

# STATE PLAN PEER REVIEW CRITERIA Peer Review Panel Notes Template

---

STATE: Tennessee



**U.S. Department of Education**  
April 5, 2017

## SECTION A: TITLE I, PART A: IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LEAS

### A.1: Challenging State Academic Standards and Assessments

*Note: State Plan template item A.1 is submitted as part of the separate assessment peer review process consistent with ESEA section 1111(b) and 34 CFR § 200.2(d), and thus has no applicable peer review criteria in this document.*

### A.2: Eighth Grade Math Exception (ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C) and 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4))

*Note: State Plan template items A.2.i and A.2.ii require binary yes/no responses from SEAs, and thus have no applicable peer review criteria.*

#### A.2.iii: Strategies (ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C); 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4))

- If applicable,<sup>1</sup> does the SEA describe, regarding the 8<sup>th</sup> grade math exception, its strategies to provide all students in the State the opportunity to be prepared for and take advanced mathematics coursework in middle school (*e.g.*, appropriate data and evidence that the strategies are likely to provide all students in the State that opportunity)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan provides an adequate description of the 8 <sup>th</sup> grade math exception implementation. Tennessee 8 <sup>th</sup> graders taking advanced math are required to take an EOC exam for Algebra I instead of the 8 <sup>th</sup> grade state assessment.
<i>Strengths</i>	Tennessee presents the plan to allow students to take the End-of-Course exam for Algebra I and are exempt from the eighth-grade annual mathematics assessment and justifies the exception based on the unnecessary need to have redundant testing. Tennessee also reinforces their goal to ensure every student in the state has an equal opportunity to be prepared for and take courses at an advanced level prior to high school through rigorous implementation of college and career ready standards and our practices regarding teacher licensure and credentials for Algebra I. Tennessee details the ability for teachers with middle

<sup>1</sup> In order for an SEA to exempt an 8<sup>th</sup> grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in 8<sup>th</sup> grade under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(aa), it must ensure that: a. the student instead takes the end-of-course mathematics assessment the State administers to high school students under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb); b. the student’s performance on the high school assessment is used in the year in which the student takes the assessment for purposes of measuring academic achievement under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) and participation in assessments under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E); and c. in high school: (1) the student takes a State-administered end-of-course assessment or nationally recognized high school academic assessment as defined in 34 CFR § 200.3(d) in mathematics that is more advanced than the assessment the State administers for 8<sup>th</sup> graders under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb); (2) the State provides for appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR § 200.6(b) and (f); and (3) the student’s performance on the more advanced mathematics assessment is used for purposes of measuring academic achievement under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) and participation in assessments under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E).

	grades licensure to earn a specific endorsement to teach Algebra I. Tennessee describes strategies to prepare and provide all students with this opportunity including parent/ family awareness.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The plan lacks direct discussion of routine progress monitoring (i.e. through review of increases in percentage of students taking the EOC Algebra I exam) and data analysis.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

### **A.3: Native Language Assessments (ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(F) and 34 CFR § 200.6(f)(2)(ii) and (f)(4))**

#### **A.3.i: Definition**

- Does the SEA provide its definition of “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population”?
- Does the SEA identify the specific languages that meet that definition?
- Does the SEA’s definition include at least the most populous language other than English spoken by the State’s participating student population?
- In determining which languages are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, does the SEA describe how it considered languages other than English that are spoken by distinct populations of English learners, including English learners who are migratory, English learners who were not born in the United States, and English learners who are Native Americans?
- In determining which languages are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, does the SEA describe how it considered languages other than English that are spoken by a significant portion of the participating student population in one or more of the State’s LEAs, as well as languages spoken by a significant portion of the participating student population across grade levels?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan indicates Tennessee is an English only state and therefore Tennessee does not administer summative assessments in languages other than English. However, the plan does not address the requirements of A.3.i. No definition is provided, nor is an identification of languages provided.
<i>Strengths</i>	Tennessee supports their process for determining eligibility requirements to identify languages spoken by

	minority students using the Home Language Survey, assessments and the additional information from the parents related to language, milestones, and former education. Tennessee details an extensive identification, service, and monitoring plan for English learners.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Tennessee does not provide evidence of the specific languages other than English that are identified through the Home Language Survey.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Tennessee must provide a definition of “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population” and identify the languages meeting that definition, including the most populous languages present in that definition.

#### A.3.ii: Existing Assessments in Languages other than English

- Does the SEA identify any existing assessments that it makes available in languages other than English, and specify for which grades and content areas those assessments are available?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Tennessee is an English only State and does not administer summative assessments in other languages and outlines that all instruction in the State is taught in English with ESL support.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

### A.3.iii: Assessments not Available and Needed

- Does the SEA indicate the languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, as defined by the SEA and identified under A.3.i of the consolidated State plan, for which yearly student academic assessments are not available and are needed?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan indicates Tennessee is an English Only state and does not administer summative assessments or instruction in languages other than English.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Tennessee must specifically identify languages other than English that are present to a significant extent, for which yearly student academic assessments are not available and are needed.

### A.3.iv: Efforts to Develop Assessments

- Does the SEA describe how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, as defined by the SEA and identified under A.3.i of the consolidated State plan template?
- Does the SEA’s description of how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population include the State’s plan and timeline for developing such assessments?
- Does the SEA’s description of how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population include a description of the process the State used to:
  - 1) gather meaningful input on the need for assessments in languages other than English;
  - 2) collect and respond to public comment; and
  - 3) consult with educators, parents and families of English learners, students, as appropriate, and other stakeholders?
- If applicable, does the SEA’s description of how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population include an explanation of the reasons (*e.g.*, legal barriers)

the State has not been able to complete the development of such assessments despite making every effort?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan indicates Tennessee is an English Only state and does not administer summative assessments or instruction in languages other than English.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Given that Tennessee is an English-only State, there may be legal barriers to the development of assessments in languages other than English. However, Tennessee must adequately address the barriers to the development of these assessments. Tennessee must outline their process for public comment, consultation and input from stakeholders regarding the state’s efforts in developing such assessments.

**A.4: Statewide Accountability Systems & School Support and Improvement (ESEA section 1111(c) and (d))**

**A.4.i: Subgroups (ESEA section 1111(b)(3), 1111(c)(2))**

**A.4.i.a: Major Racial and Ethnic Subgroups of Students (ESEA section 1111(c)(2)(B))**

➤ Does the SEA list each major racial and ethnic group that the SEA includes as a subgroup of students in its accountability system?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Tennessee details four primary subgroups included as student groups in its accountability system - Black/Hispanic/Native American (BHN), economically disadvantaged (ED), English learners (EL), and students with disabilities (SWD)
<i>Strengths</i>	The plan details that additional subgroups of students include: Black/Hispanic/Native American (BHN), economically disadvantaged (ED), English learners (EL), and students with disabilities (SWD). Tennessee recognizes the importance of holding schools accountable for all the students they serve, and so uses the combined reporting as a way to hold additional schools accountable for those groups of students where n-sizes are small; this methodology increases the number of schools accountable than would be otherwise with separate subgroups

<i>Weaknesses</i>	Reviewers discussed whether racial and ethnic minority students are addressed as a single group or are broken into subgroups (Black/Hispanic/Native American—BHN) by Tennessee. From the description in the plan, it is unclear whether Tennessee separates out the racial/ethnic groups from the BHN group for any accountability purposes. If not, this would seem inconsistent with the statute.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The plan must clarify that the four groups are in addition to, not in lieu of, separate subgroups.

A.4.i.b: Additional Subgroups at SEA Discretion

- If applicable, does the SEA describe any additional subgroups of students other than the statutorily required subgroups (*i.e.*, economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners) included in its statewide accountability system?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Tennessee describes a state specific methodology which combines Black/Hispanic/Native American due to the relative smaller number of students representing these racial groups.
<i>Strengths</i>	Tennessee is committed to ensuring all students are included in their accountability system.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Combining ethnic/racial groups may compromise the usefulness of the data.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.i.c: Previously Identified English Learners

*Note: State Plan template item A.4.i.c requires a binary yes/no response from SEAs, and thus has no applicable peer review criteria.*

A.4.i.d: If Applicable, Exception for Recently Arrived English Learners

*Note: This peer review criterion applies only if a State selects the third option in item A.4.i.d in the consolidated State plan template for recently arrived English learners under which the State applies the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i) or the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii) to a recently arrived English learner.*

- Does the SEA describe how it will choose which exception applies to a recently arrived English learner (e.g., a statewide procedure that considers English language proficiency level in determining which, if any, exception applies)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Tennessee determined they would utilize the new flexibility option in ESSA that allows states up to three years before fully including recently arrived English learners (RAELs) achievement results on state assessments in accountability.
<i>Strengths</i>	Tennessee outlines a very clear plan that details a multi-year plan to accommodate English Learners and assessment. Tennessee chose that option based on input from ESSA working groups (EL and accountability). Tennessee believes this option will allow them to better serve their ELs without undue accountability pressure. Tennessee puts the student at the center of their decision – more time for EL instruction and more information for teachers to modify instruction prior to assessing.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.ii: Minimum N-Size (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A))

A.4.ii.a: Minimum N-Size for Accountability (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A)(i))

- Does the SEA provide the minimum number of students that the State determines is necessary to meet the requirements of any provisions under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that require disaggregation of information by each subgroup of students for accountability purposes, including annual meaningful differentiation and identification of schools?
- Is the minimum number of students the same State-determined number for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State (*i.e.*, economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners) for accountability purposes?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Tennessee specifies the minimum number of students that the State determines is necessary to meet the requirements of any provisions under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that require disaggregation of information by each subgroup of students for accountability purposes. The SEA states the minimum student group size; 30 for inclusion in accountability; 10 for reporting. Tennessee specifies an N-size of 30 as the minimum number of students that the State determines is necessary to meet the requirements of any provisions under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that require disaggregation of information by each subgroup of students for accountability purposes.
<i>Strengths</i>	Tennessee includes a detailed description of how and why decisions were made. A reviewer noted that using the combined BHN group may prevent small numbers/proportions of racial and ethnic minority students from being lost to accountability in districts in which single groups strongly predominate.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	A reviewer noted that the combining separate subgroups of students into a single subgroup is problematic; issues of performance may be masked within a larger group that would otherwise identifiable if a smaller n-sized is used for disaggregation of data for each subgroup for accountability or if each group is treated as a single subgroup.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.ii.b: Statistical Soundness of Minimum N-Size (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A)(i))

- Is the selected minimum number of students statistically sound?<sup>2</sup>

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan states that an n-size of 30 is considered a best practice from a statistical basis to minimize potential sampling errors.
<i>Strengths</i>	Tennessee states that the minimum number of students is statistically sound and based on best practices and the State will continue to use 30 as its n-count threshold.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Using the combined BHN subgroup to achieve this n-size (30) appears to eliminate some subgroups from separate identification in the accountability system.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.ii.c: How the SEA Determined Minimum N-Size (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A)(ii))

- Does the SEA describe how it determined the minimum number of students?
- Does the description include how the State collaborated with teachers, principals, other school leaders, parents, and other stakeholders when determining such minimum number?

	<i>Peer Response</i>

<sup>2</sup> Consistent with ESEA section 1111(i), information collected or disseminated under ESEA section 1111 shall be collected and disseminated in a manner that protects the privacy of individuals consistent with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g, commonly known as the “Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974”). When selecting a minimum n-size for reporting, States should consult the Institute of Education Sciences report [“Best Practices for Determining Subgroup Size in Accountability Systems While Protecting Personally Identifiable Student Information”](#) to identify appropriate statistical disclosure limitation strategies for protecting student privacy.

<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan only specifies that to increase confidence of the sample, Tennessee will continue to use 30 as its n-count threshold. The plan does not describe how the minimum n-size was determined. The plan does not include description of collaboration with teachers, principals, other school leaders, parents, and other stakeholders.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Tennessee must describe the process used to determine the n-size and specifically address the engagement of stakeholders in this process.

A.4.ii.d: Minimum N-Size and Ensuring Student Privacy (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A)(iii))

➤ Does the SEA describe how it ensures that the minimum number of students will protect the privacy of individual students?<sup>3</sup>

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan indicates that the accountability framework (including minimum n-size) provides safeguards to ensure student information is protected but does not address privacy directly.
<i>Strengths</i>	The plan does outline specific strategies for ensuring the subgroups have sufficient numbers of students (large enough for reporting) to provide accurate accountability. Tennessee provides a method to by utilizing a combined subgroup which will include any student who is a member of any one of the four focus subgroups—ED, SWD, EL, and BHN. This process will hold more schools and districts accountable for the outcomes of students from historically underserved populations.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The method Tennessee determined to use the minimum n-size to report student outcomes was not discussed as a means to protect the privacy of individual students.
<i>Did the SEA meet all</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers)

<sup>3</sup> See footnote 5 above for further guidance.

<i>requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Tennessee must directly address privacy in the discussion of the rationale for determining n-sizes.

A.4.ii.e: If Applicable, Minimum N-Size for Reporting

- If the SEA’s minimum number of students for purposes of reporting is lower than the minimum number of students for accountability purposes, does the SEA provide the minimum number of students for purposes of reporting?
- Is the SEA’s minimum number of students for purposes of reporting consistent with the requirements in ESEA section 1111(i), including with respect to privacy and statistical reliability?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Tennessee shares their intent of reporting when the minimum number of students for purposes of reporting is lower than the minimum number of students for accountability purposes (10).
<i>Strengths</i>	For transparency purposes, SEA will be reporting at the level of individual racial and ethnic groups and lowering the n-size to 10 for the purposes of reporting. The SEA provides a method of reporting by utilizing a combined subgroup which will include any student who is a member of any one of the four focus subgroups—ED, SWD, EL, and BHN. This process will hold more schools and districts accountable for the outcomes of students from historically underserved populations. For example, the DEA will reduce the n-size to 10 students if the subgroup is not composed of enough students.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Tennessee does not describe how this number meets statistical reliability or privacy concerns.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Tennessee must address issues of validity, reliability, and privacy in determining the minimum n-size for reporting.

A.4.iii: Establishment of Long-Term Goals (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A))

A.4.iii.a: Academic Achievement (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(aa))

A.4.iii.a.1: Long-term goals

- Does the SEA identify (*i.e.*, by providing a numeric measure) and describe the long-term goals for all students for improved academic achievement, as measured by grade-level proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (which must apply the same academic achievement standards to all public school students in the State, except those with the most significant cognitive disabilities)?
- Does the SEA identify and describe long-term goals for each subgroup of students?
- Does the SEA’s description include baseline data for all students and for each subgroup of students?
- Does the SEA’s description include the timeline for meeting the long-term goals?
- Is the timeline the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students?
- Are the long-term goals ambitious?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Tennessee clearly addresses the long-term goals for academic achievement in the different content areas and grade levels for all students, including subgroups. Baseline data and timeline are included. The goal to achieve a 50 percent reduction in the number of students not meeting the “on track or mastered” levels are ambitious.
<i>Strengths</i>	Tennessee provides a comprehensive chart that outlines the numeric measurements for all students based on grade levels, subject areas and ACT, and graduation rates as well as postsecondary credentials. For example, Tennessee provided baseline data from the 2015-2016 year and projected to Spring of 2025 for all students and subgroups.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this</i>	

<i>requirement</i>	
--------------------	--

A.4.iii.a.2: Measurements of interim progress

- Does the SEA provide measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for all students?
- Does the SEA provide measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for each subgroup of students?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Tennessee addresses the measurements of interim progress toward meeting long-term goals in the different content areas and grade levels for all students, including subgroups.
<i>Strengths</i>	Tennessee provides a thorough charting of interim progress for all students including subgroups for the different content areas and subgroups. For example, the English Learners had a baseline of 14% for 2014 – 2015, a projected increase to 19.4% for 2015 – 2016, 24.8% for 2016 – 2017, 30.1% 2017 – 2018 and annual increments up to 20124 – 2025. The timeline meets required guidelines.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.iii.a.3: Improvement necessary to close statewide proficiency gaps

- Do the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for academic achievement take into account the improvement necessary for subgroups of students who are behind in reaching those goals to make significant progress in closing statewide proficiency gaps, such that the State’s long-term goals require greater rates of improvement for subgroups of students that are lower achieving?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Tennessee addresses the measurements of interim progress toward meeting long-term goals in the different content areas and grade levels for all students including subgroups in terms of showing progress and reducing the achievement gap. The goals consider improvement necessary for making significant progress in closing the achievement gap.

<i>Strengths</i>	Tennessee specifies that the focus is not simply limited to moving students to proficiency; districts and schools are accountable for ensuring that students' progress across the continuum of achievement. Tennessee based their goal setting on the State achieving a 50% reduction in the number of students not meeting the on track or mastered level on the state's annual assessment by 2024-25. For example, High School economically disadvantaged students will increase from the baseline of 32.7% in 2015 – 2016 to 70.6 meeting the on track or mastered level on the State's annual assessment
<i>Weaknesses</i>	A reviewer noted that the goals will narrow, but will not close the identified achievement gaps
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.iii.b: Graduation Rate (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(bb))

A.4.iii.b.1: Long-term goals for four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate

- Does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students?
- Does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for each subgroup of students?
- Does the SEA's description include baseline data for all students and for each subgroup of students?
- Does the SEA's description include the timeline for meeting the long-term goals?
- Is the timeline the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students?
- Are the long-term goals ambitious?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan describes the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and includes a table indicating baseline data and long-term goals for all students and each subgroup of students. The plan includes baseline data and a timeline. The SEA provides students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, who are assessed with the state's alternate assessment, a state-defined alternate diploma that is aligned to the state requirements for the regular high school diploma. This will be included in the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.

<i>Strengths</i>	Tennessee details the need for some students to need more time to advance and graduate and submits several proposals to meet the needs of students. The SEA differentiates the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and subgroups. The SEA shares that the State will reach a 95 percent graduation rate for all students.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	While the goal to achieve a 50 percent reduction in the number of students not meeting the “on track or mastered” levels is ambitious, the goal does not result in the same endpoint in 2024-25 for each group of students.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.iii.b.2: If applicable, long-term goals for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate

- If applicable (*i.e.*, if the SEA chooses, at its discretion, to establish long-term goals for one or more extended-year rates), does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goals for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students?
- If applicable (*i.e.*, if the SEA chooses, at its discretion, to establish long-term goals for one or more extended-year rates), does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goals for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for each subgroup of students?
- Does the SEA’s description include baseline data for all students and for each subgroup of students?
- Does the SEA’s description include the timeline for meeting the long-term goals?
- Is the timeline the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students?
- Are the long-term goals ambitious?
- Are the long-term goals more rigorous than the long-term goals set for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Beginning with the class of the 2018, Tennessee will calculate and report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate which includes students who graduate with a regular high school diploma in up to five years for reporting purposes. This metric will be included on the state’s annual report card beginning with data from the 2018-19 school year.

	While the Tennessee Plan describes the process it will take to report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (one year), it is not clear if Tennessee will use the adjusted rate in its accountability system or just report the rate on its annual report card. Long-term goals are provided.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA details the need for some students to need more time to advance and graduate and has submitted several proposals to meet the needs of students.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Tennessee does not provide specific evidence describing incremental increases of graduation rates for all students and subgroups for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate versus the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Tennessee must clarify if they will use an extended graduation rate in the accountability system. If the extended rate will be used in the accountability system Tennessee must also identify long term goals, baseline data and a timeline for all students and subgroups.

A.4.iii.b.3: Measurements of interim progress

- Does the SEA provide measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students?
- Does the SEA provide measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for each subgroup of students?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan describes the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and includes a table indicating baseline data and measurements of interim progress for all students and each subgroup of students. (No measures of interim progress are provided for the extended-year adjusted cohort rate.)
<i>Strengths</i>	Tennessee outlines a chart including all students and subgroups including economically disadvantaged, student disabilities, English Learners and all ethnic and racial groups.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Tennessee does not provide specific evidence describing incremental increase of graduation for all students and subgroups for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate versus the four-year

	adjusted cohort graduation rate.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Tennessee must include measurements of interim progress towards long-term goals for the extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate if they intend to use this in the accountability system. If Tennessee does not intend to include this in the accountability system, the information provided would meet the requirement.

A.4.iii.b.4: Improvement necessary to close statewide graduation rate gaps

- Do the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate take into account the improvement necessary for subgroups of students who are behind in reaching those goals to make significant progress in closing statewide graduation rate gaps, such that the State’s long-term goals require greater rates of improvement for subgroups of students that graduate from high school at lower rates?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan includes interim progress measures that consider the different rates of improvement necessary to make progress in closing the graduation rate gaps of sub-groups.
<i>Strengths</i>	Tennessee outlines a projected plan for all students to reach a 95% graduation rate by 2025. Tennessee details how each student subgroup will show incremental progress and allows for subgroup performance to be at a different rate than the all students’ subgroup. For example, Economically Disadvantaged students will progress from the baseline rate in 2015 -2016 of 85.5% to 93.7% in 2024 – 2025.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Tennessee does not provide specific evidence describing incremental increase of graduation for all students and subgroups for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate versus the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to</i>	

<i>fully meet this requirement</i>	
------------------------------------	--

A.4.iii.c: English Language Proficiency (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii))

A.4.iii.c.1: Long-term goals

- Does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency, as measured by the statewide English language proficiency assessment?
- Does the SEA’s description include baseline data?
- Does the SEA’s description include the State-determined timeline for English learners to achieve English language proficiency?
- Is the long-term goal ambitious?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The plan identifies and describes the long-term goals for English learners (75% of ELs will meet the expected growth standard on the ELP assessment (WIDA ACCESS). A chart is included which indicates baseline data and timeline. The expected growth target of 75% represents an achievable, but ambitious goal, with modest, appropriate interim progress increases.</p> <p>NOTE: Adjustments to the long-term goal and/or the annual progress towards that goal may be necessary based on a change to the baseline data resulting from WIDA’s most recent standards setting.</p> <p>NOTE: the long-term goals may need to be adjusted due to a new standard setting process being conducted for ACCESS.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Tennessee provides both narrative and chart information to display the percent of English Learners meeting the Growth Standard for this subgroup. For example, the SEA utilizes a baseline of 2015 – 2016 of 51.3% meeting the growth standard and with incremental annual goals reaching the 75% in 2024-2025. The SEA provides additional information that the standard assessment being used will be updated and the State guarantees that they will adjust their rated to reflect any changes.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or</i>	

<i>clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	
--	--

A.4.iii.c.2: Measurements of interim progress

- Does the SEA provide measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan identifies and describes the measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals. A chart is included which displays annual interim progress measures ending in 2024-25. Tennessee provides additional information that the assessment will be undergoing a new standard setting and notes that it may be necessary to adjust the long-term goal and/or the interim progress measures.
<i>Strengths</i>	Tennessee addresses the English Language Proficiency goals and the interim progress anticipated. For example, the SEA utilizes a baseline of 2015 – 2016 of 51.3% meeting the growth standard and with incremental annual goals reaching the 75% in 2024-2025.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.iv: Indicators (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B), 1111(c)(4)(E)(ii))

*Note: A single indicator may consist of multiple components or measures. Peers must review each such component or measure for compliance with all of the required elements.*

A.4.iv.a: Academic Achievement

- Does the SEA describe the Academic Achievement indicator used in its statewide accountability system, including that the SEA uses the same indicator for all schools in all LEAs across the State?
- Does the description include how the SEA calculates the indicator, including: 1) that the calculation is consistent for all schools, in all LEAs, across the State; 2) a description of the weighting of reading/language arts achievement relative to mathematics achievement; 3) if the State uses one, a description of the performance index; 4) if, at the high school level, the indicator includes a measure of student growth, a description of the growth measure (*e.g.*, a growth model); and 5) if the State averages data, a description of how it averages data across years and/or grades (*e.g.*, does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- Is the indicator valid and reliable?
- Is the indicator based on the SEA’s long-term goals?
- Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?
- Is the indicator measured by grade-level proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments?
- Does the indicator measure the performance of at least 95 percent of all students and 95 percent of all students in each subgroup?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	While the Tennessee plan provides detail regarding each indicator that builds to the school’s A-F grade, the plan does not differentiate between math and ELA for grade-level proficiency; it is also unclear whether science assessment is included in this indicator. The indicator can be disaggregated for each subgroup of students. Tennessee illustrates through a flow chart an overview of the district accountability framework that includes four steps to determine district performance.
<i>Strengths</i>	Tennessee employs a letter grade system that gives parents and stakeholder a summative overview of their school and a baseline comparison across schools and districts. This appears to be an easily understood system that will provide transparency. The plan is very detailed and provides many narratives and supporting graphics to help articulate the key points.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The plan lacks specific math and reading/language arts information.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this</i>	Tennessee must provide a specific and clear description of the weighting of reading/language arts achievement relative to mathematics achievement used to calculate the indicator. Tennessee must clarify if they include performance in science in the academic achievement indicator, which may be inconsistent with the statute. Tennessee must describe disaggregating the indicator for each subgroup of students; the example provided

<i>requirement</i>	disaggregates only to the combined BHN subgroup.
--------------------	--

A.4.iv.b: Other Academic Indicator for Elementary and Secondary Schools that are Not High Schools

*Note: If the SEA uses a different Other Academic indicator for each grade span, peer reviewers must separately review each indicator that an SEA submits. For example, if an SEA submits one Other Academic indicator for elementary schools and a different Other Academic indicator for middle schools, then peer reviewers will provide feedback, using the criteria below, separately for each indicator.*

- Does the SEA describe the Other Academic indicator used in its statewide accountability system for public elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools, including that the SEA uses the same indicator and calculates it in the same way for all elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools, in all LEAs, across the State, except that the indicator may vary by each grade span?
- Does the SEA describe, if applicable, how it averages data across years and/or grades (*e.g.*, does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- If the SEA uses a different indicator for each grade span, does it describe each indicator, including the grade span to which it applies?
- If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, is the indicator another valid and reliable statewide academic indicator?
- If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, does the indicator allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance?
- Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Tennessee describes the growth indicator and notes that it is for all students, all subgroups, and all grades. The growth indicator provides schools credit for moving students up the achievement continuum, from one achievement level to a higher achievement level.
<i>Strengths</i>	TN's growth indicator appropriately acknowledges <b>all</b> students' achievement levels along the achievement continuum by giving schools credit for moving students up from one achievement level to a higher achievement level.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this</i>	

A.4.iv.c: Graduation Rate

- Does the SEA describe the Graduation Rate indicator used in its statewide accountability system for public high schools in the State, including that the SEA uses the same indicator across all LEAs in the State?
- Does the description include how the SEA calculates the indicator including: 1) that the calculation is consistent for all high schools, in all LEAs, across the State; 2), if applicable, whether the SEA chooses to lag adjusted cohort graduation rate data; and 3) if applicable, how the SEA averages data (e.g., consistent with the provisions in ESEA section 8101(23) and (25), which permit averaging graduation rate data over three years for very small schools)?
- Is the indicator valid and reliable?
- Is the indicator based on the SEA’s long-term goals?
- Is the indicator based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate?
- If the State, at its discretion, also includes one or more extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates, does the description include how the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is combined with that rate or rates within the indicator?
- If applicable, does the SEA’s description include how the State includes in its four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates students with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed using an alternate assessment aligned to alternate academic achievement standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(D) and awarded a State-defined alternate diploma under ESEA section 8101(23) and (25)?
- Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan describes the graduation rate indicator in its accountability system that is used across all LEAs. Tennessee will include all public high schools on an annual basis in its accountability system. It is unclear if Tennessee includes an extended-year adjusted rate in the accountability system. The four-year adjusted rate is embedded in the Ready Graduate indicator which includes additional postsecondary, military and workforce readiness metrics. The indicator can be disaggregated.
<i>Strengths</i>	Tennessee utilizes the same statewide accountability system across the state for all high schools. Tennessee shares a plan to account for the student who transfers into the cohort as well as for the student who may graduate early.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (2 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (2 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the</i>	Tennessee must clarify if the indicator is based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, or

<i>specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	whether the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is combined with one or more extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates, and if so, how. Tennessee indicates the use of extended-year adjusted cohorts, but must clearly describe how these are used for the accountability system.
--	--

A.4.iv.d: Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency Indicator

- Does the SEA describe the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator used in its statewide accountability system, including that the SEA uses the same indicator across all LEAs in the State?
- Is the indicator valid and reliable?
- Is the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator aligned with the State-determined timeline described in A.4.iii.c.1?
- Does the indicator consistently measure statewide the progress of all English learners in each of grades 3 through 8 and in the grade for which such English learners are otherwise assessed under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) during grades 9 through 12?
- Does the SEA’s description include the State’s definition of English language proficiency, based on the State English language proficiency assessment?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan describes the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator used in Tennessee’s accountability system. The same indicator (performance on WIDA ACCESS) is used for all LEAs in the state. Measures include percent of students exiting EL or percent of students meeting or exceeding growth standard. The State’s definition of English language proficiency is included. The indicator is valid and reliable, and is aligned with the State-determined timeline for English Language proficiency. The indicator consistently measures progress in grades 3-8 and in the grade for which English learners are assessed in grades 9-12.
<i>Strengths</i>	The plan considers initial ELP and prior English proficiency in both pathways.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this</i>	

A.4.iv.e: School Quality or Student Success Indicator(s)

*Note: Peer reviewers must separately review each School Quality or Student Success indicator that an SEA submits. For example, if an SEA submits one School Quality or Student Success indicator for high schools and a different School Quality or Student Success indicator for elementary and middle schools, then peer reviewers will provide feedback, using the criteria below, separately for each indicator. For any School Quality or Student Success indicator that does not apply to all grade spans, the SEA’s description must include the grade spans to which it does apply. (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)(v))*

- Does the SEA describe each School Quality or Student Success indicator used in its statewide accountability system for all public schools in the State?
- If the SEA uses a different indicator for each grade span, does it describe each indicator, including the grade span to which it applies?
- Does the indicator allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance?
- Is the indicator valid, reliable, comparable, used statewide in all schools (for the grade span to which it applies), and calculated in a consistent way?
- Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan indicates one school quality/student success indicator – the percentage of students who are chronically out of school due to absences or out of school suspensions. The indicator will be applied to all schools and grade spans. The SEA does not use a different indicator for each grade span. The indicator allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance. The indicator is valid, reliable, used statewide and calculated in a consistent way. The indicator can be disaggregated for all student subgroups; however, it is not clear that the State intends to use all student racial/ethnic subgroups in addition to the combined BHN subgroup.
<i>Strengths</i>	Since there is a chronic absenteeism problem, the SEA chooses to include as their school quality indicator. The metric applies to all and the SEA demonstrates that it can be disaggregated by subgroup.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The description of the Chronically Out-of-School indicator lacks clarity in describing when and how the two parts of the indicator (absenteeism and out-of-school due to expulsion and suspension): page 92 language uses “or,” while table on page 92 uses “and,” and page 93 uses “encompasses.”
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewers)

*If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement*

**A.4.v: Annual Meaningful Differentiation (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C))**

**A.4.v.a: State’s System of Annual Meaningful Differentiation**

- Does the SEA describe its system of meaningfully differentiating, on an annual basis, all public schools in the State?
- Is the State’s system of annual meaningful differentiation based on all indicators in the State’s accountability system?
- Does the State’s system of annual meaningful differentiation include the performance of all students and each subgroup of students on each of the indicators in the State’s accountability system?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan addresses all requirements and meets the criteria for this section. The plan indicates annual differentiation of all schools will include all 6 indicators – proficiency, growth, graduation rates, school quality, English language proficiency, and at least 95% students tested. An A-F grade will be assigned to all schools in the state. The system includes the performance of all students and each valid subgroup of students. The SEA describes a system of meaningfully differentiating, on an annual basis, all public schools.
<i>Strengths</i>	This section includes all requirements and includes a link to connecting ESSA and state law for consistency.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	It is not clear that the State’s system of meaningful differentiation includes all racial/ethnic subgroups; that is, if the combined BHN subgroup is used in place of—rather than in addition to—racial/ethnic subgroups.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to</i>	

<i>fully meet this requirement</i>	
------------------------------------	--

A.4.v.b: Weighting of Indicators

- Does the SEA describe the weighting of each indicator in its system of annual meaningful differentiation, including how the weighting is adjusted for schools for which an indicator cannot be calculated due to the minimum number of students (e.g., for the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator)?
- Do the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicators each receive substantial weight individually?
- Do the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicators receive, in the aggregate, much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator(s), in the aggregate?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan addresses all requirements and meets the criteria for this section. The SEA specifies the indicators as Achievement, Growth, Ready Graduate, Chronically out of School, and English Language Proficiency. For example, the SEA rates the English Language proficiency based on the performance of the WIDA ACCESS assessment and Growth on an achievement continuum. The plan describes the weighting of each indicator in Tennessee’s system. The SEA describes the weighting of each indicator and addresses how the weighting is adjusted for schools without a minimum number of students. The noted indicators receive appropriate weight individually with achievement, growth and graduation receiving substantial weight and ELP and school quality indicators receiving far less weight. Achievement, growth, graduation and ELP, in the aggregate, receive much greater weight than the school quality indicator.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.v.c: If Applicable, Different Methodology for Annual Meaningful Differentiation

- If the SEA uses a different methodology or methodologies for annual meaningful differentiation than the one described in 4.v.a of the State’s plan for schools for which an accountability determination cannot be made (*e.g.*, P-2 schools), does it describe the different methodology or methodologies, including how the methodology or methodologies will be used to identify schools for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement?
- Does the SEA’s description of a different methodology indicate the type(s) of schools to which it applies?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan indicates that all public schools are included in its accountability system, with limited exceptions (adult high schools, special state schools, alternative schools, CTE schools), but does not describe the methodology used in determining annual meaningful differentiation for these schools.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Tennessee will need to confirm it has schools that are not included in its accountability system and describe the methodology used to identify such schools for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.

A.4.vi: Identification of Schools (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D), 1111(d)(2)(C)-(D))

A.4.vi.a Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools—Lowest Performing

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement including, if applicable, how it averages data (*e.g.*, does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- Does the SEA’s methodology result in the identification of not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement?

- Does the SEA include the year in which it will first identify these schools for comprehensive support and improvement (*i.e.*, does the timeline comply with the Department’s guidance)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The Tennessee Plan describes its methodology for identifying its lowest performing five percent of <b>all</b> schools, labeled as Priority Schools. The methodology employed is used to evaluate all schools, however, the criteria requires that the differentiation of the lowest performing five percent of schools be applied to schools receiving Title I funds. By including all schools in this identification process, it is possible that some Title I schools would not be identified as the lowest performing five percent that otherwise would have been if the identification process had not included the larger pool. The plan describes how it averages data across years. Tennessee indicates that Priority Schools will first be identified in 2018 under Tennessee’s new assessment system.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Tennessee will need to apply the methodology to only those schools receiving Title I funds in order to appropriately identify the lowest-performing five percent of Title I schools. This Title I identification must occur first, but would not prohibit Tennessee from identifying additional low performing schools

A.4.vi.b: Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools—Low Graduation Rates

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify all public high schools in the State failing to graduate one-third or more of their students for comprehensive support and improvement, including: 1) a description of whether the SEA uses one or more extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates in addition to the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and 2) if applicable, how the SEA averages data (*e.g.*, does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- Does the SEA’s methodology result in the identification of all public high schools in the State failing to graduate one-third or more of their students for comprehensive support and improvement?
- Does the SEA include the year in which it will first identify these schools for comprehensive support and improvement (*i.e.*, does the timeline comply with the Department’s guidance)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The Tennessee Plan describes its methodology to identify all public high schools failing to graduate one-third or more of their students for comprehensive support and improvement, but does not address the use of extended-year graduation rates. This provision would be annually applied and occur in 2018.</p> <p>Because it is not clear whether the SEA uses extended-year graduation rates (see note early in review), it is not possible to determine whether this should be incorporated in the methodology. If extended-year graduation rates are not used, the SEA would meet these criteria; this clarification is needed.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA uses a system based on qualifying as a Focus and Priority school for failure to reach certain indicators including Low Graduation Rates. The SEA specifies the plan to identify schools and districts with campuses with a graduation rate below 67 percent and the required compliance and interventions required through the annual Improvement Plan.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	While Tennessee describes the methodology, the plan does not clearly articulate how the methodology would result in identification of the appropriate schools.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Tennessee must clarify whether they are using an extended graduation rate in its accountability system.

A.4.vi.c: Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools—Additional Targeted Support Not Exiting Such Status

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify schools receiving Title I, Part A funds that have received additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C) (*i.e.*, based on identification as a school in which the performance of any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification as one of the lowest-performing five percent) that have not satisfied the statewide exit criteria for such schools within a State-determined number of years?
- Does the SEA’s methodology result in the identification of such schools?

- Does the SEA include the year in which it will first identify these schools for comprehensive support and improvement (*i.e.*, does the timeline comply with the Department’s guidance)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The Tennessee Plan describes the methodology to identify targeted schools. These identifications will occur annually and the first identification will occur in 2018. The Focus school list will be determined by reviewing the data for each of the four accountability subgroups— Black/Hispanic/Native American (BHN), economically disadvantaged (ED), English learners (EL), and students with disabilities (SWD)— and identifying those schools performing in the bottom five percent of all schools meeting the minimum n-size of 30 to be held accountable for that subgroup.</p> <p>The strategy to apply the identification methodology to all schools (rather than Title I schools), and the use of the combined BHN subgroup does not assure identification of all schools meeting the described status (<i>i.e.</i>, received additional targeted support, but are not exiting).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA is ready to offer timely assistance to schools identified with the lowest performing subgroups through the monitoring framework for Focus schools. The SEA proposes a new service model managed by the office of school improvement to offer more intensive support. The SEA shares that the schools will receive the identification after three years in Focus school status.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The plan would benefit from a more clearly articulated definition of these schools as well as the descriptions of the various pathways.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers)  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>Tennessee will need to first apply the identification methodology to Title I schools and assure that each subgroup is identified separately, in addition to, not in lieu of, the B/H/N subgroup.</p>

A.4.vi.d: Frequency of Identification

- Does the SEA include the frequency with which the State will identify each type of school for comprehensive support and improvement after the first year of identification?
- Does the SEA’s timeline result in identification of these schools at least once every three years?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The Tennessee Plan indicates the frequency with which the SEA will identify each type of school after the first year of identification - once every three years.
<i>Strengths</i>	The School Improvement Continuum provided by Tennessee specifies the frequency of identification, support, and intervention, as well as the pathway for exit criteria and monitoring.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.vi.e: Targeted Support and Improvement Schools—“Consistently Underperforming” Subgroups

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify schools with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups of students, including its definition of “consistently underperforming”?
- Does the SEA’s methodology result in the identification of any school with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups of students?
- Is the methodology based on all indicators in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation?
- Does the SEA identify these schools annually?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The Tennessee Plan describes a methodology for identifying schools with consistently underperforming subgroups of students. However, using the combined B/H/N subgroup may preclude the State’s ability to identify schools with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups of students, depending

	on the differences in performance rates among the specific racial/ethnic subgroups. Performance of one or more subgroups in the combined category could be masked. (See previous note that B/H/N students must be identified in addition to, but not in lieu of, specific racial/ethnic subgroups.) The SEA shares that ultimately it is the local district and schools' responsibility to improve and although there is a School Improvement Continuum, the strategies are defined as being more rigorous intervention through a statewide district where control and governance is shared.
<i>Strengths</i>	The methodology is based on all indicators in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation. The SEA includes a discussion of consistently underperforming subgroups within the context of meeting or remaining in Focus group status.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The Tennessee plan does not include a clear definition of consistently underperforming subgroups.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Tennessee will need to assure that each subgroup is identified separately, in addition to, not in lieu of, the B/H/N subgroup.

A.4.vi.f: Targeted Support and Improvement Schools—Additional Targeted Support

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify schools in which the performance of any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State's methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D) (*i.e.*, the methodology described above in A.4.vi.a), including: 1) whether the methodology identifies these schools from among all public schools in the State or from among only the schools identified as schools with one or more consistently underperforming subgroups and 2) if applicable, how the SEA averages data (*e.g.*, does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- Does the SEA's methodology result in identification of such schools?
- Does the SEA include the year in which the State will first identify such schools (*i.e.*, does the timeline comply with the Department's guidance)?
- Does the SEA include the frequency with which the State will identify such schools after the first year of identification?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The Tennessee Plan describes annual methodology: "designation includes schools in which one or more

	subgroup(s) are determined to be underperforming based on the school accountability indicators as previously described.” Focus schools will be identified annually, and the first identification will occur in 2018. However, the use of the combined B/H/N subgroup may preclude the ability to identify schools in which the performance of any subgroup of students would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I). Depending on the numbers and performance of each of the separate subgroups, there is a potential for one or more groups’ performance to be masked.
<i>Strengths</i>	Tennessee specifies the need for targeted supports for all schools including Title I schools and non-Title I schools with underperforming subgroups each year. The SEA designates the identification process for Focus schools needing Comprehensive support based on their pathway tracking system. The State rededicates their support to school improvement with their All Means All strategic priority.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Tennessee will need to first, assure that each subgroup is identified separately, in addition to, not in lieu of, the B/H/N subgroup.

A.4.vi.g: If Applicable, Additional Statewide Categories of Schools

➤ If the State chooses, at its discretion, to include additional statewide categories of schools, does the SEA describe those categories?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA will continue highlighting schools earning an overall letter grade of “A” as Reward schools and provides a description of this category. Reward schools will include those schools with high absolute achievement, as well as lower achieving schools with extraordinary progress in achievement that equates to changing the life trajectory of students.
<i>Strengths</i>	Based on the structure of the accountability framework, Reward schools will include those schools with high absolute achievement, as well as lower achieving schools with extraordinary progress in achievement that equates to changing the life trajectory of students.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	

<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.vii: Annual Measure of Achievement (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(iii))

- Does the SEA describe how it factors the requirement for 95 percent participation of all students and 95 percent of all students in each subgroup of students in statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments into the statewide accountability system?
- If applicable, does the SEA describe how the SEA differentiates its approach based on such factors as the number of subgroups in the school missing the participation rate requirement, the length of time over which the school has missed the requirement, or the degree to which the school missed the requirement (*e.g.*, 92 percent participation rate vs. 70 percent participation)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The Tennessee plan factors the requirement into their accountability system. Schools that do not meet the 95 percent participation rate in any subject, either for all students or for any accountability subgroup included in the achievement indicator, will receive an “F” on the achievement indicator for the given group of students.
<i>Strengths</i>	Stakeholders will benefit by TN’s clearly articulated plan for factoring the 95% criteria.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.viii: Continued Support for School and Local Educational Agency Improvement (ESEA Section 1111(d)(3)(A))

A.4.viii.a: Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(I))

- Does the SEA describe its statewide exit criteria for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, which may include how the exit criteria are aligned with the State’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress?
- Does the SEA’s description include the number of years within which schools are expected to meet such criteria?
- Is the number of years no more than four years?
- Do the exit criteria ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in the State (e.g., do the exit criteria improve student outcomes and ensure that a school that exits no longer meets the criteria under which the school was identified)?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The Tennessee Plan provides a comprehensive description of exit criteria for its schools along the School Improvement Continuum including schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement. These criteria are aligned to the state’s goals. The State description indicates that the number of years varies, but is no more than four years in any instance. The Tennessee criteria appears sufficient to ensure that a school that exits no longer meets the criteria under which it was identified.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA articulates that the Minimum Performance Goal determines those schools that will earn an overall grade of F and receive comprehensive support. These schools will continue to be labeled Priority schools, will be identified once every three years, but can exit this status on an annual basis by meeting or exceeding exit criteria for comprehensive support schools. The SEA provides additional identification.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.viii.b: Exit Criteria for Schools Receiving Additional Targeted Support (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(II))

- Does the SEA describe its statewide exit criteria for schools receiving additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C), which may include how the exit criteria align with the State’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress and the requirement that the

goals and measurements of interim progress take into account the improvement necessary to close statewide proficiency and graduation rate gaps?

- Does the SEA’s description include the number of years within which schools are expected to meet such criteria?
- Do the exit criteria ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in the State (e.g., do the exit criteria improve student outcomes for the subgroup or subgroups that led to the school’s identification and ensure that a school that exits no longer meets the criteria under which the school was identified)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The Tennessee Plan provides a comprehensive description of exit criteria for its school, including those receiving additional targeted support, along the School Improvement Continuum. They are aligned to the state’s goals. While Tennessee describes the exit criteria for schools receiving additional targeted support, and includes the number of years within which schools are expected to meet such criteria, the use of the combined B/H/N subgroup may mask the performance of some subgroups; it is thus not clear whether the exit criteria improve student outcomes for each of the racial/ethnic subgroup(s) that comprise the B/H/N subgroup.
<i>Strengths</i>	Tennessee’s Plan provides a comprehensive system of identification, intervention and supports, and exit.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	It could be made more clear that Focus Schools represent schools receiving targeted support.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.viii.c: More Rigorous Interventions (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(I))

- Does the SEA describe the more rigorous State-determined action required for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the SEA’s exit criteria within a State-determined number of years, which may include interventions that address school-level operations, such as changes in school staffing and budgeting or the school day and year?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The Tennessee Plan clearly describes rigorous interventions. Tennessee will continue to utilize the Achievement School District (ASD) as the most intensive intervention for Priority schools. The ASD will apply on behalf of its schools for applicable school improvement funding. The ASD currently uses a blended model of direct -run and charter operated schools. The SEA will ensure that there are clear entry and exit criteria for the ASD. Entry into ASD will be determined by the department with a year of planning in partnership with the ASD and the district, in order to best serve the students and families at the school. Tennessee’s goal is to significantly improve the performance these schools and return schools (after a period of no more than 10 years) to home districts.
<i>Strengths</i>	The Tennessee Plan describes, in detail, its more rigorous interventions – very clear to the reader and stakeholder. The SEA explains that if all interventions are not successful, the SEA may revoke the charter.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	It’s not clear if parents are engaged in the more rigorous interventions. While this is not a requirement, the Plan would be bolstered by a description of such engagement.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.viii.d: Resource Allocation Review (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(ii))

- Does the SEA describe how it will periodically review resource allocation to support school improvement in each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The Tennessee Plan describes how it will periodically review resource allocations to ensure sufficient support for school improvement. The plan describes how the SEA will incorporate the review into the LEA consolidated plan process. The SEA will provide TA on weighted funding models to LEAs with a significant number of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support.

<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA shares that technical support and resources will be given at each level of intervention to assist in school improvement.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	This information was included in the plan but difficult to find using the crosswalk. Tennessee may consider making this information more clearly accessible to the reader.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.viii.e: Technical Assistance (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(iii))

- Does the SEA describe the technical assistance that it will provide to each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement?
- Is the technical assistance likely to improve student outcomes by, for example, 1) identifying State-approved evidence-based interventions; 2) supporting LEAs and schools in the development and implementation of support and improvement plans; and 3) differentiating the technical assistance?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The Tennessee Plan addresses all requirements and meets the criteria for this section. The Tennessee Plan provides a comprehensive description of technical assistance through its School Improvement Continuum. A detailed description of supports and interventions are outlined for each type of school. It seems that the technical assistance provided is likely to improve student outcomes. The SEA proposes to re-envision the Office of School Improvement
<i>Strengths</i>	Tennessee has developed a School Improvement Continuum of Intervention and Support (SISN). Included in the continuum is that the SISN will provide differentiated technical assistance and support to districts and schools. For example, the support will include: will work directly with districts and Priority schools on assessing the needs, conducting a readiness review, developing a plan for improvement, and supporting and monitoring of progress. The section of the plan was well done.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	

<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

**A.4.viii.f: If Applicable, Additional Optional Action**

- If applicable, does the SEA describe the action that it will take to initiate additional improvement in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools that it consistently identifies for comprehensive support and improvement and are not meeting the State’s exit criteria or in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools implementing targeted support and improvement plans?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

**A.5: Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators (ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B))**

- Does the SEA describe the extent, if any, that low-income children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, which may include the State definition of ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers?
- Does the SEA describe the extent, if any, that minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are served at disproportionate

rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, which may include the State definition of ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers?

- Does the SEA describe the measures (e.g., data used to calculate the disproportionate rates) that it will use to evaluate and publicly report its progress with respect to how low-income and minority children are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers?<sup>4</sup>

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan addresses all requirements and meets the criteria for this section. The Tennessee Plan provides a detailed description and definitions of ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers. The plan contains a table describing the extent to which low-income and minority children are served at disproportionate rates. Measures are reported and the SEA has conducted several stakeholder meetings to address the disparities.
<i>Strengths</i>	The plan clearly describes the efforts around stakeholder meetings to address disparities, and clear charts illustrating disproportionate rates of service. The SEA provides a thorough review of the number of low-income and minority students being taught by highly effective teachers and documents the plans to eliminate the equity issues across the state. The SEA provides multiple resources to assist in the access to effective teachers through funding, professional development, grants and Educator Preparation Plans.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

#### **A.6: School Conditions (ESEA Section 1111(g)(1)(C))**

- Does the SEA describe how it will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A to improve school conditions for student learning?
- Does the SEA’s description include how it will support LEAs to reduce incidences of bullying and harassment?

---

<sup>4</sup> Consistent with ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B), this description should not be construed as requiring a State to develop or implement a teacher, principal or other school leader evaluation system.

- Does the SEA’s description include how it will support LEAs to reduce the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom?
- Does the SEA’s description include how it will support LEAs to reduce the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The Tennessee Plan addresses some, but not all aspects of the requirements. Tennessee describes LEA and school assistance (i.e. training and technical assistance) to provide and maintain safe and supportive learning environments, however, the plan does not specifically address efforts to support LEAs statewide to reduce the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety. Project AWARE is noted, but only as a pilot in three districts, and is not specifically offered as a response to the requirement.</p> <p>In addition, the plan does not describe support for LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A specifically, but rather addresses all schools.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA shares that it will offer block grants under ESSA an opportunity for statewide activity and support for district initiatives for well-rounded learning. The SEA details concerns about exclusionary practices with minority students and interventions to reduce the numbers. For example, the use of Project Aware will provide strategies to change the current disciplinary model found in schools. The SEA also specifies the office of safe and supportive schools will expand to provide needs training and offer effective alternatives suspension and expulsion.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The plan could benefit by providing additional evidence to address how it supports LEAs to reduce incidences of bullying and harassment.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>Tennessee will need to clarify how the SEA supports Title I schools, specifically. In addition, Tennessee will need to specifically address how the SEA will support LEAs to reduce the use of aversive behavioral interventions.</p>

#### **A.7: School Transitions (ESEA 1111(g)(1)(D))**

- Does the SEA describe how it will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A in meeting the needs of students at all levels of schooling (particularly students in the middle grades and high school)?
- Does the SEA’s description include how it will work with LEAs to provide effective transitions of students to middle grades and high school to decrease the risk of students dropping out?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA discusses the support it will give for meeting the needs of all students including the transitional grade levels. The SEA states that the Consolidated Planning and Monitoring Division (CPM) is responsible for ensuring transitional program strategies for assisting preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. The Title I Improving service goals include the potential for additional supports. For example, these may include literacy strategies for struggling middle grade readers, best practices for transition between middle school and high school, advanced coursework offerings in 8th grade, and school counselor supports for middle and high school to keep students on track for graduation. In addition, the SEA does describe post-secondary transition opportunities. For example, the High School & Bridge to Postsecondary and the Tennessee Promise is both a “last-dollar” scholarship and a mentoring program focused on increasing the number of students who attend college in state postsecondary completion.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA notes that it will develop tools and supports that “may” address transitions; this response does not offer adequate detail, and does not assure that supports related to transition will be provided to LEAs.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

## SECTION E: TITLE III, PART A, SUBPART 1: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AND ENHANCEMENT

### E.1: Entrance and Exit Procedures (ESEA section 3113(b)(2))

- Does the SEA describe how it will establish and implement, with timely and meaningful consultation with LEAs representing the geographic diversity of the State, standardized statewide entrance and exit procedures for English learners, including a description of how, if applicable, a State will ensure that local input included in the exit procedures, such as teacher input or a portfolio, will be applied statewide?
- Does the SEA’s description include an assurance that all students who may be English learners are assessed for such status within 30 days of enrollment in a school in the State?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>Tennessee has established and implemented standard entrance procedures for English learners. The SEA shares students enrolled prior to the beginning of a school year must be screened within 30 calendar days of the start of the school year and assures that all students who may be English learners are assess within 30 days of enrollment in a school in the State.</p> <p>The SEA does not adequately address incorporating timely and meaningful consultation with LEAs representing the geographic diversity of the State in the development of standardized statewide entrance and exit procedures for ELs. The SEA identifies multiple structures that support ELs, including a group of Title III Directors, but does not specifically link the work of that group to the processes addressed in this category.</p> <p>NOTE: the SEA is researching additional exit criteria that may be incorporated and should update their plan should criteria be added.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA fully describes the entrance procedures and the use of the screener process for identifying eligible English Language Learners. For example, the SEA shares the Home Language survey questions and the use of the WIDA ELP screener, WIDA-ACCESS Placement Test (W-APT), for incoming students in grades K–12. The SEA shares the exit procedures and on-going monitoring. Upon determining that a student is an EL, the student must be scheduled for appropriate ESL services, and those services must begin immediately.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The description of exit criteria decisions does not discuss local input.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to</i>	Tennessee must provide a description of how they implemented the established entrance and exit criteria with timely and meaningful consultation with LEAs representing the geographic diversity of the state.

<i>fully meet this requirement</i>	
------------------------------------	--

**E.2: SEA Support for English Learner Progress (ESEA section 3113(b)(6))**

- Does the SEA describe how it will assist eligible entities in meeting the State-designed long-term goal for English language proficiency established under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii), including measurements of interim progress towards meeting such goal, based on the State’s English language proficiency assessment under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(G)?
- Does the SEA describe how it will assist eligible entities in helping to ensure that English learners meet challenging State academic standards?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan describes how SEA will assist eligible entities in helping to ensure that ELs meet academic standards. The SEA describes the support that they commit to assist the LEAs with English Language Learners. The Tennessee Plan provides sufficient detail regarding efforts to develop district capacity to meet the needs of the Tennessee EL population, both in terms of meeting the long-term goals as well as helping to ensure English learners meet Tennessee’s academic content standards. Target TA is provided by ESL supervisors. Additional professional development will be provided and well as additional resources and guidance during the 2017-18 school year.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA describes its commitment to strengthening its supports to districts to improve achievement of English learners. Some of the key supports for ELs include embedding ESL strategies into state trainings for mathematics and ELA, as well as science and social studies in the following years. Rather than ESL strategies existing in a separate strand, this approach will support general education teachers—thus improving instruction to ELs in the regular classroom. In addition, the department has deployed eight ESL advisors aligned with the eight CORE regions to build capacity within the regions across the state. These individuals currently serve as Title III Directors in LEAs, each with multiple years of experience working with ELs.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to</i>	

<i>fully meet this requirement</i>	
------------------------------------	--

**E.3: Monitoring and Technical Assistance (ESEA section 3113(b)(8))**

- Does the SEA describe how it will monitor the progress of each eligible entity receiving a Title III, Part A subgrant in helping English learners achieve English language proficiency?
- Does the SEA describe the steps it will take to further assist eligible entities if the strategies funded under Title III, Part A are not effective, such as by providing technical assistance and support on how to modify such strategies?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	LEA describes detailed monitoring plan. The Tennessee Plan describes several technical assists and supports it will provide to LEAs not making progress through its monitoring division in the SEA. Tennessee is at the early stages of a new process for district planning that will include a comprehensive needs assessment, prioritize three areas to be addressed and create goals and strategies to respond to the identified needs. The SEA will approve the district plan, monitor progress toward meeting plan goals, and provide TA to adjust plans as needed. The SEA describes the steps it will take to further assist eligible entities if the strategies funded are not effective. The SEA describes the additional supports it will make available.
<i>Strengths</i>	New comprehensive monitoring framework is continuous and collaborative, and includes ongoing support and technical assistance.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	