8 = Combo 3 | Strategies 2&3 | 25 | 0 | 2 | D | |
| **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.<br><br>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.<br><br>3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.<br><br>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.

5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

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

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

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

| Column 6 Response Options Box |
| --- |
| A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells<br><br>B = Increased teacher retention<br><br>C = Improved parental involvement<br><br>D = Other |

**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 shared the effective strategies listed in item 1.4.8.3 with the state's LEAs and schools in various ways. First, the state assigned one of its Exemplary Educators (EEs) through the statewide system of support to every school identified as in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. The EEs provided technical assistance to the schools and districts. In addition, EEs met frequently to discuss the strategies that are producing results in their assigned schools. They also used a listserve to discuss these strategies and seek input from one another.
Second, all districts were assigned state NCLB field service consultants to work with individual districts and their schools to implement NCLB programs effectively. This included working with districts that have schools receiving Title I school improvement funds. While working with their schools, they shared effective strategies that other schools implemented using school improvement funds.
In addition, the State annually provides professional development to the districts applying for school improvement funds on the best use of the funds and 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.

**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 2009 (SY 2009-10) 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:**

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

For SY 2009-10 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 2009-10.

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 2009, 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. The state assisted grant facilitators in evaluating high school redesign grants. Milestone visits (to measure grant progress) occurred in the Fall of 2009 and monitored and evaluated progress in each of the school improvement grants.

**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 2009-10 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.

### 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 | 80,342 |
| Applied to transfer | 3,883 |
| Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions | 3,283 |
| **Comments:** | |

#### 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 | $ 1,913,297 |

#### 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 | 7 |

**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.

**Comments:**

[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 | 43,257 |
| Applied for supplemental educational services | 9,499 |
| Received supplemental educational services | 7,214 |
| **Comments:** | |

#### 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 | $ 7,399,022 |
| **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.

| | 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 | 221,270 | 218,321 | 98.7 | 2,949 | 1.3 |
| All elementary classes | 140,114 | 139,132 | 99.3 | 982 | 0.7 |
| All secondary classes | 81,156 | 79,189 | 97.6 | 1,967 | 2.4 |
| Secondary classes show a slightly lower percentage of HQ teachers because of the specialized nature of teaching assignments and the shortage of mathematics, Science, foreign language, ESL, and Special Education teachers. | | | | | |

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.

In the State of Tennessee, teaching assignments are entered into the statewide database by the local LEA representatives. For many years, there have been some Lea's who use "self-contained" course codes and another large group who assign an individual course code for each subject area, even when the same teacher has the students for the whole day. Furthermore, many schools have specialists in a Quasi-departmentalized setting for grades 4, 5, and 6. Students may have one teacher for half of the day and a series of teachers for the other half. There is no way to consistently report this at the elementary level, given the current circumstances.

**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 | 78.0 |
| 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 | 21.0 |
| Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program) | 1.0 |
| Other (please explain in comment box below) | 0.0 |
| Total | 100.0 |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No comment...

| | **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) | 70.0 |
| Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects | 29.0 |
| Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program) | 1.0 |
| Other (please explain in comment box below) | 0.0 |
| Total | 100.0 |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No Comment...

### 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 | 25,633 | 25,162 | 98.2 |
| Low-poverty Elementary Schools | 42,749 | 42,540 | 99.5 |
| Secondary Schools | | | |
| High Poverty secondary Schools | 16,899 | 15,912 | 94.2 |
| Low-Poverty secondary Schools | 25,429 | 25,106 | 98.7 |
| 1.5.3.1 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. | | | |

**1.5.3.1** 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 | 86.7 | 55.3 |
| Poverty metric used | Percentage of students eligible for free and reduced price meals | |
| Secondary schools | 73.2 | 43.9 |
| Poverty metric used | Percentage of students eligible for free and reduced price meals | |

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

a. *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.

b. *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.

c. *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.

d. *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 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | Dual language | Spanish |
| No | Two-way immersion | |
| No | Transitional bilingual programs | |
| No | Developmental bilingual | |
| Yes | Heritage language | Spanish and German |
| 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.

Tennessee employs Newcomer centers, language laboratories, and push-in ("other" category).

### 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 | 30,537 |
| **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. | 30,211 |
| **Comments:** | |

#### 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 | 22,046 |
| Arabic | 1,665 |
| Vietnamese | 553 |
| Somali | 526 |
| Chinese | 489 |

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 and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

| | # |
|---|---|
| Number tested on State annual ELP assessment | 26,611 |
| Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment | 1,111 |
| Total | 27,722 |
| **Comments:** The previous count was for all students enrolled throughout the year. Ninety-six percent of the LEP students enrolled during test period were tested. LEAs must account for students not tested. Many of these were CDC, fragile, or autistic children for whom no relevant data could be acquired through the assessment. | |

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

| | # |
|---|---|
| Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment | 6,289 |
| Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment | 21.9 |
| **Comments:** Benchmark for 2009-2010 was 16% for TN. | |

**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 | 26,352 |
| Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment | 1,084 |
| Total | 27,436 |
| **Comments:** All students not tested must be accounted for on form for non-tested students. Most students who could not take this assessment were on IEPs and no data could be acquired through this process. | |
| 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 and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. 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 students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1. | 10,817 |

**1.6.3.2.2**

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) =** State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
2. **Making Progress =** Number and percent 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 and percent of Title III LEP students that meet the State definition of "Attainment" of 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 | 13,827 | 89.0 | 10,924 | 62.00 |
| Attained proficiency | 6,218 | 23.6 | 4,599 | 16.00 |
| **Comments:** | | | | |

### 1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

#### 1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

| | |
|---|---|
| State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s). | _____No |
| State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s). | _____No |
| State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s). | _____No |
| **Comments:** TN is an "English Only" state. | |

#### 1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

| Language(s) |
|---|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| **Comments:** TN is an "English only" state. |

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

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

| Language(s) |
|---|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| **Comments:** TN is an "English only" state. |

#### 1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

| Language(s) |
|---|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| **Comments:** TN is an "English Only" state. |

### 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.
- 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 |
|---|---|---|
| 2,911 | 2,456 | 5,367 |
| **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 out of language instruction educational programs 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.

| # Tested | # At or Above Proficient | % Results | # Below Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5,025 | 1,755 | 34.9 | 3,270 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

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

In the table below, report results MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs 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 in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations(3 through 8 and once in high school) 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5,025 | 1,898 | 37.8 | 3,127 |
| **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 out of language instruction educational programs 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.

| # Tested | # At or Above Proficient | % Results | # Below Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5,004 | 2,212 | 44.2 | 2,792 |
| **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 | 92 |
| | |
| # - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs | 80 |
| # - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1 | 92 |
| # - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2 | 85 |
| # - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3 | 87 |
| | |
| # - 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 2008-09 and 2009-10) | 0 |
| # - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years | 0 |
| # - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10) | 0 |

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:** Three Title III subgrantees did not make AMAO 3; however, 2 of the 3 subgrantees maintained prior year status due to ESEA flood waiver/delay provisions. In addition, two subgrantees reported no AMAO 3 results because a natural disaster led to the termination of the school year prior to achievement testing.

#### 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 all three Title III AMAOs | _____No |
| **Comments:** Tennessee met AMAO 1 and AMAO 2. Tennessee did not meet AMAO 3. However, the state maintained prior year status (Good Standing) due to ESEA flood waiver/delay provisions. | |

#### 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? | _____N |
| If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated. | |
| **Comments:** No programs were terminated. | |

### 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 |
|---|---|---|
| 6,311 | 322 | 1 |

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.

### 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 as a second language.

| | # |
|---|---|
| Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs. | 937 |
| Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*. | 235 |

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.

This is figured as 5% growth for the teachers. We are seeing approximately that amount of growth in students.

* 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 | 80 | |
| Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students | 80 | |
| Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students | 60 | |
| Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards | 53 | |
| Subject matter knowledge for teachers | 62 | |
| Other (Explain in comment box) | 17 | |
| **Participant Information** | **# Subgrantees** | **# Participants** |
| PD provided to content classroom teachers | 75 | 9,602 |
| PD provided to LEP classroom teachers | 84 | 3,334 |
| PD provided to principals | 61 | 669 |
| PD provided to administrators/other than principals | 65 | 718 |
| PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative | 47 | 1,282 |
| PD provided to community based organization personnel | 24 | 882 |
| Total | 356 | 16,487 |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

TNTESOL; NABE; SIOP training; Connecting ESL Strategies to Content; Mentoring for principals and teaches of ELs; On-going PD for data collection/procedures/ESL teaching strategies; ESL on-line training for regular education teachers.

### 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 2009-10 funds July 1, 2009, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2009, for SY 2009-10 programs. Then the "# of days/$$ Distribution" is 30 days.

| Date State Received Allocation | Date Funds Available to Subgrantees | # of Days/$$ Distribution |
|---|---|---|
| 07/07/20 | 07/10/20 | 3 |
| **Comments:** We move the money as quickly as we can load it into our accountability system. | | |

#### 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 will continue to work to get the money in the system so that districts can begin to draw this down as needed for the school year. |

## 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 2009-10.

## 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 2008-09). 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*) | 67.9 |
| Limited English proficient | 84.0 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 76.4 |
| Migratory students | 70.0 |
| Male | 78.9 |
| Female | 85.6 |
| **Comments:** Graduation rates for all subgroups have been added to the EdFacts file N041. Grad rates for LEP, Economically Disadvantaged and Migratory students are incomplete in that TNDOE did not have dropout data for 9th grade dropouts for 2005-06. | |

**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.

| |
|---|
| Graduation rate = Regular on time grads/(all grads + cohort dropouts) |

### 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 2008-09). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

| Student Group | Dropout Rate |
|---|---|
| All Students | 3.2 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | <3 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | <3 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 6.5 |
| Hispanic | 3.9 |
| White, non-Hispanic | <3 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 3.3 |
| Limited English proficient | <3 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 10.4 |
| Migratory students | 12.0 |
| Male | 3.7 |
| Female | <3 |
| **Comments:** The 2008-09 dropout rates provided for LEP, Economically Disadvantaged and Migrant are the best available - although incomplete because TNDOE did not collect dropout data through its LDS for these subgroups in 2008-09. | |

**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 automatically calculated.

| | # | **#LEAs Reporting Data** |
|---|---|---|
| LEAs without subgrants | 67 | 67 |
| LEAs with subgrants | 72 | 72 |
| 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) | 21 | 309 |
| K | 104 | 1,019 |
| 1 | 83 | 1,019 |
| 2 | 83 | 998 |
| 3 | 104 | 972 |
| 4 | 87 | 902 |
| 5 | 76 | 829 |
| 6 | 69 | 817 |
| 7 | 68 | 775 |
| 8 | 88 | 677 |
| 9 | 73 | 647 |
| 10 | 58 | 479 |
| 11 | 49 | 433 |
| 12 | 66 | 459 |
| Ungraded | N<10 | 94 |
| Total | | 10,429 |
| **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 | 56 | 1,225 |
| Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family) | 801 | 8,402 |
| Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings) | 22 | 149 |
| Hotels/Motels | 150 | 653 |
| Total | 1,029 | 10,429 |
| **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) | 275 |
| K | 862 |
| 1 | 857 |
| 2 | 853 |
| 3 | 900 |
| 4 | 818 |
| 5 | 763 |
| 6 | 750 |
| 7 | 713 |
| 8 | 626 |
| 9 | 606 |
| 10 | 445 |
| 11 | 395 |
| 12 | 397 |
| Ungraded | 91 |
| Total | 9,351 |
| **Comments:** | |

#### 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 | 390 |
| Migratory children/youth | 62 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 1,074 |
| Limited English proficient students | 398 |
| **Comments:** | |

### 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 | 20 |
| Expedited evaluations | 5 |
| Staff professional development and awareness | 18 |
| Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services | 16 |
| Transportation | 23 |
| Early childhood programs | 9 |
| Assistance with participation in school programs | 22 |
| Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs | 16 |
| Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment | 14 |
| Parent education related to rights and resources for children | 15 |
| Coordination between schools and agencies | 19 |
| Counseling | 13 |
| Addressing needs related to domestic violence | 10 |
| Clothing to meet a school requirement | 33 |
| School supplies | 48 |
| Referral to other programs and services | 18 |
| Emergency assistance related to school attendance | 13 |
| Other (optional – in comment box below) | 2 |
| Other (optional – in comment box below) | 0 |
| Other (optional – in comment box below) | 0 |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 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 | 10 |
| School Selection | 3 |
| Transportation | 13 |
| School records | 10 |
| Immunizations | 5 |
| Other medical records | 1 |
| Other Barriers – in comment box below | 12 |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other barriers identified include difficulty in making identification, lack of participation in available programs, uniform expenses, transportation to school of origin, lack of affordable housing (long waiting lists, stringent requirements are also barrier), inadequate shelters, insufficient monetary assistance for housing, lack of preschool space and lack of study time and space.

### 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/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | 536 | 119 |
| 4 | 473 | 101 |
| 5 | 461 | 132 |
| 6 | 410 | 130 |
| 7 | 388 | 96 |
| 8 | 340 | 77 |
| High School | 452 | 191 |
| **Comments:** | | |

#### 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/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | 541 | 159 |
| 4 | 468 | 94 |
| 5 | 466 | 99 |
| 6 | 412 | 80 |
| 7 | 387 | 47 |
| 8 | 339 | 41 |
| High School | 620 | 42 |
| **Comments:** | | |

## 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, 2009 through August 31, 2010. 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:**

*a. 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.

*b. 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, 2009 through August 31, 2010. 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) | 420 |
| K | 132 |
| 1 | 146 |
| 2 | 121 |
| 3 | 113 |
| 4 | 98 |
| 5 | 77 |
| 6 | 83 |
| 7 | 67 |
| 8 | 56 |
| 9 | 59 |
| 10 | 55 |
| 11 | 35 |
| 12 | 19 |
| Ungraded | |
| Out-of-school | 1,276 |
| Total | 2,757 |
| **Comments:** There were no migrant students in the ungraded classification. | |

**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.

The migrant student population decreased over the past year due to several factors. The change in the definition of a temporary work program reduced migrant families and youth working in processing plants. There were fewer moves among migrant farm workers in tobacco and more long-term farm workers in that crop. Also the nursery industry was hit hard by the economic downturn. For example, sales of nursery plants and trees declined by 75% in one major nursery area. Nurseries responded by reducing employment of seasonal crews.

### 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, 2009 through August 31, 2010. 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) | 193 |
| K | 77 |
| 1 | 80 |
| 2 | 76 |
| 3 | 65 |
| 4 | 43 |
| 5 | 47 |
| 6 | 42 |
| 7 | 32 |
| 8 | 31 |
| 9 | 26 |
| 10 | 26 |
| 11 | 15 |
| 12 | N<10 |
| Ungraded | |
| Out-of-school | N<10 |
| Total | 760 |
| **Comments:** There were no migrant students in the ungraded classification. | |

**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.

Our service numbers have decreased this past due to our focus on recruiting and the implementation of our K-12 tutoring program. The increased activities in these areas reduced the resources available to serve out of school youth.

### 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.

MIS2000 was used to generate the Category 1 and 2 child count. It was also 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.

When approved Certificates of Eligibility 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 MIS2000 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.

An approved COE is one that has been confirmed as accurate and the responses from the "migrant" are within the parameters listed in the Migrant Regulations. COEs are approved by the Lead State Recruiter / Coordinator. The process of approval includes confirming all data is filled out, there are no discrepancies and all appears to be indicative of migrant activity. There are a variety of recruiting methods - occupational surveys are completed by parents of newly school enrolled students. The recruiter then calls/visits the family for the interview. Other means of recruitment are going to the migrant place of work.

All COEs are completed by the interviewing recruiter. The State of Tennessee has contracted with Tennessee Opportunity Programs to manage the migrant grant. Other than in a supervisory capacity the State Director does not complete COEs. There are annual audits of the files. Category 2 children are recruited throughout the year with a push to locate new migrants prior to school beginning. At the time of enrollment in summer programming all pertinent data on migrants is reviewed and changes are noted and forwarded to the Data Entry Specialist and State Lead Coordinator/Recruiter. Monthly lists are sent to the districts with Migrants and requested that they be reviewed for correct information. If the information is incorrect districts notify the Data Entry Specialist to change the information in the MIS2000 database. If a student leaves a Individual Student Record is sent to the Data Entry Specialist with pertinent information on the student curriculum and attendance.

State verification that summer services meet the definition provided in the CSPR is accomplished through on-site monitoring of all programs by State staff.

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 MIS2000 database where the serviced were coded and recorded. The serviced were coded with a Y (yes) for being served during the summer term or intersession.

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 List 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. This list is then sorted by grade. Our checks and balance includes exporting the information to Excel and using the "Pivot" capabilities.

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.

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;
- Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The child count was calculated using MIS2000. The report uses a start date of 9/1/09 and an end date of 8/31/10 (School. history. withdrawal date is between the start date and the end date or School History.enrolldate is between start date and end date. Using birth date, the report identifies children between the ages of 3 and 21. QAD must be greater than or equal to 9-1-06 and start date.

The School History Term Type <> N indicates that only qualifying migrants are selected. P, G and R are considered regular year enrollment types and S, T and L are summer or intersession enrollments. The above report specifically selects "P, G or R" enrollment types and omits "S, T and L" enrollment types. S means served in Summer School, T means the migrant was served by a recruiter and L means the migrant was tutored by a tutor.

For Summer Intersession the report looks only for those students that have an enrollment type of S, T or L.

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 county. The actual report contains two columns, one duplicated and one unduplicated.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The category 2 count was generated in the same manner.

**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.

After COEs have been entered in the Database, a report is run to ascertain accuracy of spelling and data. Monthly reports are forwarded to LEAs listing all identified migrants in their districts. Errors are reported back to the data entry specialist and corrected. Twice a year an internal audit is completed. During the audit a report is printed that contains every migrant enrolled in the program for the program year. This report is then compared again to the physical COE. This procedure catches duplications, omissions and errors.
During the preparation of the monthly reports, the data are exported to Excel and analyzed for priority, duplication and accuracy.
The data entry specialist's supervisor oversees the process and reviews results on an ongoing basis. At the end of the program year, the child count is finalized through a review and verification process that includes examination of COEs and databases.

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.

We use a rolling re-interview process during the year to verify the accuracy of our eligibility determinations made through completions of Certificates of Eligibility by recruiters. Any discrepancies found during the year are investigated and ineligible students are removed from the database.
1413 Students signed on with NEW COE's. Of the 1413 new students signed last year, we reviewed all COEs for accurate addresses and completeness of information. Information verified prior to database entry includes making sure individual is not already in the database. If we already have a prior COE for the family we check to make sure the information coincided with previous moves and history. If there is a question about a child's grade, we check the state EIS (student information data base) information on that child to ensure the child was coded correctly. If there is an enrollment question about when a child arrived, we check with the local district to compare their enrollment date with the date in question on a COE. All of this is reviewed on each COE, and, if additional information is needed from the recruiter, school district, family, or employer we work to acquire that.
That happened before any COE is entered into the database. We looked for red flags on all of the 1413 new COE's and those with red flags were selected for re-interview. We added families randomly to those with red flags until our 1 in 10 total was met to ensure that COEs were correct and accurately reflect the families' situations. The results of these contacts are kept, and, if a family or youth is found to be in-eligible, the COE is removed from consideration before it is entered into the database.
By selecting any and all new COEs with red flags and adding to that number to reach a 1 in 10, we ultimately selected 143 families for reinterview. This is beyond the 50 interviews recommended by OME. Of the 143 scheduled re-interviews, 90 resulted in actual interviews. Of these 90 actual interviews, 25 were determined to be ineligible. COEs for families that were selected for re-interview and with whom we were ultimately not able to make contact to conduct the re-interview, were entered into the data base. They are entered only after contact and other available information that we have on the COE is verified by the school district in which the student is enrolled. With a small MEP staff with which to contact families available to us in TN, we cannot afford to spend an extended period of time trying to locate any one particular family for the purpose of re-interview. One challenge that we have in determining eligibility during the re-interview process is that families do not always say the same thing during the interview and the re-interview. For example, the age may change on the re-interview of an OSY that makes them ineligible or on initial interview a mother may say the family came in September of 2007 making them eligible and then on re-interview she says they came in August of 2007 making them in-eligible. There are many reasons why someone can be found to not be qualifying during the re-interview besides recruiter error.
One reason why it may appear as if TN has a higher than normal discrepancy rate is related to the funds with which we have to work. Because TN has so few dollars per pupil to work with in TN, we are stretched beyond our limits in our attempt to provide services to the students that truly qualify for services. Because of this, we can ill afford to have students listed as qualifying migrant students in TN that do not qualify. We don't have enough money to serve the ones that do qualify. Toward that end, our head recruiter reviews every COE submitted by recruiters. She reviewed all 1413 new COEs during the year. From those, ANY COE that presented a red flag to her was selected for reinterview. Because we choose COEs that we believe may be flawed for reinterview, it only stands to reason that we would have a higher error rate than if we selected a truly random sample from all of the 1413 new COEs for the year. After all potentially flawed COEs were selected for reinterview, that number was supplemented with randomly selected new COEs until we reached a self imposed 1 in 10 new COEs for reinterview. Again, this 1 in 10 is a number far higher than the 50 recommended.
Red flags for which the head recruiter looks include:
• QAD dates after residency dates
• Incomplete addresses or phone numbers
• Children born after qualifying moves
• Incomplete birthdates
• Families that return each year- ensure information is consistent
• 12th grade students- ensure that they have not yet graduated.
• Note if qualifying work matches what types of work that are known for the area where they appear to have made a qualifying move.
• To join moves
• Moves of short durations
• COE's lacking required comments

The head recruiter did not complete/conduct initial interviews of any of the ineligible COE findings. TN has 3 full-time recruiter positions in addition to the head recruiter. This means that most of the year, we have only 3 recruiters actually working in the field to attempt to cover

the entire state. Again, a result of funding. At any time there can range from 3-7 recruiters when we split the positions due to turn-over. The higher number is reached during our peak seasons of migrant population.
If the recruiter is found in error on a COE, the recruiter is contacted and informed of the results of the re-interview. They are given the chance to provide additional information if they had any that would show the family was eligible. To eliminate subsequent COE ineligibility, additional guidance is provided to the recruiter over the phone by the head recruiter, additional mentoring in the field is provided as needed, and concerns from any ultimate ineligibility findings are noted and included in the content of the next all recruiter training provided. Recruiter retraining is provided as often as needed and as funding permits. We do most training on an informal basis by phone and emails once the initial trainings are conducted. We meet formally with all recruiters at least twice a year to review program regulations and initiatives. Content of recruiter training depends on whether those gathered are new recruiters or are more experienced. For new recruiters, completely reviewing the guidance section on ID&R staff is always included. Although not followed exactly, we are guided in our overall training content by the National ID&R Curriculum. TN adapts and augments the curriculum to meet the specific needs of our State. Recruiter staff are then required to complete tests to measure their mastery of the guidance in relation to the scenarios on the test. We
also require them to accompany an experienced recruiter in the field before recruiting on their own. We also require daily reports from all our recruiters which are reviewed as submitted by the head recruiter with on-going training provided as needed. Training for experienced recruiters includes a review of program regulations and discussion of any new issues. We have ongoing communication through daily email reports and phone conversations with all recruiters.
TN is scheduled to conduct external-independent re-interviews during the 2011-2012 program year.

---

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Audits are conducted throughout the year in which COEs are compared to databases. In addition, districts review migrant student lists monthly.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For the Category 1 count, a final audit is completed at the end of the year comparing report information generated from MIS2000 and the actual paper COEs contained in program files.

All service log data with information regarding program services are reviewed by the state coordinator and the data entry specialist before entry into the database for the Category 2 count. It is then reviewed again after the information has been entered into the database.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We continue to work to design and implement training for program staff and recruiters that promotes proper eligibility determinations upon the recruitment of migrant families.

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.