

## Amendments to the Tennessee Department of Education's Approved ESEA Flexibility Request

The following is a summary of the Tennessee Department of Education's (TDOE's) amendment requests. The U.S. Department of Education (ED) is approving the following amendments as Tennessee's ESEA flexibility request, as amended, continues to be aligned with the principles of ESEA flexibility.

Please refer to ED's website at: [www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplans03/index.html](http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplans03/index.html) for Tennessee's original and amended ESEA flexibility requests.

- **Develop and Implement a State-Based System of Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support (Element 2.A)**

Revision: TDOE established a business rule in its State-based system of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system whereby a district may not be rated at the highest level (*Exemplary*) if it declines in a majority of total or aggregate measures (grades 3-8 math, 3-8 reading/language arts, and the majority of high school measures) even though it met its performance targets. Rather, such a district will be rated as *Intermediate*.

Revision: In the 2012–2013 school year, TDOE began including performance in both Algebra I and Algebra II and English II and English III, respectively, in its State-based system of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support (it has previously included solely Algebra I and English II). The State established performance targets for each subject, but will require a district to meet targets in both subjects in order to be eligible for *Exemplary* status.

- **Set Ambitious But Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (Element 2.B)**

Revision: TDOE established performance targets for Algebra II and English III, the two additional subjects it began including in its State-based system of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system in the 2012–2013 school year. These targets are listed below in Table 1-3.

Table 1. Algebra II Achievement Targets

Subgroup	Actual	Target						
	2011 – 12	2012 – 13	2013 – 14	2014 – 15	2015 – 16	2016 – 17	2017 – 18	2018 – 19
All Students	33.3	37.5	41.4	45.0	48.5	51.7	54.7	57.5
White	40.7	44.4	47.9	51.1	54.2	57.1	59.7	62.3
African American	14.2	19.6	24.6	29.3	33.7	37.9	41.7	45.4
Asian	59.7	62.2	64.6	66.8	68.9	70.8	72.6	74.3
Native American	32.6	36.8	40.8	44.5	47.9	51.2	54.2	57.1
Hispanic	24.4	29.1	33.6	37.7	41.6	45.3	48.7	51.9

Subgroup	Actual	Target						
	2011 – 12	2012 – 13	2013 – 14	2014 – 15	2015 – 16	2016 – 17	2017 – 18	2018 – 19
Hawaiian Pacific Islander	60.0	62.5	64.8	67.0	69.1	71.0	72.8	74.5
Economically Disadvantaged	19.6	24.6	29.3	33.8	37.9	41.8	45.4	48.8
English Learners	13.7	19.1	24.2	28.9	33.3	37.5	41.4	45.1
Students with disabilities	11.6	17.1	22.3	27.2	31.7	36.0	40.0	43.7

Table 2. English III Achievement Targets

Subgroup	Actual	Target						
	2011 – 12	2012 – 13	2013 – 14	2014 – 15	2015 – 16	2016 – 17	2017 – 18	2018 – 19
All Students	37.8	41.7	45.3	48.7	52.0	55.0	57.8	60.4
White	45.6	49.0	52.2	55.2	58.0	60.6	63.1	65.4
African American	17.6	22.8	27.6	32.1	36.3	40.3	44.1	47.6
Asian	46.0	49.4	52.5	55.5	58.3	60.9	63.3	65.6
Native American	35.2	39.3	43.0	46.6	49.9	53.1	56.0	58.8
Hispanic	25.9	30.5	34.9	38.9	42.8	46.3	49.7	52.8
Hawaiian Pacific Islander	46.7	50.0	53.2	56.1	58.8	61.4	63.8	66.1
Economically Disadvantaged	24.2	28.9	33.4	37.5	41.4	45.1	48.5	51.8
English Learners	4.9	10.8	16.4	21.6	26.5	31.1	35.4	39.5
Students with disabilities	9.3	15.0	20.3	25.3	29.9	34.3	38.4	42.3

Table 3. Algebra I and Algebra II Gap Closure Targets

Gap Closure Subgroups	Actual	Target						
	2011 – 12	2012 – 13	2013 – 14	2014 – 15	2015 – 16	2016 – 17	2017 – 18	2018 – 19
Economically Disadvantaged versus Non- Economically Disadvantaged	16.2	15.2	14.2	13.3	12.5	11.7	11.0	10.3
English Learner versus	24.2	22.7	21.3	19.9	18.7	17.5	16.4	15.4

Gap Closure Subgroups	Actual	Target						
	2011 – 12	2012 –13	2013 –14	2014 –15	2015 –16	2016 –17	2017 –18	2018 –19
Non-English Learner								
Students with Disabilities versus Non-Students with Disabilities	22.2	20.8	19.5	18.3	17.1	16.1	15.1	14.1

Table 4. English II and English III Gap Closure Targets

Gap Closure Subgroups	Actual	Target						
	2011 – 12	2012 –13	2013 –14	2014 –15	2015 –16	2016 –17	2017 –18	2018 –19
Economically Disadvantaged versus Non- Economically Disadvantaged	18.9	17.7	16.6	15.6	14.6	13.7	12.8	12.0
English Learner versus Non-English Learner	27.7	26.0	24.3	22.8	21.4	20.1	18.8	17.6
Students with Disabilities versus Non-Students with Disabilities	41.2	38.6	36.2	33.9	31.8	29.8	28.0	26.2

Revision: TDOE established a business rule in its State-based system of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system whereby if a district's gap closure subgroups meet their achievement performance targets and the gap either remains the same or decreases, that district will earn an *Achieve* in the gap closure element of TDOE's accountability system and thus be eligible to be rated *Exemplary* overall.

Revision: TDOE set a cap of 95 percent for graduation rate targets whereby a subgroup would meet its target once it achieved a graduation rate of 95 percent or higher.