

**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 2013-14**



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2014**  
**PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2015**

**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) 2013-14 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 2013-14 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 18, 2014**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 13, 2015**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2013-14, 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 2013-14 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 2013-14 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: 7/31/2015
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2013-14 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2013-14		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Tennessee Department of Education		
Address: 10th Floor Andrew Johnson Tower 710 James Robertson Pkwy		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: LaQuisha Oliver		
Telephone: 615-253-3596		
Fax: 615-532-7510		
e-mail: laquisha.oliver@tn.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): LaQuisha Oliver (for Tony Pratt)		
		<u>Thursday, April 16, 2015, 1:14:02 PM</u>
Signature _____		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2013-14**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 18, 2014  
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.

Response	Options
<p><u>No Revisions or changes</u></p>	<p>No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>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 "Not Applicable" 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., 2013-14) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards			

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

<p>Due to legislation effective May 2014, Tennessee will not be joining PARCC. For 2014-2015 Tennessee assessments are identical in specifications to 2013-2014. An RFP was released summer 2014 to contract for new assessments aligned to the Tennessee academic standards (common core) adopted in 2012. The new assessment will be administered in 2015-2016.</p>
---

**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.

Response	Options
<p><u>No Revisions or changes</u></p>	<p>No revisions or changes to academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>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 "Not Applicable" 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., 2013-14) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8			
Regular Assessments in High School			
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards			

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.

Due to legislation effective May 2014, Tennessee will not be joining PARCC. For 2014-2015 Tennessee assessments are identical in specifications to 2013-2014. An RFP was released summer 2014 to contract for new assessments aligned to the Tennessee academic standards (common core) adopted in 2012. The new assessment will be administered in 2015-2016.

**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.

Response	Options
<p><u>No Revisions or changes</u></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 "Not Applicable" 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., 2013-14) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8			
Regular Assessments in High School			
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards			

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.

<p>Due to legislation effective May 2014, Tennessee will not be joining PARCC. For 2014-2015 Tennessee assessments are identical in specifications to 2013-2014. An RFP was released summer 2014 to contract for new assessments aligned to the Tennessee academic standards (common core) adopted in 2012. The new assessment will be administered in 2015-2016.</p>
---

**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 2013-14, 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
<b>Comments:</b> 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 2013-14 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)	<u>Yes</u>
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)	<u>No</u>
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with Section 1111(b)(7)	<u>Yes</u>
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	<u>Yes</u>
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<u>No</u>
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	<u>No</u>
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	<u>No</u>
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	<u>No</u>
Other	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b> 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 racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; 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 have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

### 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	501,998	99.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,542	99.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	10,026	97.20
<i>Asian</i>	S	9,306	S
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	S	720	>=99
Black or African American	S	120,436	99.00
Hispanic or Latino	S	38,617	98.10
White	S	331,374	99.40
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	70,401	98.90
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	13,089	99.60
Economically disadvantaged students	S	293,889	99.00
Migratory students	S	263	>=95
Male	S	257,810	99.00
Female	S	244,186	99.20

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. One white, female, *IDEA* 3rd grade student was mistakenly assigned to two separate scores, resulting in the documentation that she was a single participant, but has two scores assigned.

**1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) in Mathematics Assessment**

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	14,023	19.92
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	34,482	48.98
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	15,722	22.33
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6,174	8.77
Total	70,401	////////////////////////////////////

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Tennessee implemented a policy where students that scored proficient or advanced on the alternative assessment based on modified standards in the previous year in both math and science had scores changed to basic if they retested on the alternative assessment based on modified standards in 2012-13. As a result, the number of students taking the alternative assessment based on modified assessment standards declined significantly, and the number of students with disabilities taking the regular assessment with accommodations increased significantly. The data presented here is consistent with what we would expect when implementing that policy. Tennessee's percentage of students with disabilities taking the regular assessments increased from 64.04 percent to 68.6 percent from CSPR 12-13 to CSPR 13-14.

The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for assessment participation data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

### 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	517,498	99.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,601	>=99
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	11,516	98.10
<i>Asian</i>	S	10,758	98.00
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	S	758	99.00
Black or African American	S	123,144	99.10
Hispanic or Latino	S	39,735	97.90
White	S	341,498	99.50
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	70,198	98.80
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	12,387	92.90
Economically disadvantaged students	S	296,997	99.00
Migratory students	S	270	>=95
Male	S	264,517	99.10
Female	S	252,979	99.30
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. A large number of LEP students (approximately 896) were identified as absent on the day of the assessment.			

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

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 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	#
Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	2,282

**1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) 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 (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	13,908	19.81
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	34,286	48.84
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	15,840	22.56
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6,049	8.62
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	115	0.16
Total	70,198	////////////////////////////////////
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Tennessee implemented a policy where students that scored proficient or advanced on the alternative assessment based on modified standards in the previous year in both math and science had scores changed to basic if they retested on the alternative assessment based on modified standards in 2013-14. As a result, the number of students taking the alternative assessment based on modified assessment standards declined significantly, and the number of students with disabilities taking the regular assessment with accommodations increased significantly. The data presented here is consistent with what we would expect when implementing that policy. Tennessee's percentage of students with disabilities taking the regular assessments increased from 63.80 to 68.6 percent from CSPR 12-13 to CSPR 13-14.</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	572,023	99.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,786	99.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	12,194	98.00
Asian	S	11,349	97.90
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	845	99.00
Black or African American	S	136,504	98.80
Hispanic or Latino	S	42,173	98.10
White	S	379,358	99.30
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	S	72,418	98.60
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	13,367	99.50
Economically disadvantaged students	S	321,917	98.80
Migratory students	S	280	>=95
Male	S	291,331	99.00
Female	S	280,690	99.20

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. A single SWD student was identified as having participated in the Science assessment twice, but correctly assigned as having only a single proficiency level reported.

**1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) 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	15,387	21.25
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	35,315	48.77
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	15,701	21.68
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6,015	8.31
Total	72,418	////////////////////////////////////

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Tennessee implemented a policy where students that scored proficient or advanced on the alternative assessment based on modified standards in the previous year in both math and science had scores changed to basic if they retested on the alternative assessment based on modified standards in 2013-14. As a result, the number of students taking the alternative assessment based on modified assessment standards declined significantly, and the number of students with disabilities taking the regular assessment with accommodations increased significantly. The data presented here is consistent with what we would expect when implementing that policy. Tennessee's percentage of students with disabilities taking the regular assessments increased from 63.56 to 69.76 percent from CSPR 12-13 to CSPR 13-14.

### 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 racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; 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 have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

#### 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.

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

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment, and the difference noted in the paragraph below.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months and who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment. Do not include former LEP students.

#### 1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

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

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

The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for assessment participation data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

## 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	74,846	S	56.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	209	S	58.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,709	S	79.00
<i>Asian</i>	1,589	S	80.00
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	120	S	70.00
Black or African American	17,620	S	38.80
Hispanic or Latino	6,853	S	48.40
White	48,455	S	63.40
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,543	S	37.20
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,329	S	31.60
Economically disadvantaged students	45,426	S	46.00
Migratory students	51	S	25.00
Male	38,297	S	56.50
Female	36,548	S	56.60

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. One white, female, IDEA 3rd grader was incorrectly assigned as having been assessed twice, but was correctly assigned one score in 2013-2014- When all students are counted, she is counted twice, but when subgroup counts are made, she is counted once. We are aware of the discrepancy, and feel comfortable accepting the single student difference.

## 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	74,870	S	43.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	209	S	44.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,700	S	65.00
<i>Asian</i>	1,580	S	66.00
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	120	S	55.00
Black or African American	17,644	S	28.10
Hispanic or Latino	6,854	S	30.30
White	48,463	S	50.90
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,572	S	30.40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,304	S	12.40
Economically disadvantaged students	45,452	S	32.50
Migratory students	51	S	<=10
Male	38,309	S	39.80
Female	36,560	S	48.20

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. One white, female, IDEA 3rd grader was incorrectly assigned as having been assessed twice, but was correctly assigned one score in 2013-2014- When all students are counted, she is counted twice, but when subgroup counts are made, she is counted once. We are aware of the discrepancy, and feel comfortable accepting the single student difference.

## 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	74,790	S	67.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	209	S	77.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,708	S	83.00
<i>Asian</i>	1,589	S	83.00
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	119	S	83.00
Black or African American	17,605	S	47.80
Hispanic or Latino	6,844	S	56.00
White	48,424	S	75.90
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,525	S	47.50
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,324	S	36.00
Economically disadvantaged students	45,384	S	57.40
Migratory students	51	S	27.00
Male	38,261	S	68.30
Female	36,528	S	67.00

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. One white, female, IDEA student was incorrectly assigned as having been assessed twice, but was correctly assigned one score in 2013-2014- When all students are counted, she is counted twice, but when subgroup counts are made, she is counted once. We are aware of the discrepancy, and feel comfortable accepting the single student difference.

## 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	73,847	S	48.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	226	S	47.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,720	S	73.00
<i>Asian</i>	1,611	S	75.00
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	109	S	50.00
Black or African American	17,263	S	30.60
Hispanic or Latino	6,117	S	39.30
White	48,521	S	55.20
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,693	S	29.00
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,809	S	21.00
Economically disadvantaged students	43,470	S	36.80
Migratory students	44	S	23.00
Male	37,765	S	49.30
Female	36,082	S	47.80

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of American Indian students in Tennessee who received a score in the Math assessment in 2012-13 CSPR in 3rd grade (2013-14 4th graders) was 211, which suggests that the increase was less than 20% for the cohort.

## 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	73,894	S	48.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	226	S	53.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,706	S	70.00
<i>Asian</i>	1,598	S	71.00
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	108	S	56.00
Black or African American	17,297	S	30.50
Hispanic or Latino	6,109	S	36.70
White	48,556	S	56.30
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,732	S	26.70
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,782	S	13.00
Economically disadvantaged students	43,525	S	36.00
Migratory students	44	S	20.00
Male	37,779	S	45.00
Female	36,115	S	53.00

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of American Indian students in Tennessee who received a score in the Math assessment in 2012-13 CSPR in 3rd grade (2013-14 4th graders) was 211, which suggests that the increase was less than 20% for the cohort.

## 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	73,803	S	56.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	226	S	64.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,720	S	74.00
<i>Asian</i>	1,612	S	76.00
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	108	S	56.00
Black or African American	17,245	S	32.40
Hispanic or Latino	6,113	S	43.10
White	48,499	S	66.70
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,673	S	31.30
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,807	S	20.00
Economically disadvantaged students	43,439	S	44.00
Migratory students	44	S	25.00
Male	37,738	S	59.50
Female	36,065	S	54.20

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of American Indian students in Tennessee who received a score in the Math assessment in 2012-13 CSPR in 3rd grade (2013-14 4th graders) was 211, which suggests that the increase was less than 20% for the cohort.

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	73,589	S	61.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	213	S	58.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,713	S	82.00
<i>Asian</i>	1,601	S	83.00
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	112	S	73.00
Black or African American	17,507	S	46.00
Hispanic or Latino	5,875	S	56.00
White	48,281	S	67.10
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,890	S	36.70
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,133	S	34.00
Economically disadvantaged students	43,501	S	51.20
Migratory students	35	S	57.00
Male	37,471	S	60.10
Female	36,118	S	62.90

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 101 Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander students were in the 2012-2013 4th grade 1.3.1.3 CSPR, which is within the 20% increase.

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	73,641	S	53.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	213	S	54.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,706	S	73.00
<i>Asian</i>	1,594	S	74.00
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	112	S	66.00
Black or African American	17,586	S	36.90
Hispanic or Latino	5,854	S	41.30
White	48,282	S	59.50
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,903	S	34.50
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,083	S	14.00
Economically disadvantaged students	43,562	S	40.70
Migratory students	35	S	23.00
Male	37,497	S	48.60
Female	36,144	S	57.50

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 101 Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander students were in the 2012-2013 4th grade 1.3.1.3 CSPR, which is within the 20% increase.

## 1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	73,531	S	64.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	213	S	72.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,714	S	83.00
<i>Asian</i>	1,602	S	83.00
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	112	S	74.00
Black or African American	17,487	S	42.60
Hispanic or Latino	5,874	S	54.90
White	48,243	S	73.00
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,876	S	39.30
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,136	S	27.00
Economically disadvantaged students	43,456	S	52.60
Migratory students	35	S	43.00
Male	37,434	S	66.50
Female	36,097	S	62.50

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 101 Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander students were in the 2012-2013 5th grade 1.3.1.3 CSPR, which is within the 20% increase.

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	73,301	S	50.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	226	S	51.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,497	S	75.00
<i>Asian</i>	1,399	S	76.00
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	98	S	56.00
Black or African American	17,637	S	31.10
Hispanic or Latino	5,511	S	41.40
White	48,430	S	57.30
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,415	S	27.50
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,388	S	17.00
Economically disadvantaged students	42,800	S	38.30
Migratory students	40	S	30.00
Male	37,522	S	47.70
Female	35,778	S	52.70

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Accurate gender and race data was not available for one student in the 2013-14 6th grade cohort.

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	73,463	S	55.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	228	S	62.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,512	S	73.00
<i>Asian</i>	1,415	S	74.00
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	97	S	64.00
Black or African American	17,652	S	36.40
Hispanic or Latino	5,496	S	43.30
White	48,575	S	63.00
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,442	S	29.80
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,358	S	10.00
Economically disadvantaged students	42,869	S	43.00
Migratory students	40	S	23.00
Male	37,620	S	50.40
Female	35,843	S	60.50

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

## 1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	73,333	S	62.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	226	S	71.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,513	S	82.00
<i>Asian</i>	1,416	S	82.00
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	97	S	76.00
Black or African American	17,633	S	42.00
Hispanic or Latino	5,508	S	54.90
White	48,453	S	70.20
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,406	S	32.60
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,388	S	19.00
Economically disadvantaged students	42,778	S	50.80
Migratory students	40	S	45.00
Male	37,539	S	64.40
Female	35,793	S	60.50
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Accurate gender data was not available for one student in the 2013-14 6th grade cohort.			

## 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	73,651	S	44.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	235	S	42.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,432	S	71.00
<i>Asian</i>	1,324	S	72.00
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	108	S	57.00
Black or African American	17,566	S	29.20
Hispanic or Latino	5,403	S	38.90
White	49,015	S	49.60
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,038	S	23.90
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,302	S	16.00
Economically disadvantaged students	42,214	S	33.40
Migratory students	41	S	29.00
Male	38,007	S	41.00
Female	35,644	S	47.80

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of Native Hawaiian students with a valid score for the 2013-14 7th grade Math CSPR Cohort in the 2012-13 CSPR 6th grade cohort was 103, which suggests that the number has not increased by 20%.

## 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	74,259	S	50.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	239	S	50.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,540	S	70.00
<i>Asian</i>	1,430	S	70.00
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	110	S	63.00
Black or African American	17,599	S	31.90
Hispanic or Latino	5,408	S	39.20
White	49,473	S	57.90
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,051	S	25.60
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,279	S	5.00
Economically disadvantaged students	42,278	S	37.60
Migratory students	41	S	29.00
Male	38,301	S	45.20
Female	35,958	S	56.30

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of Native Hawaiian students with a valid score for the 2013-14 7th grade RLA CSPR Cohort in the 2012-13 CSPR 6th grade cohort was 101, which suggests that the number has not increased by 20%.

## 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	74,203	S	65.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	239	S	72.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,543	S	82.00
<i>Asian</i>	1,433	S	82.00
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	110	S	78.00
Black or African American	17,583	S	44.20
Hispanic or Latino	5,426	S	56.80
White	49,412	S	73.00
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,016	S	36.60
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,310	S	20.00
Economically disadvantaged students	42,248	S	53.60
Migratory students	41	S	61.00
Male	38,262	S	64.90
Female	35,941	S	65.50

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of Native Hawaiian students with a valid score for the 2013-14 7th grade Science CSPR Cohort in the 2012-13 CSPR 6th grade cohort was 104, which suggests that the number has not increased by 20%. Gender data for one student was not collected for the 2013-14 CSPR 7th grade cohort.

## 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	64,872	S	40.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	215	S	40.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	991	S	61.00
<i>Asian</i>	900	S	62.00
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	91	S	53.00
Black or African American	15,702	S	22.10
Hispanic or Latino	4,442	S	35.30
White	43,522	S	47.80
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,161	S	20.40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,009	S	17.00
Economically disadvantaged students	38,229	S	31.10
Migratory students	31	S	45.00
Male	33,283	S	38.00
Female	31,589	S	43.90

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 217 American Indian or Alaska Native were accounted for in the 2012-13 7th grade Cohort in the CSPR. This suggests that the cohort change from the 2012-13 7th grades to the 2013-14 8th graders was less than 20%. The discrepancy in the number of students in Math and RLA is due to a number of students (about 10,000 students) take Algebra I in 8th grade and according to our business rules, in rare occasions do we report those students as they take a different assessment. This difference can account for the difference in the number of White, Asian, Black, pacific Islander, Male, and Female students between RLA and Math.

## 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	73,968	S	46.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	247	S	50.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,496	S	66.00
<i>Asian</i>	1,390	S	67.00
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	106	S	57.00
Black or African American	17,687	S	26.90
Hispanic or Latino	4,871	S	34.60
White	49,667	S	54.60
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,303	S	25.50
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	986	S	3.00
Economically disadvantaged students	41,141	S	33.40
Migratory students	31	S	13.00
Male	37,595	S	43.50
Female	36,373	S	50.30

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 217 American Indian or Alaska Native were accounted for in the 2012-13 7th grade Cohort in the CSPR. This suggests that the cohort change from the 2012-13 7th grades to the 2013-14 8th graders was less than 20%. The change in the size of the Native Hawaiian subgroup has been validated. The change from 2012-13 CSPR should be noted, but it is an accurate representation of demographic changes in Tennessee.

## 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	72,624	S	66.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	242	S	77.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,352	S	80.00
<i>Asian</i>	1,248	S	81.00
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	104	S	71.00
Black or African American	17,143	S	45.10
Hispanic or Latino	4,859	S	56.90
White	49,028	S	73.90
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,243	S	36.40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,019	S	15.00
Economically disadvantaged students	40,706	S	54.60
Migratory students	31	S	42.00
Male	36,952	S	66.60
Female	35,672	S	65.60
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. See Comments under 1.3.1.6 for discrepancies between Science and Math.			

## 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	67,893	S	62.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	218	S	61.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	964	S	79.00
<i>Asian</i>	882	S	79.00
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	82	S	77.00
Black or African American	17,141	S	49.50
Hispanic or Latino	4,416	S	56.30
White	45,151	S	68.20
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,662	S	32.50
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,119	S	26.00
Economically disadvantaged students	38,249	S	54.00
Migratory students	21	S	43.00
Male	35,465	S	58.80
Female	32,428	S	67.30

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Asian or Pacific Islander (total), Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, Limited English proficient (LEP) students, Migratory students subgroup counts differ among MATH, RLA, Science due to:  
- HS Algebra I MATH counts spread from grades 7 - 12 vs grades 9 - 12,  
- use of differing grade levels typically assessed for End of Course exams,  
- EOC are not grade level exams so we may see a different progression for LEP students in English  
Tennessee does not report data on two or multiple races; a hierarchy is applied to assign student to only one race.

## 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	71,122	S	63.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	236	S	69.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,394	S	79.00
<i>Asian</i>	1,293	S	79.00
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	101	S	78.00
Black or African American	17,503	S	44.90
Hispanic or Latino	4,029	S	56.80
White	47,956	S	70.60
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,081	S	26.40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	595	S	10.00
Economically disadvantaged students	36,436	S	50.40
Migratory students	19	S	32.00
Male	36,202	S	59.60
Female	34,919	S	67.90

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Gender was not available for one student. Asian or Pacific Islander (total), Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, Limited English proficient (LEP) students, Migratory students subgroup counts differ among MATH, RLA, Science due to:  
- HS Algebra I MATH counts spread from grades 7 - 12 vs grades 9 - 12,  
- use of differing grade levels typically assessed for End of Course exams,  
- EOC are not grade level exams so we may see a different progression for LEP students in English  
Tennessee does not report data on two or multiple races; a hierarchy is applied to assign student to only one race.

Gender was not correctly assigned for a single student in High School English (Error CSPR-HS-1031.HS)

## 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	129,739	S	51.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	431	S	61.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,644	S	72.00
<i>Asian</i>	2,449	S	73.00
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	195	S	56.00
Black or African American	31,808	S	30.80
Hispanic or Latino	7,549	S	42.50
White	87,299	S	59.50
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,678	S	24.90
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,383	S	11.00
Economically disadvantaged students	63,906	S	38.90
Migratory students	38	S	21.00
Male	65,145	S	51.40
Female	64,594	S	52.10

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Asian or Pacific Islander (total), Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, Limited English proficient (LEP) students, Migratory students subgroup counts differ among MATH, RLA, Science due to:

- HS Algebra I MATH counts spread from grades 7 - 12 vs grades 9 - 12,
- use of differing grade levels typically assessed for End of Course exams,
- EOC are not grade level exams so we may see a different progression for LEP students
- Science 2013-14 CSPR submits data on the Biology I and Chemistry EOC exams, while English and Math submit data for a single exam, so we would expect more students in science. In 2012-13, Chemistry EOC was not offered and thus not submitted to CSPR.

Tennessee does not report data on two or multiple races; a hierarchy is applied to assign student to only one race. With only 195 Native Hawaiian students participating in the Science EOC, it is not unexpected that there would be year-to-year variation in the percent of students scoring at advanced or proficient. These data have been validated.

**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**

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 2013-14. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2013-14	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2013-14
Schools			
Districts			

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

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator <sup>3</sup> based on data for SY 2013-14. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2013-14	Percentage that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2013-14
Schools	1,667	8	0.48
Districts	139	1	0.72

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

<sup>3</sup> For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

**1.4.2 Title I School Accountability**

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 2013-14. 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 2013-14	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2013-14
All Title I schools			
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools			
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools			

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

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and the other academic indicator <sup>4</sup> based on data for SY 2013-14. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by LEAs in private schools. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2013-14	Percentage of Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2013-14
All Title I schools	1,115	6	0.54
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,095	6	0.55
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	20		

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

<sup>4</sup> For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

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

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 2013-14. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2013-14	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2013-14	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2013-14

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

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that met all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator<sup>5</sup> based on data for SY 2013-14. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2013-14	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2013-14	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2013-14
134		

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

<sup>5</sup> For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

**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 2013-14 (based on SY 2012-13 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2013-14
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members, not including the principal, relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. TN no longer submits file C152. Given TN's waiver, the section is not applicable.	

**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 2013-14 (based on SY 2012-13 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. TN no longer submits file C153. Given TN's waiver, the section is not applicable.	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

**1.4.5.2 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.

Given TN's waiver, the section is not applicable.

**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 2013-14 (based on SY 2012-13 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 2013-14
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2012-13 and beginning of SY 2013-14 as a corrective action)	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Given TN's waiver, the section is not applicable.	

**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 2013-14 data and the results of those appeals.

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts		
Schools		
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Given TN's waiver, the section is not applicable.		

In the table below, provide the data by which processing appeals based on SY 2013-14 data was complete.

Processing Appeals completion	Date
Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2013-14 data was complete	

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

In the section below, "schools in improvement" refers to Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

**1.4.8.5 Use of Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds.****1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2013 (SY 2013-14) 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. Four percent of Title I, Part A funds are reserved for 1003a School Improvement. Of the 1003a reservation the State used five percent for evaluation and technical assistance.  
In last year's CSPR, we at the Tennessee Department of Education may have misunderstood this question. We thought it was asking about the percent of 1003a funds that were reserved by the state for evaluation and technical assistance, so we entered five percent.  
For both 2012-13 and 2013-14 the Tennessee Department of Education has reserved four percent of the Title I, Part A funds to be used as 1003a School Improvement funds. Of this four percent off the top, we used five percent for evaluation and technical assistance in each year.

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

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS). The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part I of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN012 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

**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 2013-14.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State reserved 5% of the 1003a School Improvement set aside to be used for evaluation and technical assistance. There were four people working in the Office of School Improvement (OSI). The main purpose of this office was to distribute funds to districts with Focus and Priority Schools from across the state. We monitored the implementation of grants, collected and analysed data, and provided technical assistance to the districts. The OSI had one person dedicated to working with Focus Schools, two people working on the School Improvement Grants and Priority Schools, and a Director who coordinated the efforts. Additionally, we ran a Reading Grant and a Signing and Retention Bonus Grant for outstanding teachers who elected to serve in Priority Schools. Technical assistance was provided in the form of on-site monitoring, webinars, on-going communication with LEAs, and professional development in the form of a Leadership Summit for SIG district leaders from across the state.

**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 2013-14 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.

Given TN's waiver, the section is not applicable.

**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 Title I school 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.

<b>Public School Choice</b>	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for public school choice	
Applied to transfer	
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. TN no longer submits file C010. Given TN's waiver, the section is not applicable.	

**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*.

<b>Transportation for Public School Choice</b>	<b>Dollars Spent</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$

**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.

<b>Unable to Provide Public School Choice</b>	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	

**FAQs about public school choice:**

- a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?* For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
  - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
  - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
  - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

- b. *How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice?* In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

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

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 1.4.9.1.3  
 TN no longer submits file C164. Given TN's waiver, the section is not applicable.

1.4.9.1.4  
 Given TN's waiver, the section is not applicable.

**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*.

The number of students who received supplemental educational services should include all students who were enrolled with a provider and participated in some hours of services. States and LEAs have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation needed by a student to be considered as having received services.

<b>Supplemental Educational Services</b>	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	
Applied for supplemental educational services	
Received supplemental educational services	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. TN no longer submits file C128. Given TN's waiver, the section is not applicable.	

**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*.

<b>Spending on Supplemental Educational Services</b>	<b>Dollars Spent</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. TN no longer submits file C164. Given TN's waiver, the section is not applicable.	

**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.

Classes	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	251,793	247,088	98.13	4,705	1.87
All elementary classes	172,316	170,098	98.71	2,218	1.29
All secondary classes	79,477	76,990	96.87	2,487	3.13

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

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction in core academic subjects.	<u>Yes</u>
--	------------

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

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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.

<b>1.5.2.1 Elementary School Classes</b>	
<b>Elementary School Classes</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
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	40.00
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	35.00
Elementary 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)	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

<b>1.5.2.2 Secondary School Classes</b>	
<b>Secondary School Classes</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
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)	40.00
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	35.00
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)	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

### 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	41,662	41,045	98.52
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	48,171	47,725	99.07
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	10,498	9,750	92.87
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	33,274	32,659	98.15

#### 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	80.70	50.00
Poverty metric used	Percentage of students eligible for free and reduced price meals	
Secondary schools	80.70	50.00
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](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
<u>No</u>	Dual language	
<u>No</u>	Two-way immersion	
<u>No</u>	Transitional bilingual programs	
<u>No</u>	Developmental bilingual	
<u>No</u>	Heritage language	
<u>Yes</u>	Sheltered English instruction	////////////////////////////////////
<u>Yes</u>	Structured English immersion	////////////////////////////////////
<u>Yes</u>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	////////////////////////////////////
<u>Yes</u>	Content-based ESL	////////////////////////////////////
<u>Yes</u>	Pull-out ESL	////////////////////////////////////
<u>Yes</u>	Other (explain in comment box below)	////////////////////////////////////

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

TN also has LEAs that use the push-in model for ESL instruction.

**1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**

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

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

- o 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.
- o 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	35,145
<b>Comments:</b> 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 in the State who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

<b>LEP Students Receiving Services</b>	<b>#</b>
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	33,301
<b>Comments:</b> 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.

<b>Language</b>	<b># LEP Students</b>
Spanish; Castilian	25,970
Arabic	2,294
Somali	470
Vietnamese	465
Kurdish	396

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).

<b>All LEP Testing</b>	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	34,829
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,407
Total	36,236
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

<b>All LEP Results</b>	<b>#</b>
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	S
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	25.20
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Regarding the school-level file, schools in cohorts 2 and 3 received SIG funds in 2013-14. There were significantly fewer schools that received funding in 2013-14 as compared to 2012-13	

**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 and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

<b>Title III LEP Testing</b>		<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment		34,366
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment		1,330
Total		35,696
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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).

<b>Title III First Time Tested</b>		<b>#</b>
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.		10,309

**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:**

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

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and 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%).

<b>Title III Results</b>	<b>Results #</b>	<b>Results %</b>	<b>Targets #</b>	<b>Targets %</b>
Making progress	S	67.50	16,600	69.00
Attained proficiency	S	25.00	6,868	20.00

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. To determine the target number of students who would need to show progress in order to meet the target of 69.00%, we multiplied the number of students who took the English Language Proficiency test in both of the last two years by .69 and rounded up to 16,600 students. To determine the target number of students who would need to attain proficiency to meet the state target of 20.00%, we multiplied the total number of test takers by .20 to obtain the target number of 6,868 students. The target number for making progress included only students who took the test for two years in a row because, to make progress, we needed baseline data about those students. The latter figure included all test takers because students could attain proficiency on their first year of taking the test.

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

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

**1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language**

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All state assessments are administered 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)
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.



**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
3,580	4,421	8,001
<b>Comments:</b> 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
7,389	S	51.80	S
<b>Comments:</b> 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
7,321	S	37.00	S
<b>Comments:</b> 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
7,304	S	58.40	S
<b>Comments:</b> 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.)

<b>Title III Subgrantees</b>		<b>#</b>
Total number of subgrantees for the year		88
////////////////////////////////////		
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs		41
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 1		52
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 2		64
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 3		1
////////////////////////////////////		
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs		4
////////////////////////////////////		
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2012-13 and 2013-14)		15
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2013-14 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years		6
Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14)		3

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. If applicable, also please note if this method is the same or different from the previous year.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. TN considers consortia members as subgrantees. This is the same as last year.

**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.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. TN did not make AMAO 1 and 3. Our largest LEP district failed both benchmarks causing this failure at the state level. By including all LEP students not only Title III, the state made AMAO 1 and 2.	

**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?	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The two programs that were at the 4 year point have restructured. One changed personnel and the other changed curriculum and program design. Three of the subgrantees who implemented improvement plans made all AMAOs this year.	

**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
8,040	1,135	5

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

<b>Title III Teachers</b>	<b>#</b>
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,118
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	116

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.

In 2013-14, the state had 1,118 teachers, a 1.02% increase from 1,098 in 2012-13. If the state continues to need more LEP teachers at a rate of 1.02% per year, it will require 1,234 certified teachers in 2018-19, an increase of 116 teachers from 2013-14.

\* 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.

Professional Development (PD) Topics	# Subgrantees
Instructional strategies for LEP students	88
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	70
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	67
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	49
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	57
Other (Explain in comment box)	28

PD Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	72	17,559
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	79	2,317
PD provided to principals	64	1,079
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	65	695
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	43	1,401
PD provided to community based organization personnel	20	1,012
Total	//////////	24,063

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

**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 2013-14 funds July 1, 2013, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2013, for SY 2013-14 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7-1-2013	7-1-2013	0
<b>Comments:</b> 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.

We have the money to subgrantees as soon as we receive it at the Tennessee Department of Education if they have an approved consolidated application. We cannot shorten this process.

**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>.

<b>Persistently Dangerous Schools</b>	<b>#</b>
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM**

This section collects data on homeless children and youth 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 youth and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be automatically calculated.

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	116	116
LEAs with subgrants	24	24
Total	140	140

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 19 districts reported that they did not have any Homeless students in 2013-14.

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

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

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youth**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	88	134
K	465	1,141
1	589	1,302
2	592	1,307
3	496	1,269
4	440	1,093
5	446	1,046
6	379	904
7	359	882
8	306	781
9	240	919
10	162	644
11	126	468
12	169	429
Ungraded	24	72
Total	4,881	12,391

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

**1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youth**

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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.

<b>Primary Nighttime Residence</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	295	1,296
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,745	9,555
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	221	183
Hotels/Motels	620	1,357
Total	4,881	12,391

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

**1.9.1.3 Subgroups of Homeless Students Enrolled**

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

<b>Special Population</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants</b>
Unaccompanied homeless youth	133	557
Migratory children/youth	21	55
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	879	2,134
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	122	483

**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 Youth Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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/Youth Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	134
K	1,141
1	1,302
2	1,307
3	1,269
4	1,093
5	1,046
6	904
7	882
8	781
9	919
10	644
11	468
12	429
Ungraded	72
Total	12,391

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

**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.

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	557
Migratory children/youth	55
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	2,134
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	483

**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 youth.

**1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment**

In the table below, provide the number of enrolled homeless children and youth who were tested on the State 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	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	354	112	863	213
4	334	94	745	209
5	330	135	724	240
6	259	102	624	195
7	256	82	613	180
8	224	62	539	139
High School	120	44	386	162

**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	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	358	145	861	304
4	339	97	737	207
5	328	151	721	303
6	263	95	617	179
7	258	68	608	165
8	226	51	494	113
High School	175	83	456	212

**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	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	355	212	860	380
4	329	151	741	245
5	331	164	712	280
6	258	122	621	249
7	258	116	610	274
8	230	125	530	238
High School	193	78	675	187

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