

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended in 2001**

**For reporting on
School Year 2011-12**



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2012
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2013**

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

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 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 *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2011-12 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2011-12 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 20, 2012**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 15, 2013**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2011-12, 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 2011-12 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 2011-12 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 11/30/2013
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2011-12 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2011-12	
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: Diane Perhac	
Telephone: 615-532-6265	
Fax: 615-253-5706	
e-mail: Diane.Perhac@tn.gov	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Debra Owens	
_____ Signature	_____ Wednesday, April 17, 2013, 3:05:19 PM

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2011-12



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 20, 2012
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

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

No Revisions or changes	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (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.

No Revisions or changes	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic assessments were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (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.

<p>No Revisions or changes</p>	<p>No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.</p>

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

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 2011-12, 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)	30.00
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	70.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12 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 (<i>IDEA</i>) 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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	512,042	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,364	>=99
Asian	S	8,817	>=99
Black or African American	S	123,078	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	32,887	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	727	>=99
White	S	344,369	>=99
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	63,977	97
Limited English proficient (<i>LEP</i>) students	S	12,476	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	295,251	>=99
Migratory students	S	312	>=99
Male	S	262,867	>=99
Female	S	249,175	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	11,058	17.28
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	19,645	30.71
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	27,519	43.01
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,755	9.00
Total	63,977	////////////////////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standard count confirmed.		

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	S	514,749	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,356	>=99
Asian	S	9,090	>=99
Black or African American	S	123,464	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	32,496	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	733	>=99
White	S	347,320	>=99
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	63,610	97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	11,397	97
Economically disadvantaged students	S	292,562	>=99
Migratory students	S	293	>=98
Male	S	263,591	>=99
Female	S	251,158	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. LEP < 12 months, took ELP (ELDA) not included as participants in 1.2.3: 10.			

1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 and 1.3.2.1 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	326
--	-----

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.

Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (*IDEA*) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	10,760	16.91
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	19,703	30.97
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	27,525	43.26
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,622	8.84
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	10	0.02
Total	63,620	////////////////////
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standard count confirmed. LEP < 12 months, took ELP (ELDA) not included as participants in 1.2.3: 10.</p>		

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	S	511,869	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,343	>=99
Asian	S	9,152	>=99
Black or African American	S	123,514	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	32,514	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	714	>=99
White	S	344,347	>=99
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	S	63,245	97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	12,197	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	288,387	>=99
Migratory students	S	298	98
Male	S	262,267	>=99
Female	S	249,602	>=99

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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	10,826	17.12
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	19,236	30.42
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	27,524	43.52
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,659	8.95
Total	63,245	////////////////////////////////////

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standard count confirmed.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

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	74,387	S	55
American Indian or Alaska Native	183	S	56
Asian	1,516	S	79
Black or African American	17,722	S	37
Hispanic or Latino	5,682	S	45
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	135	S	65
White	49,064	S	63
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,229	S	45
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,934	S	29
Economically disadvantaged students	44,689	S	44
Migratory students	64	S	34
Male	38,042	S	56
Female	36,345	S	55
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander count confirmed. Tennessee does not report Two or more races for achievement data. Migratory students count confirmed.			

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	74,259	S	47
American Indian or Alaska Native	183	S	46
Asian	1,477	S	68
Black or African American	17,704	S	29
Hispanic or Latino	5,640	S	33
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	134	S	63
White	49,036	S	54
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,217	S	39
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,815	S	14
Economically disadvantaged students	44,599	S	34
Migratory students	63	S	19
Male	37,960	S	43
Female	36,299	S	50
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander count confirmed. Tennessee does not report Two or more races for achievement data.			

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	74,308	S	63
American Indian or Alaska Native	183	S	60
Asian	1,515	S	79
Black or African American	17,701	S	39
Hispanic or Latino	5,680	S	51
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	135	S	79
White	49,009	S	73
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,215	S	28
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,940	S	32
Economically disadvantaged students	44,633	S	51
Migratory students	63	S	44
Male	38,001	S	63
Female	36,307	S	63
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander count confirmed. Tennessee does not report Two or more races for achievement data. Migratory students count confirmed.			

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	74,273	S	44
American Indian or Alaska Native	196	S	42
Asian	1,392	S	69
Black or African American	17,553	S	26
Hispanic or Latino	5,320	S	35
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	89	S	52
White	49,694	S	51
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,165	S	39
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,553	S	20
Economically disadvantaged students	44,058	S	33
Migratory students	53	S	19
Male	38,008	S	45
Female	36,265	S	44
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander count confirmed. Tennessee does not report Two or more races for achievement data.			

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	74,151	S	49
American Indian or Alaska Native	196	S	46
Asian	1,363	S	67
Black or African American	17,524	S	30
Hispanic or Latino	5,264	S	36
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	89	S	62
White	49,686	S	57
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,155	S	43
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,437	S	14
Economically disadvantaged students	43,967	S	37
Migratory students	54	S	19
Male	37,942	S	45
Female	36,209	S	54
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander count confirmed. Tennessee does not report Two or more races for achievement data.			

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	74,166	S	52
American Indian or Alaska Native	195	S	54
Asian	1,391	S	72
Black or African American	17,528	S	26
Hispanic or Latino	5,303	S	38
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	89	S	69
White	49,631	S	62
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,154	S	17
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,540	S	18
Economically disadvantaged students	43,977	S	38
Migratory students	52	S	27
Male	37,950	S	53
Female	36,216	S	50
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander count confirmed. Tennessee does not report Two or more races for achievement data.			

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	75,166	S	55
American Indian or Alaska Native	201	S	51
Asian	1,447	S	77
Black or African American	17,655	S	38
Hispanic or Latino	5,247	S	49
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	110	S	68
White	50,478	S	62
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,030	S	44
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,048	S	30
Economically disadvantaged students	44,249	S	45
Migratory students	51	S	55
Male	38,797	S	54
Female	36,369	S	57
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. American Indian or Alaska Native count confirmed. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander count confirmed. Tennessee does not report Two or more races for achievement data.			

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	75,090	S	60
American Indian or Alaska Native	201	S	54
Asian	1,419	S	75
Black or African American	17,656	S	42
Hispanic or Latino	5,205	S	49
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	108	S	73
White	50,473	S	67
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,045	S	55
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,942	S	20
Economically disadvantaged students	44,192	S	48
Migratory students	49	S	41
Male	38,760	S	56
Female	36,330	S	64
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. American Indian or Alaska Native count confirmed. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander count confirmed. Tennessee does not report Two or more races for achievement data.			

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	75,129	S	56
American Indian or Alaska Native	201	S	55
Asian	1,450	S	73
Black or African American	17,659	S	30
Hispanic or Latino	5,243	S	43
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	109	S	75
White	50,439	S	66
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,050	S	16
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,041	S	15
Economically disadvantaged students	44,218	S	43
Migratory students	50	S	40
Male	38,786	S	58
Female	36,343	S	54
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. American Indian or Alaska Native count confirmed. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander count confirmed. Tennessee does not report Two or more races for achievement data.			

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	74,701	S	43
American Indian or Alaska Native	209	S	42
Asian	1,319	S	66
Black or African American	17,938	S	24
Hispanic or Latino	4,657	S	34
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	89	S	53
White	50,466	S	50
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9,190	S	39
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,337	S	15
Economically disadvantaged students	43,075	S	32
Migratory students	37	S	22
Male	38,139	S	43
Female	36,562	S	44
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. American Indian or Alaska Native count confirmed. Tennessee does not report Two or more races for achievement data.			

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	74,636	S	57
American Indian or Alaska Native	208	S	61
Asian	1,291	S	74
Black or African American	17,928	S	37
Hispanic or Latino	4,626	S	47
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	89	S	67
White	50,471	S	65
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9,183	S	44
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,234	S	12
Economically disadvantaged students	43,017	S	45
Migratory students	38	S	26
Male	38,106	S	53
Female	36,530	S	61
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. American Indian or Alaska Native count confirmed. Tennessee does not report Two or more races for achievement data.			

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	74,702	S	58
American Indian or Alaska Native	208	S	64
Asian	1,327	S	75
Black or African American	17,934	S	33
Hispanic or Latino	4,658	S	47
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	89	S	73
White	50,463	S	67
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9,193	S	15
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,338	S	13
Economically disadvantaged students	43,065	S	44
Migratory students	37	S	30
Male	38,139	S	60
Female	36,563	S	56
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. American Indian or Alaska Native count confirmed. Tennessee does not report Two or more races for achievement data.			

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	74,066	S	45
American Indian or Alaska Native	194	S	48
Asian	1,220	S	73
Black or African American	17,985	S	27
Hispanic or Latino	4,213	S	37
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	94	S	55
White	50,278	S	51
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,598	S	30
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,303	S	16
Economically disadvantaged students	42,016	S	33
Migratory students	36	S	39
Male	38,193	S	43
Female	35,873	S	47
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. American Indian or Alaska Native count confirmed. Tennessee does not report Two or more races for achievement data.			

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	73,970	S	47
American Indian or Alaska Native	194	S	49
Asian	1,182	S	65
Black or African American	17,992	S	27
Hispanic or Latino	4,186	S	34
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	94	S	55
White	50,297	S	54
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,604	S	39
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,205	S	7
Economically disadvantaged students	41,958	S	34
Migratory students	34	S	26
Male	38,133	S	42
Female	35,837	S	52
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. American Indian or Alaska Native count confirmed. Tennessee does not report Two or more races for achievement data.			

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	73,988	S	56
American Indian or Alaska Native	194	S	64
Asian	1,206	S	75
Black or African American	17,967	S	33
Hispanic or Latino	4,232	S	47
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	94	S	70
White	50,271	S	65
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,590	S	12
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,300	S	13
Economically disadvantaged students	41,963	S	43
Migratory students	35	S	46
Male	38,144	S	56
Female	35,844	S	56
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. American Indian or Alaska Native count confirmed. Tennessee does not report Two or more races for achievement data.			

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	73,093	S	44
American Indian or Alaska Native	180	S	41
Asian	1,188	S	70
Black or African American	17,594	S	25
Hispanic or Latino	4,053	S	36
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	115	S	62
White	49,430	S	51
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,101	S	23
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,165	S	17
Economically disadvantaged students	40,267	S	31
Migratory students	29	S	31
Male	37,065	S	42
Female	36,028	S	47
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. American Indian or Alaska Native count confirmed. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander count confirmed. Tennessee does not report Two or more races for achievement data.			

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	72,193	S	48
American Indian or Alaska Native	180	S	50
Asian	1,197	S	62
Black or African American	17,552	S	29
Hispanic or Latino	4,099	S	38
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	116	S	61
White	48,973	S	56
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,101	S	38
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,090	S	6
Economically disadvantaged students	39,863	S	35
Migratory students	28	S	25
Male	36,663	S	44
Female	35,530	S	53
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. American Indian or Alaska Native count confirmed. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander count confirmed. Tennessee does not report Two or more races for achievement data.			

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	70,641	S	60
American Indian or Alaska Native	175	S	62
Asian	1,099	S	74
Black or African American	17,276	S	37
Hispanic or Latino	3,974	S	53
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	103	S	73
White	47,938	S	69
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,056	S	12
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,119	S	15
Economically disadvantaged students	39,466	S	47
Migratory students	28	S	46
Male	35,889	S	60
Female	34,752	S	60
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander count confirmed. Tennessee does not report Two or more races for achievement data.			

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	66,356	S	55
American Indian or Alaska Native	201	S	57
Asian	735	S	75
Black or African American	16,631	S	38
Hispanic or Latino	3,715	S	49
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	95	S	59
White	44,959	S	62
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,664	S	27
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,136	S	26
Economically disadvantaged students	36,897	S	45
Migratory students	42	S	52
Male	34,623	S	52
Female	31,733	S	59

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Tennessee does not report Two or more races for achievement data.

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	70,450	S	61
American Indian or Alaska Native	194	S	58
Asian	1,161	S	74
Black or African American	17,108	S	40
Hispanic or Latino	3,476	S	48
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	103	S	73
White	48,384	S	68
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,305	S	25
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	674	S	10
Economically disadvantaged students	34,966	S	46
Migratory students	27	S	26
Male	36,027	S	56
Female	34,423	S	65

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Tennessee does not report Two or more races for achievement data.

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	68,935	S	55
American Indian or Alaska Native	187	S	59
Asian	1,164	S	71
Black or African American	17,449	S	31
Hispanic or Latino	3,424	S	45
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	95	S	62
White	46,596	S	64
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,987	S	16
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	919	S	9
Economically disadvantaged students	31,065	S	42
Migratory students	33	S	24
Male	35,358	S	54
Female	33,577	S	55
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander count confirmed. Tennessee does not report Two or more races for achievement data.			

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 SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
Schools	1,784		
Districts	140		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Waiver state			

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 SY 2011-12. 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 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	1,132		
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,106		
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	26		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Waiver state			

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 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2011-12	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12
135		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Waiver state		

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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	1
Extension of the school year or school day	4
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	4
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 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)	0
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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. N/A no restructuring actions	

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.

No actions taken with respect to "other major restructuring of the school governance" category.

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.

The State has implemented the Tennessee Academic Specialists (TAS) program, a statewide capacity-building effort focused on helping Title I schools identified for improvement to achieve their achievement goals. Tennessee Academic Specialists work in assigned schools to support standards-based curriculum, research-informed instructional practices, data-driven decision making, and school-wide cultures of success. In addition, each of the districts is served by an ESEA consultant who assists with fiscal and programmatic issues related to Title I.

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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 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 2011-12
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	0
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 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 2011-12 data and the results of those appeals.

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	0	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Waiver state		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete	N/A
---	-----

1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

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 2011-12.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2011 (SY 2011-12) 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*: 4.00%

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 4%

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

For SY 2011-12 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 ED Facts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to ED Facts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools- CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the ED Facts 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 2011-12.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State used the 5% carryover FY10 1003(g) funds for evaluation and monitoring activities for the SY 2011-12 assigning Turnaround Support Consultants to schools in improvement (Priority, Renewal & Focus) providing technical assistance, support and monitoring of the School Improveemnt Grant.

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 2011-12 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.

Schools identified for improvement as Renewal schools received Race to the Top (RTTT) funds to implement various level interventions to address student proficiency including, but not limited to, the adoption of a whole school reform model.

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.

Public School Choice	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	104,954
Applied to transfer	2,999
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	2,703
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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*.

Transportation for Public School Choice	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 5,466,414

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.

Unable to Provide Public School Choice	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	10

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:
 - o 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
 - o 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
 - o 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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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*.

Supplemental Educational Services	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	77,510
Applied for supplemental educational services	13,803
Received supplemental educational services	11,722
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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*.

Spending on Supplemental Educational Services	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 20,523,117
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	239,717	236,161	98.52	3,556	1.48
All elementary classes	161,034	159,587	99.10	1,447	0.90
All secondary classes	78,683	76,574	97.32	2,109	2.68

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.

Tennessee's submission of EdFacts files C063 & C064 containing Classes in Core Academic Subjects showed large increases between 2010-11 data and 2011-12 data. A large increase in the number of elementary core academic classes and overall core academic classes between 2010-11 and 2011-12 exists (134,257 vs. 161,236 and 218,316 vs. 239,919, respectively). We used an alternate, more accurate data source this year and confirm the data was compiled correctly from this source for 2011-12 data.
--

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.

LEAs submit teaching assignments to the state's database based on varying local practices. In some, elementary full-day self-contained classes count as one class. In others, elementary full-day self-contained classes are entered as multiple subject area classes.
--

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.

Elementary School Classes	Percentage
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	20.00
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	60.00
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	20.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The number and percentage of elementary classes being taught by teachers who are not HQ is small. Non-HQTs at the elementary level include teachers who are new to their teaching assignment, new to the teaching profession or new to the State of Tennessee and have not yet documented their HQ status.

Secondary School Classes	Percentage
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)	30.00
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	45.00
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	25.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The number and percentage of non-HQTs are somewhat higher at the secondary level than the elementary level due to greater content area staffing challenges.

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.

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).

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 a different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

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	32,293	31,575	97.78
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	56,776	56,348	99.25
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	16,587	15,720	94.77
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	27,665	27,280	98.61

1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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	82.30	54.40
Poverty metric used	Percentage of students eligible for free and reduced price meals	
Secondary schools	71.70	45.20
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 AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Districts may propose other plans, but all programs currently fall within the categories listed.

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	32,570
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	32,154
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	23,734
Arabic	2,119
Chinese	555
Vietnamese	541
Somali	516

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 students' 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 (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	30,963
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	960
Total	31,923
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Some of the 960 LEP students not assessed with the ELPA were SWDs who were not capable of taking the assessment as stated in their IEPs.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	8,126
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	25.46
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

Title III LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	30,615
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	925
Total	31,540
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. This 925 is a subgroup of the 960 listed in questions 1.6.3.1.1 and contains some SWDs who were not capable of taking the assessment as stated in their IEPs.	
The high number, shown below, (15,991) is based on the fact that Tennessee has new LEP students entering the State.	

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 AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).

Title III First Time Tested	#
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.	15,991

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

- Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
- 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 Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
- Attained Proficiency** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
- 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 percent of students 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%).

Title III Results	Results #	Results %	Targets #	Targets %
Making progress	11,045	75.53	10,262	66.00
Attained proficiency	8,021	26.20	5,677	18.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. For the number for the making progress target the total tested and not tested LEP 31540 was used. From that the 15991 was subtracted and then 66% of that number was found to be 10262. For the number for the attained proficiency target, the total of 31540 was multiplied by .18.				

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).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. TN administers all assessments in English.	

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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All assessment are administered in English.

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 (MFLEP) 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
3,322	3,264	6,586
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics

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 who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
6,113	S	47	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results for 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. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
6,122	S	41	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for MFLEP 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 MFLEP 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. This will be automatically calculated.
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
6,091	S	53	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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.)

Title III Subgrantees	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	90
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	71
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	83
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	85
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	80
////////////////////////////////////	
# - 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 2010-11 and 2011-12)	3
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	3
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	1

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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The AMAOs are calculated at the LEA level for all districts including those in consortia. TN counted each consortia member as a subgrantee and figured an AMAO for each subgrantee in the consortium that meant each member of that particular consortium. If any member met the required N = or > 30, and met the benchmark for the AMAO, they met that specific AMAO.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>Yes</u>
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State met all three Title III AMAOs. The State met AMAO 3 for the subgroup.	

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 <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP 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 only 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
6,352	4,474	7

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 educational 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) v The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course v (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.

Title III Teachers	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,071
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	266

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.

The estimated number shows an overall 25% increase.

* 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 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 and 1.6.4.)
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	84	////////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	69	////////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	66	////////////////////////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	56	////////////////////////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	67	////////////////////////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	17	////////////////////////////////////
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	77	13,009
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	81	2,979
PD provided to principals	71	899
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	61	684
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	58	1,799
PD provided to community based organization personnel	34	453
Total	382	19,823

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other training was OCR compliance and teacher's responsibilities, terminology and coding updates for principals and secretaries, alignment of PD to standards, special education ESL issues, how to communicate with English Learners, Sheltered Instructional Observation Protocol training, culture acquisition and parental involvement, the Learning Focused Model, refugee issues, Common Core State Standards, Tennessee Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages conference, Southeast Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Spanish language development, technology strategies and training for language arts 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 submitted using the MM/DD/YY format.

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 2011-12 funds July 1, 2011, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2011, for SY 2011-12 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/12	07/01/12	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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.

TN makes the money available as within days of receiving the funds. We feel that we have reached our capability on this matter.

The money is available as soon as the grant comes into the state and is loaded into our accounts. We do not have a waiting period for LEAs since consolidated applications and budgets have been approved in advance.

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	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Tennessee has no persistently dangerous schools to report for the 2011-12 school year.	

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	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	127	127
LEAs with subgrants	13	13
Total	140	140
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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 <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	87	110
K	496	968
1	508	973
2	461	957
3	459	981
4	397	864
5	380	840
6	311	823
7	295	770
8	231	647
9	237	829
10	180	545
11	186	450
12	235	366
Ungraded	0	0
Total	4,463	10,123

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Tennessee does not collect Ungraded counts.

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.

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	330	910
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,599	8,380
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	111	99
Hotels/Motels	423	734
Total	4,463	10,123

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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 Birth Through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	101
K	887
1	896
2	878
3	925
4	810
5	777
6	717
7	668
8	580
9	734
10	484
11	389
12	314
Ungraded	0
Total	9,160
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Tennessee does not collect Ungraded counts.	

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.

Subgroups	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	512
Migratory children/youth	36
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,396
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	434
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youths.

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of enrolled homeless children and youths 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	2,053	563
4	1,848	574
5	1,782	725
6	1,745	648
7	1,512	367
8	1,289	306
High School	1,014	359

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State 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	2,055	722
4	1,854	503
5	1,785	694
6	1,747	439
7	1,512	357
8	1,297	268
High School	1,268	453

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State science 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	2,053	838
4	1,844	549
5	1,780	591
6	1,747	608
7	1,504	478
8	1,273	419
High School	1,091	324

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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)	458
K	163
1	144
2	128
3	105
4	118
5	100
6	85
7	65
8	72
9	66
10	53
11	27
12	30
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	670
Total	2,284

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Tennessee has no ungraded migrant children counted for funding purposes.

We continue to see a small reduction in migrant out of school youth coming to Tennessee. We used to have almost half of our population that were youth. Now we are seeing more families than in the past but less overall migrants coming to TN. Although there is still plenty of work we have heard repeatedly that due to tough state immigration laws in states that are around us that many families regardless of their legal situation are not wanting to travel. We have many migrants that come from Florida and traveling through Georgia and Alabama has been problematic for them. We also continue to no longer find eligible families in meat processing and this was half of our overall population several years ago. All of these families are now phased out of our program. In addition our growing season was challenged this year by severe drought in several parts of the state. This affected the crops and in several places less people came to work due to the conditions of the crops.

(We may not need to put anything here since we didn't have a 10% decrease)

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.

We continue to see a small reduction in migrant out of school youth coming to Tennessee. We used to have almost half of our population that were youth. Now we are seeing more families than in the past but less overall migrants coming to TN. Although there is still plenty of work we have heard repeatedly that due to tough state immigration laws in states that are around us that many families regardless of their legal situation are not wanting to travel. We have many migrants that come from Florida and traveling through Georgia and Alabama has been problematic for them. We also continue to no longer find eligible families in meat processing and this was half of our overall population several years ago. All of these families are now phased out of our program. In addition our growing season was challenged this year by severe drought in several parts of the state. This affected the crops and in several places less people came to work due to the conditions of the crops.

(We may not need to put anything here since we didn't have a 10% decrease)

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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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)	247
K	112
1	95
2	87
3	74
4	78
5	54
6	57
7	42
8	45
9	35
10	29
11	15
12	10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	197
Total	1,177

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. We have continued to look for ways to increase services to migrant students. We have had over a year and a half with our in-home tutoring model. The time has allowed us to increase our staff and to be able to cover much of the state through these efforts. We also offered science camps in seven counties as well as a leadership institute for high school students. In addition we offered classes to out of school youth. We also increased our efforts to provide services to our pre-K students through our parent training program EXITO.

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We have continued to look for ways to increase services to migrant students. We have had over a year and a half with our in-home tutoring model. The time has allowed us to increase our staff and to be able to cover much of the state through these efforts. We also offered science camps in seven counties as well as a leadership institute for high school students. In addition we offered classes to out of school youth. We also increased our efforts to provide services to our pre-K students through our parent training program EXITO.

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.

Tennessee used MIS2000. No different system was used from last year.

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 through a secure server. Should there be differences in grade and/or school information, this is corrected within the database.

The Child count data for the A2 count was collected through service logs submitted by the program area staff 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, MSeD has created several reports that print out the information necessary for the C SPR. 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.

TN uses, and has used since it was required, the national COE in paper form. Trained State Recruiters complete the COE. The interviews are generally face to face. Some are conducted over the phone when we do follow up calls from occupational surveys from the local districts. We have several processes in place to check to ensure that students are residing in the state throughout the year. As our staff are out and about working to serve students we keep a record of who is visited and who has moved. This is then submitted on a form called a service log. This log keeps track of the services provided as well as a way for us to submit address updates and information about students that have moved. Generally when we know someone has moved this is reported on a daily report by our staff. When this is turned into a supervisor it is then turned into our data entry specialist who works with the local school district to ensure that we have all of the data needed for MSIX. We also work with local districts to gather student records when students move. Also in September of each year we physically verify that every student is still present. This is done by contacting local districts to confirm the list of eligible students are currently enrolled in a specific school is they are school age. If they are out of school or pre-school age we make contact either via phone or by visiting their physical address to confirm they are present before they are added into the new year's count that starts each year in September. Our recruiters and staff collect the information and it is sent in electronically through our secure server to our data entry staff person who then updates the information into our student database. Category 2 child counts are reported on the monthly service logs that are submitted by all of our staff. These logs count all students served during the month. The log also provides a description of the basic service provided to the students and their families during the month. We keep track of all services provided at all times of the year on our monthly service log. This allows us to make sure that as many students as possible are receiving quality services throughout the year. In addition all of our staff provide a daily report detailing out what was provided in any instructional session with students. This allows us to have a general report sent in monthly that lists students but we also have a clear report for every service session provided to students.

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.

The data entry specialist works for Tennessee Opportunity Programs who is contracted by the state to manage the program in TN. We have one data entry specialist for the entire state. Students are not re-enrolled into the program at the end of a program year until we verify that they are present in TN. They are not counted in our count until we can verify with

a local district that they are attending a TN school, or speak directly via phone or through home visit to confirm their address and update any contact information to show they are residing in TN. This is always done at the start of a new program year. All of our staff are involved in this process. Category 2 data is not entered into the database until a service is provided. A service can only be provided for a student currently living in TN so the process is completely different. This process has already been explained. This is gathered through our monthly service logs and daily reports.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The following has been copied directly from MIS2000's 12 Month Contact List report: SchoolHistory.QA3Date >= !StartDate
((SchoolHistory.TERMTYPE <> N) or (SchoolHistory.TERMTYPE is null))
((SchoolHistory.TYPE_ <> S) and (SchoolHistory.TYPE_ <> T) and SchoolHistory.TYPE_ <> L)
and (((SchoolHistory.TYPE_ = P) or (SchoolHistory.TYPE_ = R) or (SchoolHistory.TYPE_ = G)))
SchoolHistory.DOMID = TN
((((Facility.MEPFACILITY is not null) and (((SchoolHistory.ENROLLDATE is between !StartDate and !EndDate)
or (SchoolHistory.WITHDRAWDATE is between !StartDate and !EndDate)))) or (((Facility.MEPFACILITY is null)
and (((SchoolHistory.WITHDRAWDATE is null) or (SchoolHistory.WITHDRAWDATE >= !StartDate))) and
(SchoolHistory.FUNDINGDATE is between !SHStartDate and !SHEndDate))))
Student.TWENTYSECONDBDAY >= !StartDate
Student.THIRDBDAY <+ !EndDate
((SchoolHistory.TERMTYPE <> N) or SchoolHistory.TERMTYPE is null)

The !StartDate (and !SHStartDate) is 9/1/2010 and the !EndDate (and !SHEndDate) is 8/31/11.

The SchoolHistory.TermType <> N indicates that only qualifying migrants are selected. P, G and R are considered regular year enrollment types and S, T and L are summer or intersession enrollments. The above report specifically selects "P, G or R" enrollment types and omits "S, T and L" enrollment types.

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

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.

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.

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 out all identified migrants in their districts. Errors are reported back to the data entry specialist and corrected. At least 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, they are exported to Excel and the information is analyzed for priority, duplication and accuracy of entering. The supervisor of the data entry specialist also has a copy of the reports and the database. In addition, districts are asked to review the accuracy of the data on their student lists when the monthly reports are distributed to the districts. The final steps taken by the staff to verify the child count, is an audit of the whole year just prior to the submission to ED. This audit is a comparison of each hard copy COE to the information stored in the database.

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

The MIS2000 report picks off the most recent enrollment for each County that meets the following criteria. • School History.QA3Date >= !StartDate (Student's 3 years of eligibility based on their QADate ends after the beginning of the date range) The start date is 9/1/2008. QA3 is QAD X 3. • ((School History.TERMTYPE <> N) or (School History.TERMTYPE is null)) (Has no TermType or if they do, it's not N) N is non-migrant. • ((School History.TYPE_ <> S) and (School History.TYPE_ <> T) and (School History.TYPE_ <> L) and (((School History.TYPE_ = P) or (School History.TYPE_ = R) or (School History.TYPE_ = G)))) (Enrollment type can not be S, T, or L which are summer/intersession enrollments and must be P, R, or G which are year round/school enrollments/GED Enrollment). • School History.DOMID = TN (TN created the enrollment). • (((Facility.MEPFACILITY is not null) and (((School History.ENROLLDATE is between !StartDate and !EndDate) or (School History.WITHDRAWDATE is between !StartDate and !EndDate)))) or (((Facility.MEPFACILITY is null) and (((School History.WITHDRAWDATE is null) or (School History.WITHDRAWDATE >= !StartDate)))) and (School History.FUNDINGDATE is between !SHStartDate and !SHEndDate)))) (EnrollDate or WithdrawDate during date range if the Facility is an MEP Facility. Otherwise, FundingDate is during the date range and WithdrawDate is after the beginning of the date range or is null) End date is 8/31/12. Student.TWENTYSECONDBDAY >= !StartDate (Student turns 22 after the beginning of the date range). • Student.THIRDBDAY <= !EndDate (Student turns 3 before the end of the date range). • ((School History.TERMTYPE <> N) or (School History.TERMTYPE is null)) (Has no TermType or if they do, it's not N). The SchoolHistory.TermType <> N indicates that only qualifying migrants are selected. P, G and R are considered regular year enrollment types and S, T and L are summer or intersession enrollments. The above report specifically selects "P, G or R" enrollment types and omits "S, T and L" enrollment types. For Summer Intersession the report looks only for those students that have an enrollment type of S, T or L. 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.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The same system was used to generate the Category 1 and 2 Child counts.

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.

Audits are conducted at various times of the year comparing lists of migrant students with the COEs on file. In addition, districts are asked to review the accuracy of the data on their student lists when the monthly reports are distributed to the districts. In addition COE's are reviewed before they are entered into the state database for accuracy.

Tennessee has used the national COE since it has been required, including this year. TN uses paper COE's. We conduct annual training for all new staff when they are hired and at least once a year for all program staff. We have always use the OME Guidance in our trainings and now we use the recruitment manual for all of our staff. Our staff is involved in conducting the projects. We review attendance each day of our summer intersession projects. TN has both local and state- level process for resolving eligibility questions. Our staff submit COE's. These are reviewed and then some are re- contacted. If any questions arise during this process, we let our local staff know of the issue and the outcome of the interview with the family. If anything is found to not be in order, the family is taken out of the count or never included in the count. The local staff is given the chance to provide any additional information to the original COE, but if not enough evidence is provided to determine the family or youth does qualify, they are taken out of the count. If a local district questions why a family has been determined to qualify, we answer any and all questions they have. If they have information that shows the student is not eligible, we take the student out of the count. TN has a form developed for summer/intersession personnel to use in reporting student enrollment and attendance data. This form includes directions for completion. TN trains data personnel annually on use and recording of summer/intersession data for the purpose of the child count.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

If a family is found to be in-eligible a discussion is held with the recruiter about the results of the re-interview. If a recruiter has additional information to provide regarding a specific eligibility case they are given the chance to submit the information. If they do not have additional information we consider the youth or family to be in-eligible for the program. During the training process for recruiters, they are given specific instruction regarding eligibility requirements through a thorough review of the eligibility section in the Draft Regulatory Guidance. Upon completion of this, training recruiters are given a 90-question recruitment test that lists 90 different situations the guidance covers. The recruiters must take the test until they complete all

90 questions accurately. We have found this to be an effective way to ensure the new recruiters understand how to apply all of the eligibility criteria to the different situations they can encounter when recruiting. During the training recruiters also

are given recruiting questionnaires they use as eligibility scripts when they are conducting interviews to ensure we all are asking the same eligibility questions and assessing eligibility on the same criteria. A recruiter then is given in the field training by an experienced trainer. They spend 1-2 days observing the recruiter and then a least 1-day during which the trainer observes the recruiter. The re-interviewers are given the same instruction as the recruiters and use a set of eligibility scripts very similar to what the recruiter uses. Recruiters are required to send in a daily email of what they accomplish each day. This includes what activities they did, where they went, and who they qualified etc. Recruiters are not assessed on the number of COE's they fill out but rather their accuracy in obtaining information, their ability to canvas a community to find all eligible families, how well they can establish a rapport with families, and how well they can organize their time. A review of their emails each day helps our program ensure we are working in a focused balanced way to find all of the eligible families in the state.

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

This year we hired an independent re-interviewer to come in and conduct our formal re-interview. All of the re-interviews conducted were done face-to-face. Our re-interviewer was given a random list of students. This list included 80 students to account for those that would have moved. Our goal was to conduct 50 re-interviews. The re-interviews were conducted in April, May and June. Of the re-interviews conducted eleven migrant students had moved. Parents of five students declined to be interviewed. Five were visited several times but were not found to ever be home even though we confirmed they were still present. Fifty nine were found to be eligible.

Fifty- nine interviews were completed and fifty-nine were found to be eligible. Our re-interviewer was given a random list of students. This list included 80 students to account for those that would have moved. Our goal was to conduct 50 re-interviews. The re-interviews were conducted in April, May and June. Of the re-interviews conducted, eleven migrant students had moved. Parents of five students declined to be interviewed. Five were visited several times but were not found to ever be home even though we confirmed they were still present. We did not use sampling replacement. The sampling was stratified by area. We conducted the sampling of all of Middle TN. These were all areas that the re-interviewer could make long day trips and would save on the overall cost of the re-interview. To ensure that this year's re-interview process was independent, we followed the guidelines outlined by OME in the re-interview guide. We provided a specific protocol and form for the re-interviewer to follow. We hired a re-interviewer that had not worked in the program in anyway. We trained him on program rules and regulations. He took a certification test that we required him to pass. We went through the program regulations and guidance with him. He shadowed a recruiter during the interview process to see how it was done. The re-interviewer was given a questionnaire to follow and to fill out for each interview that was conducted. This questionnaire was turned in once the re-interview was completed. the re-interviewer was provided a complete and thorough training before he began conducting re-interviews.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Audits are conducted at various times of the year comparing lists of migrant students with the COEs on file. In addition, districts are asked to review the accuracy of the data on their student lists when the monthly reports are distributed to the districts.

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 is 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.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

we do not have any concerns at this time.