



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY SECRETARY

September 5, 2012

The Honorable Bill Haslam
Office of the Governor
State Capitol
Nashville, Tennessee 37243-0001

Dear Governor Haslam:

I am writing in response to Tennessee's request to amend its approved Race to the Top grant project. Between May 30 and August 27, 2012, the State submitted requests and held conversations with the U.S. Department of Education (Department) staff in the Implementation and Support Unit (ISU) and Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) to support amendment requests to its approved Race to the Top plan and performance measures to align with the State's request for Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) flexibility. As you are aware, the Department has the authority to approve amendments to your plan and budget, provided that such a change does not alter the scope or objectives of the approved proposal. On October 4, 2011, the Department sent a letter and revised "Grant Amendment Submission Process" document to Governors of grantee States indicating the process by which amendments would be reviewed and approved or denied. To determine whether approval could be granted, the Department has applied the conditions noted in the document, and compared it with the Race to the Top program *Principles*, which are also included in that document.

The Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) requested and was approved on February 9, 2012, for ESEA flexibility.ⁱ As part of its approved request, the State set targets -- Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) -- for increasing student achievement and closing achievement gaps. It is the State's intent to align its Race to the Top targets to its approved AMOs. Based on conversations between the State and the Department from summer 2011 and summer 2012, I approve the State's request to revise its student outcomes targets to align with those approved under ESEA flexibility.

- The State will amend its Race to the Top student achievement, gap closure, and high school graduation rate goals to align with those in its approved ESEA flexibility request. See appendices 1 and 2 for revised and added measures in ***bold italic***.

The goals in Tennessee's initial approved Race to the Top plan reflected baselines set in SY 2008-2009. The State implemented more rigorous assessments in SY 2009-2010 and reset cut scores to provide a more accurate picture of student achievement. As a function of this update, the State's SY 2009-2010 data dropped significantly from the SY 2008-2009 data initially used to set targets.

www.ed.gov

400 MARYLAND AVE., SW, WASHINGTON, DC 20202

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.

The State will amend Race to the Top targets for grades 3-8 aggregate math and reading proficiency, gap closure for grades 3-8 aggregate math and reading, grades 9-12 math and reading proficiency (now high school Algebra I and English II) and high school graduation rate. These revisions will align Race to the Top with Annual Measurable Objectives in the State's approved ESEA Flexibility request based on assessment results in SY 2010-2011 and the overarching goal of halving achievement gaps by SY 2018-2019. The State will also add four additional goals for grade 3 and grade 7 reading and math proficiency described in its approved ESEA Flexibility request to its Race to the Top targets. According to the State, these top-line goals will help track local education agency (LEA) progress toward meeting the revised aggregate targets for grades 3-8 in a specific and meaningful way.

- The State will amend its Race to the Top National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) goals to align with the State's theory of action for student achievement gap closure. See appendix 3 for the revised and added measures in *bold italic*.

The State's revised targets for NAEP grade 8 align with the State's goal of halving achievement gaps by SY 2018-2019 (approximately 6 percent each year). Additionally, the State will establish targets for NAEP grade 4 reading and mathematics proficiency and gap closure.

Through its approved ESEA flexibility request, TDOE also outlined a revised accountability structure which distinguishes performance based on a combination of achievement targets and gap closure targets. In this new structure, school-level accountability and State supports were identified for the lowest-achieving schools in Priority and Focus categories and the highest-achieving schools were identified as Reward Schools.ⁱⁱ

The State's initial plan included a total of \$56,395,089 to provide support to the State's lowest-achieving schools through Renewal and Focus Schools projects. Schools in the high-priority categories of Corrective Action and Restructuring were eligible for Renewal grants and an additional layer of support known as Focus grants were made available to schools in categories of School Improvement I or II. Based on awards made in Years 1 and 2 and future funding for three-year grant awards, a total of \$12,033,187 of the \$56,395,089 has been expended or obligated.

In order to align Tennessee's Race to the Top plan with its ESEA flexibility request's updated vision and comprehensive program, the funds previously allocated for "Renewal Schools" and "Focus Schools" budget will be combined into a budget now referred to as the "Turnaround" budget. The State will include the \$12,033,187 in obligated and expended funds in this overall project-level budget.

The budget will also include a total of \$27,294,445 to provide supports and interventions to its lowest-achieving schools categorized as Focus Schools, the schools with the highest proficiency scores and rate of growth categorized as Reward Schools, and to support a contract with Teach for America.ⁱⁱⁱ

I approve the State's request to revise its approach as outlined below:

- To support Focus Schools, the State will budget a total of \$20,934,872 in Years 3 and 4 for a grant competition, contractual support, and a Gap Closure Specialist.
 - A total of \$12,700,000 in the supplemental funding to LEAs budget category will support competitive two-year grant awards available to a subset of the 170 identified Focus Schools. The State expects to award approximately one-fourth of the eligible applicants in fall 2012 based on their specific plans for the following: (1) Individualized Student Support: Analysis of subgroup data and development of individualized student learning plans; (2) Human Capital: Implementation of high-quality job-embedded professional development for school leaders and teachers; (3) Performance Management and Sustainability: Establishment of a detailed performance plan to track quality of implementation; and (4) Additional area: extended learning time, community engagement, or another focus with evidence of identified school need.

It is the Department's understanding that the State plans to structure award size based on student enrollment and tie the second year of funding to improved student performance.

- A total of \$8,003,000 in contractual and indirect costs budget categories will support all 170 Focus Schools, including those not receiving competitive grants. These funds will provide performance management support to the subset of Focus Schools that win two-year competitive grant awards. Additionally, the contract will build the State's capacity to provide each non-grantee Focus School with a Tennessee Academic Specialist (TAS) to address performance gaps in these schools. TASs will provide support services to address specific school needs including: coaching school leaders, observing and providing feedback to educators, conducting staff development, and setting up excellent school visits. It is the Department's understanding that the contractor is being held accountable through the performance of the Focus Schools they serve as well as through intermediary metrics including formative assessment data and satisfaction surveys from principals and district leaders.
 - A total of \$231,872 will support personnel, fringe, travel, and supplies costs for a Gap Closure Specialist to work through the state's Centers of Regional Excellence (CORE) offices to oversee coordination of the TASs and to disseminate best practices and resources on gap closure to other LEAs and schools through CORE Directors.
- To establish partnerships between Focus Schools and Reward Schools, the State will budget a total of \$2,860,000 in Years 3 and 4 for a grant competition to recruit highly effective teacher leaders from Reward Schools to serve as "ambassadors" to Focus Schools in their regions.

- In Years 3 and 4 the State plans to recruit two cohorts of 20 Reward School ambassadors. Ambassadors will serve their region for two years -- remaining in their full-time teaching positions while planning and coordinating occasional regional training in the first year, and then temporarily leaving the classroom to serve as a full-time residents in the second year to conduct robust regional and school-level training and develop a toolkit of best practices. Each ambassador will receive training from TDOE and each ambassador's host LEA will receive funding to expand or create educational programs. The first ambassador cohort is expected to be selected by October 2012.
- The State will also budget \$3,499,573 in Year 4 contractual to extend a contract with Teach for America to provide teachers to Priority, Focus, and other Title I schools in Memphis and Nashville. This contract will support training and placement of at least 390 additional corps members in preparation for SY 2014-2015.

It is our understanding that these amendments will not substantially change the Scope of Work. Please note that this letter will be posted on the Department's website as a record of the amendments. If you need assistance or have any questions regarding Race to the Top, please do not hesitate to contact Tennessee's Race to the Top Program Officer, Jessie Levin, at 202-453-6651 or Jessie.Levin@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

//s//

Ann Whalen
Director, Policy and Program Implementation
Implementation and Support Unit

Cc: Commissioner Kevin Huffman
Meghan Curran, Race to the Top Lead

Appendix 1: Student Achievement Goals and Gap Closure Goals

The charts below show initial targets in (parenthesis) and revised targets in *bold italic*.

Grades 3-8 Aggregate Math

	SY 2010-2011 (target) <i>actual</i>	SY 2011-2012 (target) <i>target</i>	SY 2012-2013 (target) <i>target</i>	SY 2013-2014 (target) <i>target</i>	SY 2014-2015 (target) <i>target</i>
All Students	(93%) 41.0%	(93%) 44.5%	(93%) 48.0%	(100%) 51.5%	55.0%
White	(93%) 47.1%	(93%) 50.4%	(93%) 53.7%	(100%) 57.0%	60.3%
African American	(93%) 23.6%	(93%) 28.4%	(93%) 33.2%	(100%) 37.9%	42.7%
Asian	(93%) 67.7%	(93%) 69.7%	(93%) 71.7%	(100%) 73.8%	75.8%
Native American	(93%) 39.9%	(93%) 43.7%	(93%) 47.4%	(100%) 51.2%	54.9%
Hispanic	(93%) 32.8%	(93%) 37.0%	(93%) 41.2%	(100%) 45.4%	49.6%
Hawaiian Pacific Islander	49.8%	52.9%	56.1%	59.2%	62.4%
Economically Disadvantaged	(93%) 29.8%	(93%) 34.2%	(93%) 38.6%	(100%) 43.0%	47.4%
English Learners	(93%) 21.4%	(93%) 26.3%	(93%) 31.2%	(100%) 36.1%	41.1%
Students with disabilities	(93%) 28.2%	(93%) 32.7%	(93%) 37.2%	(100%) 41.7%	46.2%

Statewide Goals for Math Grades 3 and 7

	SY 2010-2011	SY 2011-2012	SY 2012-2013	SY 2013-2014	SY 2014-2015
	<i>actual</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>
All Students – Grade 3	51.0%	54.2%	57.3%	60.5%	63.6%
All Students – Grade 7^{iv}	35.7%	39.5%	43.3%	47.0%	50.8%

Grades 3-8 Aggregate Reading

	SY 2010-2011	SY 2011-2012	SY 2012-2013	SY 2013-2014	SY 2014-2015
	(target)	(target)	(target)	(target)	(target)
	<i>actual</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>
ALL Students	(94%) 47.5%	(94%) 50.6%	(94%) 53.8%	(100%) 56.9%	60.0%
White	(94%) 54.9%	(94%) 57.7%	(94%) 60.5%	(100%) 63.4%	66.2%
African American	(94%) 28.2%	(94%) 32.7%	(94%) 37.2%	(100%) 41.7%	46.2%
Asian	(95%) 65.7%	(95%) 67.8%	(95%) 70.0%	(100%) 72.1%	74.3%
Native American	(94%) 44.7%	(94%) 48.2%	(94%) 51.6%	(100%) 55.1%	58.5%
Hispanic	(94%) 35.4%	(94%) 39.4%	(94%) 43.5%	(100%) 47.5%	51.6%
Hawaiian Pacific Islander	57.7%	60.3%	63.0%	65.6%	68.3%
Economically Disadvantaged	(94%) 34.8%	(94%) 38.9%	(94%) 43.0%	(100%) 47.0%	51.1%
English Learners	(94%) 15.9%	(94%) 21.2%	(94%) 26.4%	(100%) 31.7%	36.9%
Students with Disabilities	(94%) 31.9%	(94%) 36.2%	(94%) 40.4%	(100%) 44.7%	48.9%

Statewide Goals for Reading Grades 3 and 7

	SY 2010-2011	SY 2011-2012	SY 2012-2013	SY 2013-2014	SY 2014-2015
	<i>actual</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>
All Students – Grade 3	43.0%	47.0%	51.1%	55.1%	59.1%
All Students – Grade 7	44.3%	47.2%	50.2%	53.1%	56.0%

Gap closure for Grades 3-8 Aggregate Math

	SY 2010-2011	SY 2011-2012	SY 2012-2013	SY 2013-2014	SY 2014-2015
	(target)	(target)	(target)	(target)	(target)
	<i>actual</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>
Comparison Group of Racial/Ethnic Sub-groups Currently Performing Below the State Average vs. All Students	15.4%	14.4%	13.5%	(0) 12.5%	11.6%
Economically Disadvantaged vs. Non-Economically Disadvantaged	26.3%	24.7%	23.0%	(0) 21.4%	19.7%
English learners vs. Non-English Learners	20.7%	19.4%	18.1%	(0) 16.8%	15.5%
Students with Disabilities vs. Non-Students with Disabilities	14.6%	13.7%	12.8%	(0) 11.9%	11.0%

Gap Closure for Grades 3-8 Aggregate Reading

	SY 2010-2011	SY 2011-2012	SY 2012-2013	SY 2013-2014	SY 2014-2015
	(target)	(target)	(target)	(target)	(target)
	<i>actual</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>
Comparison Group of Racial/Ethnic Sub-groups Currently Performing Below the State Average vs. All Students	17.7%	16.6%	15.5%	(0) 14.4%	13.3%
Economically Disadvantaged vs. Non-Economically Disadvantaged	30.1%	28.2%	26.3%	(0) 24.5%	22.6%
English learners vs. Non-English Learners	33.5%	31.4%	29.3%	(0) 27.2%	25.1%
Students with Disabilities vs. Non-Students with Disabilities	17.8%	16.7%	15.6%	(0) 14.5%	13.4%

Grades 9-12 Aggregate Reading_– Now High School English II

	SY 2010-2011	SY 2011-2012	SY 2012-2013	SY 2013-2014	SY 2014-2015
	(target)	(target)	(target)	(target)	(target)
	<i>actual</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>
All Students	(97%) 58.0%	(97%) 60.6%	(97%) 63.3%	(100%) 65.9%	68.5%
White	(97%) 66.4%	(97%) 68.5%	(97%) 70.6%	(100%) 72.7%	74.8%
African American	(97%) 35.8%	(97%) 39.8%	(97%) 43.8%	(100%) 47.8%	51.9%
Asian	(97%) 71.8%	(97%) 73.6%	(97%) 75.3%	(100%) 77.1%	78.9%
Native American	(97%) 48.6%	(97%) 51.8%	(97%) 55.0%	(100%) 58.2%	61.5%
Hispanic	(97%) 46.4%	(97%) 49.8%	(97%) 53.1%	(100%) 56.5%	59.8%
Hawaiian Pacific Islander	67.1%	69.2%	71.2%	73.3%	75.3%
Economically Disadvantaged	(97%) 42.7%	(97%) 46.3%	(97%) 49.9%	(100%) 53.4%	57.0%
English Learners	(97%) 12.3%	(97%) 17.8%	(97%) 23.3%	(100%) 28.7%	34.2%
Students with Disabilities	(97%) 22.5%	(97%) 27.3%	(97%) 32.2%	(100%) 37.0%	41.9%

Grades 9-12 Aggregate Math– Now High School Algebra I

	SY 2010-2011	SY 2011-2012	SY 2012-2013	SY 2013-2014	SY 2014-2015
	(target)	(target)	(target)	(target)	(target)
	<i>actual</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>
All Students	(91%) 47.1%	(91%) 50.1%	(91%) 53.0%	(100%) 56.0%	58.9%
White	(92%) 52.9%	(92%) 55.8%	(92%) 58.8%	(100%) 61.7%	64.7%
African American	(91%) 31.0%	(91%) 35.3%	(91%) 39.6%	(100%) 43.9%	48.3%
Asian	(95%) 63.7%	(95%) 66.0%	(95%) 68.2%	(100%) 70.5%	72.8%
Native American	(92%) 45.7%	(92%) 49.1%	(92%) 52.5%	(100%) 55.9%	59.3%
Hispanic	(91%) 42.3%	(91%) 45.9%	(91%) 49.5%	(100%) 53.1%	56.7%
Hawaiian Pacific Islander	50.5%	53.6%	56.7%	59.8%	62.9%
Economically Disadvantaged	(91%) 36.4%	(91%) 40.4%	(91%) 44.4%	(100%) 48.3%	52.3%
English Learners	(91%) 23.5%	(91%) 28.3%	(91%) 33.1%	(100%) 37.8%	42.6%
Students with Disabilities	(91%) 21.5%	(91%) 26.4%	(91%) 31.3%	(100%) 36.2%	41.1%

Gap Closure for Grades 9-12 Aggregate Math - Now High School Algebra I

	SY 2010-2011	SY 2011-2012	SY 2012-2013	SY 2013-2014	SY 2014-2015
	(target)	(target)	(target)	(target)	(target)
	<i>actual</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>
Comparison Group of Racial/Ethnic Sub-groups Currently Performing Below the State Average vs. All Students	20.0%	18.8%	17.5%	(0) 16.3%	15.0%
Economically Disadvantaged vs. Non-Economically Disadvantaged	24.1%	22.6%	21.1%	(0) 19.6%	18.1%
English learners vs. Non-English Learners	24.6%	23.1%	21.5%	(0) 20.0%	18.5%
Students with Disabilities vs. Non-Students with Disabilities	29.1%	27.3%	25.5%	(0) 23.6%	21.8%

Gap Closure for Grades 9-12 Aggregate Reading - Now High School English II

	SY 2010-2011	SY 2011-2012	SY 2012-2013	SY 2013-2014	SY 2014-2015
	(target)	(target)	(target)	(target)	(target)
	<i>actual</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>
Comparison Group of Racial/Ethnic Sub-groups Currently Performing Below the State Average vs. All Students	20.5%	19.2%	17.9%	(0) 16.7%	15.4%
Economically Disadvantaged vs. Non-Economically Disadvantaged	30.7%	28.8%	26.9%	(0) 24.9%	23.0%
English learners vs. Non-English Learners	46.9%	44.0%	41.0%	(0) 38.1%	35.2%
Students with Disabilities vs. Non-Students with Disabilities	39.7%	37.2%	34.7%	(0) 32.3%	29.8%

Appendix 2: Graduation Rate Targets

	SY 2010-2011	SY 2011-2012	SY 2012-2013	SY 2013-2014	SY 2014-2015
	(target)	(target)	(target)	(target)	(target)
	<i>actual</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>
ALL Students	(78.7%) 85.5%	(81.5%) 86.8%	(84.4%) 88.1%	(87.2%) 89.4%	(90%) 90.7%
White	(82.5%) 88.7%	(84.4%) 89.8%	(86.3%) 90.9%	(88.1%) 92.0%	(90%) 93.1%
African American	(69.1%) 78.3%	(74.3%) 80.0%	(79.6%) 81.8%	(84.8%) 83.5%	(90%) 85.3%
Asian	(84.3%) 91.2%	(85.7%) 91.5%	(87.2%) 91.8%	(88.6%) 92.1%	(90%) 92.4%
Native American	(75.5%) 88.5%	(79.1%) 89.7%	(82.8%) 90.9%	(86.4%) 92.1%	(90%) 93.3%
Hispanic	(72.4%) 78.9%	(76.8%) 80.5%	(81.2%) 82.2%	(85.6%) 83.8%	(90%) 85.5%
Hawaiian Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	79.8%	81.3%	82.8%	84.3%	85.8%
English Language Learners	70.8%	72.9%	75.0%	77.1%	79.2%
Students with Disabilities^v	67.4%	69.8%	72.2%	74.6%	77.0%
Male	(71.5%) <i>N/A</i>	(78.8%) <i>N/A</i>	(82.6%) <i>N/A</i>	(86.3%) <i>N/A</i>	(90%) <i>N/A</i>
Female^{vi}	(82.5%) <i>N/A</i>	(84.4%) <i>N/A</i>	(86.3%) <i>N/A</i>	(88.1%) <i>N/A</i>	(90%) <i>N/A</i>

Appendix 3: NAEP Targets**NAEP Grade 4 Reading (Percent Proficient or Advanced)**

	SY 2008-2009 <i>actual</i>	SY 2010-2011 <i>actual</i>	SY 2012-201 <i>target</i>	SY 2014-2015 <i>target</i>
All Students	28%	26%	29.5%	33%
White	34.0%	31.0%	34.7%	38.4%
Black	12.0%	11.0%	16.1%	21.2%
Hispanic	16.0%	16.0%	20.7%	25.4%
Eligible School Lunch Program	17.0%	15.0%	19.2%	23.4%

NAEP Grade 4 Math (Percent Proficient or Advanced)

	SY 2008-2009 <i>actual</i>	SY 2010-2011 <i>actual</i>	SY 2012-2013 <i>target</i>	SY 2014-2015 <i>target</i>
All Students	29.0%	30.0%	34.5%	39.0%
White	36.0%	36.0%	40.9%	45.8%
Black	7.0%	12.0%	18.5%	25.0%
Hispanic	19.0%	19.0%	25.0%	31.0%
Eligible School Lunch Program	16.0%	19.0%	24.4%	29.8%

NAEP Grade 8 Reading (Percent Proficient or Advanced)

	SY 2008-2009	SY 2010-2011	SY 2012-2013	SY 2014-2015
	(target)	(target)	(target)	(target)
	<i>actual</i>	<i>actual</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>
All Students	(26%) 28.0%	(28%) 27.0%	(31%) 31.0%	(35%) 35.0%
White	(32%) 34.0%	(33%) 31.0%	(35%) 35.4%	(36%) 39.8%
Black	(8%) 11.0%	(12%) 12.0%	(21%) 17.7%	(30%) 23.4%
Hispanic	(18%) 21.0%	(21%) 24.0%	(26%) 28.9%	(33%) 33.8%
Eligible School Lunch Program	(14%) 15.0%	(17%) 17.0%	(24%) 21.7%	(32%) 26.4%

NAEP Grade 8 Math (Percent Proficient or Advanced)

	SY 2008-2009	SY 2010-2011	SY 2012-2013	SY 2014-2015
	(target)	(target)	(target)	(target)
	<i>actual</i>	<i>actual</i>	<i>target</i>	<i>target</i>
All Students	(23%) 25.0%	(25%) 24.0%	(30%) 28.5%	(37%) 33.0%
White	(30%) 30.0%	(32%) 28.0%	(38%) 32.9%	(43%) 37.8%
Black	(7%) 10.0%	(9%) 9.0%	(18%) 15.1%	(34%) 21.2%
Hispanic	(13%) 19.0%	(17%) 15.0%	(28%) 20.7%	(39%) 26.4%
Eligible School Lunch Program	(12%) 13.0%	(17%) 13.0%	(27%) 18.3%	(38%) 23.6%

Gap Closure Grade 4 Reading NAEP

	SY 2008-2009 <i>actual</i>	SY 2010-2011 <i>actual</i>	SY 2012-2013 <i>target</i>	SY 2014-2015 <i>target</i>
All vs. Black	22.0%	20.0%	18.6%	17.2%
All vs. Hispanic	18.0%	15.0%	14.0%	13.0%
Non-Eligible School Lunch Program vs. Eligible School Lunch Program	22.0%	26.0%	24.4%	22.8%

Gap Closure Grade 4 Math NAEP

	SY 2008-2009 <i>actual</i>	SY 2010-2011 <i>actual</i>	SY 2012-2013 <i>target</i>	SY 2014-2015 <i>target</i>
All vs. Black	29.0%	24.0%	22.4%	20.8%
All vs. Hispanic	17.0%	17.0%	15.9%	14.8%
Non-Eligible School Lunch Program vs. Eligible School Lunch Program	26.0%	25.0%	23.3%	21.6%

Gap Closure Grade 8 Reading NAEP

	SY 2008-2009 <i>actual</i>	SY 2010-2011 <i>actual</i>	SY 2012-2013 <i>target</i>	SY 2014-2015 <i>target</i>
All vs. Black	23.0%	19.0%	17.7%	16.4%
All vs. Hispanic	13.0%	7.0%	6.5%	6.0%
Non-Eligible School Lunch Program vs. Eligible School Lunch Program	23.0%	21.0%	19.7%	18.4%

Gap Closure Grade 8 Math NAEP

	SY 2008-2009 <i>actual</i>	SY 2010-2011 <i>actual</i>	SY 2012-2013 <i>target</i>	SY 2014-2015 <i>target</i>
All vs. Black	20.0%	19.0%	17.8%	16.6%
All vs. Hispanic	11.0%	13.0%	12.2%	11.4%
Non-Eligible School Lunch Program vs. Eligible School Lunch Program	22.0%	23.0%	21.5%	20.0%

ⁱ Subsequent to that approval, the State determined a need for technical corrections to several subgroups and to take into account the waiver granted by OESE on July 20, 2012, to allow the State to use, with respect to a student who is not yet enrolled in high school but who takes Algebra I or English II and the corresponding end of course assessment, the student's score on that assessment for federal accountability purposes for the grade in which the student is enrolled. OESE approved these technical corrections on August 31, 2012.

ⁱⁱ According to the State's approved ESEA flexibility plan, Focus Schools are defined as the ten percent of schools with the largest achievement gaps, subgroup performance below a 5 percent proficiency threshold, or high schools with graduation rates less than 60 percent; Reward Schools are defined as Schools in the top 5 percent of overall performance and schools in the top 5 percent of fastest growth— a total of 10 percent of schools in all.

ⁱⁱⁱ The State will propose additional amendments for the remaining \$17,067,457 of the \$56,395,089 in the original "Renewal" and "Focus" budgets for Department review.

^{iv} If a student takes Algebra I in grade 7, s/he would be counted here, not in Algebra I high school, per the aforementioned waiver.

^v Tennessee's original targets noted that these three subgroups would not be able to be calculated until SY 2009-2010, so no targets were initially set for Economically Disadvantaged, English Learners, or Students with Disabilities.

^{vi} Male and female subgroups are not included in the regulation related to the cohort rate. The State will report actuals through the Race to the Top Annual Performance Report.