

ESEA FLEXIBILITY PART B MONITORING REPORT

MONITORING VISIT INFORMATION	
State Educational Agency (SEA)	Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE)
Request Approved	February 9, 2012
Request Amended	May 2, 2013
ESEA Flex Monitoring Activity	Part B Desk Monitoring
Monitoring Review Date(s)	September 23-24, 2013
Exit Conference	November 5, 2013
Interviews Conducted	Jerry Bush, Eve Carney, Rita Fentress, Kelli Gauthier, Ken Green, Joey Hassell, Sara Heyburn, Bing Howell, Luke Kohlmoos, Mike Koprowski, Jan Lanier, Deb Malone, Lori Nixon, Erin O'Hara, and Justin Tooley
U.S. Department of Education (ED) Monitors	Victoria Hammer, Leticia Braga

OVERVIEW OF ESEA FLEXIBILITY MONITORING

The U.S. Department of Education (ED) is committed to supporting State educational agencies (SEAs) as they implement ambitious reform agendas through their approved ESEA flexibility requests. Consistent with this commitment, ED has designed a monitoring process to assess an SEA's implementation of the principles of ESEA flexibility and the State-level systems and processes needed to support that implementation.

Part B Monitoring

In Part B monitoring, SEA implementation of ESEA flexibility was reviewed across several key areas: State-level Systems and Processes, Principle 1, Principle 2, and Principle 3, as outlined in the *ESEA Flexibility Part B Monitoring Protocol*. In each broad area, ED identified key elements that are required under ESEA flexibility and are likely to lead to increased achievement for students. Through examination of documentation submitted by the SEA and interviews with SEA staff, ED assessed the effectiveness of implementation of ESEA flexibility by identifying the extent to which an SEA:

1. Is ensuring that implementation is occurring consistent with the SEA's approved request and the principles and timelines of ESEA flexibility.
2. Is continuing to review and make adjustments to support implementation.
3. Is establishing systems and processes to sustain implementation and improvements.

The report contains the following sections:

- *Highlights of the SEA's Implementation.* This section identifies key accomplishments in the SEA's implementation of ESEA flexibility.
- *Status of Implementation of ESEA Flexibility.* This section indicates whether or not the SEA has met expectations for each element of ESEA flexibility.
- *Elements Requiring Next Steps.* When appropriate, this section identifies any elements where the SEA is not meeting expectations and includes Next Steps that the SEA must take to meet expectations.

- *Recommendations to Strengthen Implementation.* This section provides recommendations to support the SEA in continuing to meet the principles and timelines of ESEA flexibility and strengthening implementation.
- *Additional Comments.* When appropriate, this section includes any additional information related to the SEA’s implementation of ESEA flexibility not included elsewhere.

HIGHLIGHTS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF ESEA FLEXIBILITY

The SEA’s work includes the following key accomplishments relating to the implementation of ESEA flexibility and/or efforts to engage in a process of continuous review and analysis, particularly for those elements receiving a comprehensive review:

- The Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) has implemented a robust set of activities to transition its schools and local educational agencies (LEAs) to college- and career-ready standards (CCRS), including administration of Statewide constructed response assessments in mathematics and writing-in-response-to-reading assessments in reading/language arts; development and implementation of structures to provide training and professional development by both TDOE and staff at its Centers of Regional Excellence (COREs) (formerly Field Service Centers); placement of math and data coaches, respectively, at each CORE; and development or identification and dissemination of CCRS-aligned instructional resources and materials. As part of the multi-pronged approach, the State has a rigorous process of identifying “Core Coaches” to train school and LEA staff from their schools and LEAs.
- The State convened Focus School principals in November 2013 to identify intervention strategies to address the needs of the students that led to the school’s identification as a focus school and disseminate this information broadly across the State.
- The State has established a method for transitioning students who have been taking the State’s alternate assessment based on modified academic achievement standards (AA-MAAS) to the general assessment. Specifically, students who scored proficient on both the State’s reading/language arts and mathematics AA-MAAS were tracked into the general assessment for the 2012–2013 assessment administration.
- TDOE completed its second year of fully implementing its teacher evaluation system and principal evaluation system. It piloted further refinements to the principal evaluation system in 2013–2014, and will begin full implementation of the further revised principal evaluation system in the 2014–2015 school year. TDOE revised elements of its teacher evaluation system in the 2012–2013 school year based on input from the field and analysis of the data it has collected thus far (*e.g.*, the number of observations conducted on each staff member will be based on both licensure status and evaluation scores from the first to second year of the system implementation).

STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF ESEA FLEXIBILITY

SEA Systems & Processes

Element	Status
Monitoring (EDGAR 80.40 and 2.G)	Not Meeting Expectations
Technical Assistance (2.G)	Not Meeting Expectations
Data Collection & Use (§9304(a)(6))	Meeting Expectations
Family & Community Engagement and Outreach (Implementation Letter)	Meeting Expectations

Principle 1

Element	Status
Transition to and Implement College- and Career-ready Standards (1.B)	Meeting Expectations
Adopt English Language Proficiency Standards (Assurance 2)	Meeting Expectations
Develop and Administer High-Quality Assessments (Assurance 3)	Meeting Expectations
Develop and Administer Alternate Assessments (Assurance 3)	Meeting Expectations
Develop and Administer English Language Proficiency Assessments (Assurance 4)	Meeting Expectations
Annually Reports College-going and College-credit Accumulation Rates (Assurance 5)	Meeting Expectations

Principle 2

Element	Status
Develop and Implement a State-Based System of Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support (2.A)	Meeting Expectations
Reward Schools (2.C)	Meeting Expectations
Priority Schools (2.D)	Not Meeting Expectations
Focus Schools (2.E)	Not Meeting Expectations
Other Title I Schools (2.F)	Not Meeting Expectations
State and Local Report Cards (§1111 of the ESEA; 2.B and Assurance 14)	Not Meeting Expectations

Principle 3

Element	Status
Teacher Evaluation and Support Systems (3.B)	Meeting Expectations
Principal Evaluation and Support Systems (3.B)	Meeting Expectations

ELEMENTS REQUIRING NEXT STEPS

Element	Monitoring
<p>Summary and Status of Implementation</p>	<p>The SEA has not demonstrated that this element is carried out consistent with its approved ESEA flexibility request and the principles and timelines outlined in the document titled <i>ESEA Flexibility</i>. Specifically, under ESEA flexibility, States must have a process in place to ensure timely and comprehensive monitoring of priority and focus schools. Based on the documentation that Tennessee provided and information that it reported during the monitoring call, the State does not have a process for ensuring that its LEAs with focus schools that did not receive funds in the State’s competitive focus school grant competition or accept support from the Public Consulting Group (PCG) (11 of 169 focus schools) conduct timely and comprehensive monitoring of these schools.</p>
<p>Next Steps</p>	<p>See Next Step identified in the <i>Focus Schools</i> element of this report. By completing the Next Step described below in the <i>Focus Schools</i> element, Tennessee will address this issue.</p>

Element	Technical Assistance
<p>Summary and Status of Implementation</p>	<p>The SEA has not demonstrated that this element is carried out consistent with its approved ESEA flexibility request and the principles and timelines outlined in the document titled <i>ESEA Flexibility</i>. Specifically, under ESEA flexibility, States must have a process in place to ensure that each LEA with focus schools provides timely and comprehensive technical assistance to priority and focus schools. Based on the documentation that Tennessee provided and information that it reported during the monitoring call, the State does not have a process for ensuring that its LEAs with focus schools that did not receive funds in the State’s competitive focus school grant competition or accept support from the Public Consulting Group (PCG) (11 of 169 focus schools) provide technical assistance to these schools.</p>
<p>Next Steps</p>	<p>See Next Step identified in the <i>Focus Schools</i> element of this report. By completing the Next Step described below in the <i>Focus Schools</i> element, Tennessee will address this issue.</p>

Element	Priority Schools
<p>Summary and Status of Implementation</p>	<p>The SEA has not demonstrated that this element is carried out consistent with its approved ESEA flexibility request and the principles and timelines outlined in the document titled <i>ESEA Flexibility</i>. Specifically, under ESEA flexibility, schools identified as priority schools must implement either one of the four School Improvement Grant (SIG) models or interventions aligned with the turnaround principles. Based on evidence provided and information reporting during the monitoring call, the State has intervened in its priority schools on a different timeline than in its approved request for ESEA flexibility. In addition, the State did not have in place a process to ensure that these schools implemented the first turnaround principle (review of building principal and</p>

Element	Priority Schools
	either replacement of that principal or a demonstration that that principal has a track record in improving achievement and the ability to lead a turnaround effort in that building).
Next Steps	Through the ESEA flexibility extension process Tennessee will (1) revise the timeline on which all priority schools will implement either one of the four SIG models or interventions aligned with the turnaround principles (reflecting that all non-SIG priority schools will fully implement the turnaround principles by the 2014–2015 school year), and (2) describe the process by which it will ensure that its LEAs with priority schools implement all turnaround principles.

Element	Focus Schools
Summary and Status of Implementation	The SEA has not demonstrated that this element is carried out consistent with its approved ESEA flexibility request and the principles and timelines outlined in the document titled <i>ESEA Flexibility</i> . Specifically, under ESEA flexibility, States must have a process in place to ensure timely and comprehensive monitoring of and technical assistance to priority and focus schools. Based on the documentation that Tennessee provided and information that it reported during the monitoring call, the State does not have a process to ensure that its LEAs with focus schools that neither received funds in the State’s competitive focus school grant competition nor accepted support from PCG monitor implementation of interventions intended to address the needs of the students for which the State identified the schools as focus schools and provide technical assistance to support effective implementation of these interventions.
Next Steps	Through the ESEA flexibility extension process, Tennessee will submit a plan for ensuring that its LEAs with the subset of 11 of 169 focus schools described above monitor implementation of interventions in these schools and provide technical assistance to support effective implementation of these interventions.

Element	Other Title I Schools
Summary and Status of Implementation	The SEA has not demonstrated that this element is carried out consistent with its approved ESEA flexibility request and the principles and timelines outlined in the document titled <i>ESEA Flexibility</i> . Specifically, under ESEA flexibility, States must provide incentives and supports for other Title I schools that, based on the State’s new AMOs and other measures (<i>i.e.</i> , graduation rates and other indicators) are not making progress in improving student achievement and narrowing achievement gaps. Tennessee’s approved request indicates that its nine COREs will be the “key element” in ensuring that LEAs facilitate continuous improvement in other Title I schools, and places the responsibility for improving other Title I schools with LEAs. Based on evidence provided and information reported during the monitoring call, it was not evident if and how the COREs ensure that each LEA provides incentives and supports to other Title I schools in which students consistently miss performance targets.
Next Steps	Through the ESEA flexibility extension process, Tennessee will either provide evidence that that its nine COREs support LEAs in providing incentives and

Element	Other Title I Schools
	supports to other Title I schools in which students consistently miss performance targets (including AMOs, graduation rates, and other indicators) or a plan describing how they will do this in the 2014-2015 school year and beyond.

Element	State and Local Report Cards
Summary and Status of Implementation	The SEA has not demonstrated that this element is carried out consistent with its approved ESEA flexibility request and the principles and timelines outlined in the document titled <i>ESEA Flexibility</i> . Specifically, Tennessee does not include all of the required elements on its State and local report cards. For example, based on the 2012 Tennessee report cards available at http://www.tn.gov/education/reportcard/ , neither the State nor local report cards include various required National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) data elements or the percentage of classes in core academic subjects not taught by highly qualified teachers by high and low poverty schools.
Next Steps	As part of the extension process, Tennessee will submit a timeline for revising its State and local report card templates to include all the required elements such that the report cards based on 2013–2014 data will contain all required elements.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO STRENGTHEN IMPLEMENTATION

The following recommendations are provided to support the SEA in continuing to meet the principles and timelines of ESEA flexibility and strengthening implementation through continuous improvement and the establishment of systems and processes to sustain implementation and improvement.

- In order to better meet the need of targeted student groups the SEA should increase its capacity to address the needs of teachers of English Learners in both the transition to college- and career-ready standards and interventions in priority, focus, and other Title I schools, respectively. Additionally, the SEA should ensure implementation of the TDOE professional development plan for the 2013-14 school year to provide training to educators on the new WIDA standards, so that teachers are fully prepared to implement the standards.