
**Tennessee Department of Education Consolidated State Application
Accountability Workbook, July 2011**

The Background:

The U.S. Department of Education and the State Board of Education approve revisions to Tennessee's Accountability Workbook. This Workbook explains how Tennessee will hold all schools and districts accountable for student performance. Tennessee's Accountability Workbook meets the requirements of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* and the State's Education Improvement Act.

The attached 2011 Tennessee Accountability Workbook is presented to the State Board of Education for approval. Additionally, the attached document Accountability Workbook Differences between 2007 and 2011, outlines the current year's requested amendments, as well as, changes noted from 2007 to 2011.

The Master Plan Connection:

The amendments to the Accountability Workbook promote a quality curriculum as included in the State Board of Education's *Master Plan*. Each of these revisions is designed to ensure that students are successful in completing a quality education.

The Recommendation:

The Department of Education recommends adoption of the amendments to be approved by the U.S. Department of Education on final reading. The SBE staff concurs with this recommendation.

Accountability Workbook Differences between 2007 and 2011

Below are the Accountability Workbook Differences between 2007 and 2011. The page on which the change can be found in the 2011 workbook is shown. There were also several updates to the website links to supporting evidence that were listed in the workbook, that are not included in the list below.

Pg. 10: “Alternative Schools – Students in alternative schools will have their performance data assigned to the regular school they were attending when remanded to the alternative school;”

Pg. 10: “Local Special Schools – Students in special schools at the local level will have their performance data assigned to the district;”

Pg. 12: “Tennessee’s rigorous content and academic standards define four levels of performance: below basic, basic, proficient, and advanced. These standards were adopted by the State Board of Education in 2010 with standards and assessments approved by US ED.

2009-2010 Assessments

- New Curriculum Standards and aligned Assessments are to be utilized for reporting purposes and determining AYP for 2009-10 assessment results
- New Assessments were implemented in the Fall/Spring 2009-10 for high school and Spring 2010 for grades 3-8 in reading/language arts and math
- New Curriculum Standards were adopted by the State Board of Education for K-8 Science (November 2007), 9-12 Science (January 2008), K-12 Language Arts (January 2008), and K-12 Math (January 2008).

Pg. 14: The timeline was changed. “March-Grades K-12—English Language Proficiency; March/April—Grades 3-8—Standards-based assessments—Reading/Language Arts, Math, and Science;”

Pg. 18: The language “(or ‘on notice’ by state law)” was removed.

Pg. 26: Starting points, intermediate goals, and annual measurable objectives were set separately for reading/language arts and math in “Summer 2010” ... to reach 100% “within the 5 year period.”

Accountability Workbook Differences between 2007 and 2011

Pg. 26: Gateway language removed: “High School – Combining the results of the High School English and writing assessment (Grade 11)” and “Students who took the High School Math test in middle school”

Pg. 26: **In 2011, the following is returned to the 2007 language regarding improvement categories:** All schools, Title I and non-Title I, which fail to meet annual measurable objectives in the same content area (math and reading/language arts) or the additional indicator (attendance rate or graduation rate) for two consecutive years are identified as in improvement status or moved to the next improvement category, **according to the Accountability Chart found in Attachment A**. All districts which fail to meet annual measurable objectives in the same content area (math and reading/language arts) or the additional indicator (attendance rate or graduation rate) for two consecutive years in both their elementary/middle school and high school levels are identified as in LEA Improvement status, or moved to the next improvement category, **according to the Accountability Chart found in Attachment B**. The State uses the “Same Subject, All Grade Spans” practice. Districts which contain only one grade span level, either elementary/middle or high school, and fail to meet annual measurable objectives in the same content area (math and reading/language arts) or the additional indicator for two consecutive years are identified in LEA Improvement or moved to the next improvement category, **according to the Accountability Chart found in Attachment B**.

Pg. 28: Projections: Removed language requiring AMOs be met “in both reading/language arts and math” to read, “To meet AYP through this option, schools and districts must meet the annual measurable objectives for each student subgroup without the application of a confidence interval.”

Pg. 28: New Paragraph: “Tennessee will calculate 2009-2010 AYP on the most current year data only due to the implementation of new assessments. Schools and districts are able to meet AYP by using their most current year data only. Tennessee will not allow averaging for the 2009-2010 AYP calculations due to the implementation of new assessments. In 2010-2011 when the two-year data is available for assessments based on the same achievement levels, schools and districts will be able to use most current two-year averages. The following year in 2011-2012 when three-year data is available for assessments based on the same achievement levels, schools and districts will be able to use the most current three-year averages.”

Accountability Workbook Differences between 2007 and 2011

Pg. 30: AYP Starting points were determined in “Summer 2010”

These AYP starting points were determined by the test results from school year “2009-2010” for the standards-based assessments in reading/language arts, writing, and mathematics for grades “3-8” for the elementary and middle school level.

These AYP starting points were determined by the test results from school year “2009-2010” for the High School Algebra I, English II, and 11th grade writing assessments for the high school level. (Gateway Language removed)

Those AYP starting point were determined by the test results from school year “2009-10”

“Gateway English Proficiency Score” changed to “High School English Proficiency Score”

Pg. 32: “Intermediate goals and annual measurable objectives were determined in Summer 2010”.

“The State Board of Education adopted annual measurable objectives at its July 30, 2010 meeting.”

Change to target percentages in both elementary/middle and high school tables.

Pg. 34: “Intermediate AYP goals were determined in Summer 2010.”

Pg. 38: **In 2011, the following change is requested:** “Subgroup data are required for various AYP calculations including attendance rate, graduation rate and assessments.”

Race/ethnicity – “Beginning in the 2010-2011 school year, Tennessee will report racial and ethnic data in the following major categories: Hispanic, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Black or African American, White”

Pg. 38: Change to 4th bullet: Limited English Proficient – Students who are non-English language background and have not been reclassified as Fluent English proficient as defined by “State Board of Education policy 3.207, revised 08/22/2008.”

“English Language Proficiency assessment” changed to read “English as a Second Language screening assessment” throughout

Accountability Workbook Differences between 2007 and 2011

Item 3. Removed: “demonstrated the ability to meet the State’s proficient or above proficient level of achievement on State assessments described in section 1111(b)(3) for reading and language arts.”

Pg. 40: Paragraph added. “Within a single school year AYP assessment cycle, in which students are “first time test takers” who retest subsequent to the official administration of an assessment, Tennessee will calculate AYP using the “best score” or results from subsequent test administrations. Tennessee’s school year begins on July 1 and ends on June 30th which deems the AYP assessment cycle as including, in this order, the summer, fall and spring assessment administrations. This moves the State from the prior practice of calculating only “first time test takers” for AYP purposes into the use of a “best score” for students taking multiple test administrations during the same school year AYP assessment cycle.”

Pg. 42: Scores from the TCAP-Alternate are reported in the four levels used by the State: below basic, basic, proficient, and advanced.

“Tennessee has developed a modified academic achievement standards assessment for an additional 2% of students based on final USEDE regulations. Beginning in school year 2009-2010, only eligible students, as determined by their IEP team, will participate in the modified achievement standards assessments. The scores for students with disabilities who take the modified achievement standards assessment will be included in the assessment data in the accountability system so long as the number of those proficient and advanced scores does not exceed 2% of all students in the grades assessed at the LEA and state levels. The 2% cap is necessary to ensure that modified academic achievement standards are used appropriately. Proficient scores exceeding this cap must be changed to below proficient for accountability purposes.”

“Beginning with data from school year 2009-10, Tennessee will no longer calculate a proxy to determine the percentage of special education that is equivalent to 2% of all students assessed and will no longer add the proxy to the percent of students with disabilities who are proficient or advanced.”

Pg. 44: To ensure compliance... all (LEP) students are included in the TCAP administration with “either the regular or accommodated assessment.”

LEP students take the TCAP science and math assessment subtests and the English as a Second Language screening assessment the first academic year they are in an American school.

Accountability Workbook Differences between 2007 and 2011

Pg. 44: **In 2011, the following change is requested:** The Department has developed and implemented an English Linguistically Simplified Assessment (ELSA) form of the TCAP assessment for LEP students to measure their content knowledge in reading/language arts and math. This accommodated assessment is aligned with the State's content standards. All LEP students are required to participate in the TCAP program with allowable accommodations.

All LEP and Monitored Former Limited English Proficient (MFLEP) students are eligible to take the ELSA. Students participating in the ELSA must test in all required content areas with the ELSA. Students tested with the ELSA, who are not eligible to take the ELSA, will count in AYP calculations as non-participating and non-proficient. Scores are reported in the four levels used by the State: below basic, basic, proficient, and advanced.

Pg. 50: Gateway language removed. "High school Reading/Language Arts and Writing assessment results and High School Math; and,"

Pg. 52-53: See workbook for entire section. **In 2011, the following clarification to the section is requested:**

Because 2009-10 is the first school year the Department will calculate graduation rates for all required subgroups, the Department will continue to use the event dropout rate for economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, and limited English proficient to show improvement from the prior year for the safe harbor provision. Because two years of adjusted cohort graduation rate data will be available beginning with the 2010-11 school year, the Department will use the graduation rate to show improvement for all subgroups. For high schools not serving grade 12 that do not have a graduation rate, the event dropout rate will continue to be used as the additional indicator.

Pg. 67: "These data are randomly audited for accuracy by the Division of Internal Audit." was changed to read: "These data are randomly audited for accuracy."

Pg. 69: "These data are randomly audited for accuracy by the Division of Internal Audit." was changed to read: "These data are randomly audited for accuracy."

Pg. 71-72: Attachments A and B are Accountability Charts. Both charts have minor and substantial changes. Please see pgs. 71-72.

**Tennessee Department of Education
Consolidated State Application
Accountability Workbook
Resubmitted July 29, 2011**

for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and
Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)



**U. S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Washington, D.C. 20202**

Instructions for Completing Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

By January 31, 2003, States must complete and submit to the Department this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook. We understand that some of the critical elements for the key principles may still be under consideration and may not yet be final State policy by the January 31 due date. States that do not have final approval for some of these elements or that have not finalized a decision on these elements by January 31 should, when completing the Workbook, indicate the status of each element which is not yet official State policy and provide the anticipated date by which the proposed policy will become effective. In each of these cases, States must include a timeline of steps to complete to ensure that such elements are in place by May 1, 2003, and implemented during the 2002-2003 school year. By no later than May 1, 2003, States must submit to the Department final information for all sections of the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

Transmittal Instructions

To expedite the receipt of this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, please send your submission via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Send electronic submissions to conapp@ed.gov.

A State that submits only a paper submission should mail the submission by express courier to:

Celia Sims
U.S. Department of Education
450 Maryland Ave., SW
Room 3W300
Washington, D.C. 20202-6450
(202) 451-0113

PART I: Summary of Required Elements for State Accountability Systems

Instructions

The following chart is an overview of States' implementation of the critical elements required for approval of their State accountability systems. States must provide detailed implementation information for each of these elements in Part II of this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

For each of the elements listed in the following chart, States should indicate the current implementation status in their State using the following legend:

- F:** State has a final policy, approved by all the required entities in the State (e.g., State Board of Education, State Legislature), for implementing this element in its accountability system.
- P:** State has a proposed policy for implementing this element in its accountability system, but must still receive approval by required entities in the State (e.g., State Board of Education, State Legislature).
- W:** State is still working on formulating a policy to implement this element in its accountability system.

**Summary of Implementation Status for Required Elements of
State Accountability Systems**

| Status | State Accountability System Element |
|--|---|
| Principle 1: All Schools | |
| F | 1.1 Accountability system includes <i>all schools and districts in the state</i> . |
| F | 1.2 Accountability system holds <i>all schools to the same criteria</i> . |
| F | 1.3 Accountability system incorporates the <i>academic achievement standards</i> . |
| F | 1.4 Accountability system provides <i>information in a timely manner</i> . |
| F | 1.5 Accountability system includes <i>report cards</i> . |
| F | 1.6 Accountability system includes <i>rewards and sanctions</i> . |
| Principle 2: All Students | |
| F | 2.1 The accountability system includes <i>all students</i> |
| F | 2.2 The accountability system has a consistent definition of <i>full academic year</i> . |
| F | 2.3 The accountability system properly includes <i>mobile students</i> . |
| Principle 3: Method of AYP Determinations | |
| F | 3.1 Accountability system expects <i>all student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs to reach proficiency by 2013-14</i> . |
| F | 3.2 Accountability system has a method for determining whether <i>student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs made adequate yearly progress</i> . |
| F | 3.2a Accountability system establishes a <i>starting point</i> . |
| F | 3.2b Accountability system establishes <i>statewide annual measurable objectives</i> . |
| F | 3.2c Accountability system establishes <i>intermediate goals</i> . |
| Principle 4: Annual Decisions | |
| F | 4.1 The accountability system <i>determines annually the progress</i> of schools and districts. |

STATUS Legend:

- F – Final state policy
- P – Proposed policy, awaiting State approval
- W – Working to formulate policy

Principle 5: Subgroup Accountability

| | | |
|---|-----|--|
| F | 5.1 | The accountability system <i>includes all the required student subgroups</i> . |
| F | 5.2 | The accountability system holds <i>schools and LEAs accountable for the progress of student subgroups</i> . |
| F | 5.3 | The accountability system includes <i>students with disabilities</i> . |
| F | 5.4 | The accountability system includes <i>limited English proficient students</i> . |
| F | 5.5 | The State has determined the minimum number of students sufficient to yield statistically reliable information for each purpose for which disaggregated data are used. |
| F | 5.6 | The State has strategies to protect the privacy of individual students in reporting achievement results and in determining whether schools and LEAs are making adequate yearly progress on the basis of disaggregated subgroups. |

Principle 6: Based on Academic Assessments

| | | |
|---|-----|---|
| F | 6.1 | Accountability system is based <i>primarily on academic assessments</i> . |
|---|-----|---|

Principle 7: Additional Indicators

| | | |
|---|-----|--|
| F | 7.1 | Accountability system includes <i>graduation rate for high schools</i> . |
| F | 7.2 | Accountability system includes an <i>additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools</i> . |
| F | 7.3 | Additional indicators are valid and reliable. |

Principle 8: Separate Decisions for Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics

| | | |
|---|-----|---|
| F | 8.1 | Accountability system holds students, schools and districts separately accountable for <i>reading/language arts and mathematics</i> . |
|---|-----|---|

Principle 9: System Validity and Reliability

| | | |
|---|-----|---|
| F | 9.1 | Accountability system produces <i>reliable decisions</i> . |
| F | 9.2 | Accountability system produces <i>valid decisions</i> . |
| F | 9.3 | State has a plan for addressing <i>changes in assessment and student population</i> . |

Principle 10: Participation Rate

| | | |
|---|------|--|
| F | 10.1 | Accountability system has a means for calculating the <i>rate of participation</i> in the statewide assessment. |
| F | 10.2 | Accountability system has a means for <i>applying the 95% assessment criteria to student subgroups and small schools</i> . |

STATUS Legend:

F – Final policy

P – Proposed Policy, awaiting State approval W– Working to formulate policy

PART II: State Response and Activities for Meeting State Accountability System Requirements

Instructions

In Part II of this Workbook, States are to provide detailed information for each of the critical elements required for State accountability systems. States should answer the questions asked about each of the critical elements in the State's accountability system. States that do not have final approval for any of these elements or that have not finalized a decision on these elements by January 31, 2003, should, when completing this section of the Workbook, indicate the status of each element that is not yet official State policy and provide the anticipated date by which the proposed policy will become effective. In each of these cases, States must include a timeline of steps to complete to ensure that such elements are in place by May 1, 2003, and implemented during the 2002-2003 school year. By no later than May 1, 2003, States must submit to the Department final information for all sections of the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

PRINCIPLE 1. A single statewide Accountability System applied to all public schools and LEAs.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|---|---|--|
| <p>1.1 How does the State Accountability System include every public school and LEA in the State?</p> | <p>Every public school and LEA is required to make adequate yearly progress and is included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a definition of “public school” and “LEA” for AYP accountability purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State Accountability System produces AYP decisions for all public schools, including public schools with variant grade configurations (e.g., K-12), public schools that serve special populations (e.g., alternative public schools, juvenile institutions, state public schools for the blind) and public charter schools. It also holds accountable public schools with no grades assessed (e.g., K-2). | <p>A public school or LEA is not required to make adequate yearly progress and is not included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State policy systematically excludes certain public schools and/or LEAs.</p> |

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Tennessee will hold every public school and LEA in the state accountable, including charter schools. Only K-2 schools do not participate in the standardized state assessment system. These schools will be held accountable based on the performance of their receiving schools. T.C.A.49-1-602, enacted during the 2002 legislative session, amended the Education Improvement Act to form a single accountability system for all Tennessee public schools. All schools, Title I and non-Title I, will be held to the same Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) measures. The State will identify their progress in meeting those objectives by the required disaggregated subgroup populations on the State's report card.

In addition, during the 2002 legislative session, Tennessee enacted its first charter school legislation. This legislation specifically requires charter schools to meet adequate yearly progress measures or face the revocation of their charters.

T.C.A. 49-1-602 requires the Department of Education to present to the State Board of Education by September 1 the list of schools identified as not meeting AYP objectives and identified in a sanction category.

The State will assist LEAs to understand how the accountability system works by providing written guidance and holding special conferences and workshops. This information will include how the State calculates participation, attendance, and graduation rates.

Links to Supporting Evidence:

<http://www.michie.com/tennessee/lpext.dll?f=templates&fn=main-h.htm&cp=tncode>

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|---|--|
| <p>1.2 How are all public schools and LEAs held to the same criteria when making an AYP determination?</p> | <p>All public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of the same criteria when making an AYP determination.</p> <p>If applicable, the AYP definition is integrated into the State Accountability System.</p> | <p>Some public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of alternate criteria when making an AYP determination.</p> |

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

All public schools, including charter schools, and LEAs are judged on the basis of the same AYP criteria for accountability purposes. Schools that contain grade configurations that cross both AYP levels (elementary/middle and secondary) will be held accountable for meeting AYP for both levels. Determination of the accountability status will be made for both levels in the school. The following types of schools will be held accountable in the manner described below:

K-2 Schools – The State will base their status on their receiving schools' AYP determination;

Alternative Schools - Students in alternative schools will have their performance data assigned to the regular school they were attending when remanded to the alternative school;

Local Special Schools – Students in special schools at the local level will have their performance data assigned to the district;

Special Classrooms within Schools – Students in special classrooms within schools designed to meet special needs and serve students from other schools, such as specialized special education classes, will have their performance data assigned to the schools they are attending;

State Special Schools – Students in special schools at the state level, such as Tennessee School for the Blind, will have their performance data assigned to the state;

Small Schools – Schools with fewer than an N of 45 for all students for the most current year, which account for only about 3% of the schools in the state, will be defined as a small school and a 95% confidence band will be utilized to determine AYP for that year based on the school's "N" count. For schools with fewer than an N of 10 for all students for the most current year, the State will determine AYP by summing test results over 2 to 3 years, until an N of 10 is reached; and,

New Schools – Students in newly opened schools, including newly opened charter schools, will have their performance data assigned to the new school they are attending. The first year a new school is open, the State will only report the results of the assessments. The second year the State will make its initial adequate yearly progress (AYP) determination for the new school. The third year the new school is open will be the first year that the new school could potentially be identified for school improvement.

Schools with only grades 7-9 – Junior high schools with 7-9 grade configurations will base their status on elementary/middle AYP additional indicator standards.

High schools without a 12th grade – The State will use the event dropout rate as the additional indicator for high schools that do not include 12th grade.

In Tennessee, students in court-ordered facilities are by law the direct responsibility of the Department of Children's Services rather than the Department of Education and cannot be included in public school accountability determinations.

Please see Element 3.2 for a description of elementary/middle AYP determinations under the growth model pilot program.

Results from Tennessee's Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) will be used to help schools and districts improve their educational programs for all students; to recognize schools and districts that meet adequate yearly progress and demonstrate high value-added effects; and to determine the level and kind of technical assistance provided to schools and districts that are identified in school improvement status.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|--|---|
| <p>1.3 Does the State have, at a minimum, a definition of <i>basic</i>, <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> student achievement levels in reading/language arts and mathematics?</p> | <p>State has defined three levels of student achievement: <i>basic</i>, <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i>.¹</p> <p>Student achievement levels of <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> determine how well students are mastering the materials in the State’s academic content standards; and the <i>basic</i> level of achievement provides complete information about the progress of lower-achieving students toward mastering the <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> levels.</p> | <p>Standards do not meet the legislated requirements.</p> |

¹ System of State achievement standards will be reviewed by the Standards and Assessments Peer Review. The Accountability Peer Review will determine that achievement levels are used in determining AYP.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Tennessee's rigorous content and academic standards define four levels of performance: below basic, basic, proficient, and advanced. These standards were adopted by the State Board of Education in 2010 with standards and assessments approved by US ED. The following timeline delineates additional activities:

2009-10 Assessments

- New Curriculum Standards and aligned Assessments are to be utilized for reporting purposes and determining AYP for 2009-10 assessment results
- New Assessments were implemented in the Fall/Spring 2009-10 for high school and Spring 2010 for grades 3-8 in reading/language arts and math
- New Curriculum Standards were adopted by the State Board of Education for K-8 Science (November 2007), 9-12 Science (January 2008), K-12 Language Arts (January 2008), and K-12 Math (January 2008).

Links to Supporting Evidence:

New Curriculum Standards – K-8 Science

http://www.tennessee.gov/sbe/pdfNovember/Agenda11_07_links.pdf

New Curriculum Standards – 9-12 Science, K-12 Language Arts, K-12 Math

<http://www.tennessee.gov/sbe/2008Januarypdfs/January%202008%20Agenda.pdf>

New High School Policy/Rule

<http://www.tennessee.gov/sbe/2008Januarypdfs/IV%20N%20High%20School%20Transition%20Policy%20&%20Rule.pdf>

Current Curriculum Standards

<http://www.state.tn.us/education/ci/curriculum.shtml>

TCAP Achievement Levels: Standards Setting Process and Implementation

<http://www.tennessee.gov/sbe/2010Julypdfs/IV%20J%20TCAP%20Achievement%20Levels%20Standards%20Setting%20Process%20-%20Combined.pdf>

| <p>CRITICAL ELEMENT</p> | <p>EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS</p> | <p>EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> |
|---|---|---|
| <p>1.4 How does the State provide accountability and adequate yearly progress decisions and information in a timely manner?</p> | <p>State provides decisions about adequate yearly progress in time for LEAs to implement the required provisions before the beginning of the next academic year.</p> <p>State allows enough time to notify parents about public school choice or supplemental educational service options, time for parents to make an informed decision, and time to implement public school choice and supplemental educational services.</p> | <p>Timeline does not provide sufficient time for LEAs to fulfill their responsibilities before the beginning of the next academic year.</p> |

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The testing schedule for assessments included in the State’s accountability system is as follows:
February – Grades 5, 8, and 11 – Writing Assessments;
March – Grades K-12 – English Language Proficiency;
March/April – Grades 3-8 – Standards-based assessments – Reading/Language Arts, Math, and Science; and,
May (and December for schools with block scheduling) – High School Reading/Language Arts, Math, and Science.

TCAP summary results and initial AYP determinations will be accomplished by August 1. The State and the affected district will notify parents of their options for public school choice and supplemental services for identified schools before the first day of school. This will be done by notifying the public through such mediums as the media and posting the information on the State and district web site. Identified schools will follow this initial public notification by sending letters home with students on the first day of school. All schools identified in any school improvement status will be notified by August 1 so that they may review their data and have an opportunity to appeal the decision for “statistical or other substantive reasons.” The Department expects very few appeals and only those schools that 1) have indicated that they plan to appeal the decision for “statistical or other substantive reasons” and 2) would not have to offer public school choice and/or supplemental services if the appeal were successful would be allowed to inform parents that the implementation of these options would only occur if the school lost its appeal. This will happen by September 1, the date the Department is mandated to present its list of identified schools to the State Board of Education for approval as required by state law.

Schools that are identified will provide parents with the opportunity to enroll their child in another public school that is not identified for improvement. Schools in their second year of school improvement will also provide opportunities for supplemental services to the low-income lowest achieving students in the school.

Links to Supporting Data:

<http://www.michie.com/tennessee/lpext.dll?f=templates&fn=main-h.htm&cp=tncode>

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|---|--|
| <p>1.5 Does the State Accountability System produce an annual State Report Card?</p> | <p>The State Report Card includes all the required data elements [see Appendix A for the list of required data elements].</p> <p>The State Report Card is available to the public at the beginning of the academic year.</p> <p>The State Report Card is accessible in languages of major populations in the State, to the extent available.</p> <p>Assessment results and other academic indicators (including graduation rates) are reported by student subgroups</p> | <p>The State Report Card does not include all the required data elements.</p> <p>The State Report Card is not available to the public.</p> |

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The Tennessee Annual Report Card includes all required data elements. In accordance with TCA 49-1-211, it is published online each year by November 1. NCLB results are also posted online at the beginning of the school year.

Under flexibility granted through the growth model pilot program, elementary/middle AYP determinations will include student projected scores on future assessments for all students and for each student subgroup. This data will be included on the Annual Report Card.

Links to Supporting Evidence:

<http://www.state.tn.us/education/mdata.shtml>

<http://www.michie.com/tennessee/lpext.dll?f=templates&fn=main-h.htm&cp=tncode>

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|---|---|
| <p>1.6 How does the State Accountability System include rewards and sanctions for public schools and LEAs?²</p> | <p>State uses one or more types of rewards and sanctions, where the criteria are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set by the State; • Based on adequate yearly progress decisions; and, • Applied uniformly across public schools and LEAs. | <p>State does not implement rewards or sanctions for public schools and LEAs based on adequate yearly progress.</p> |

² The state must provide rewards and sanctions for all public schools and LEAs for making adequate yearly progress, except that the State is not required to hold schools and LEAs not receiving Title I funds to the requirements of section 1116 of NCLB [§200.12(b)(45)].

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

As a result of its unified single accountability system, the State recognizes two groups of schools: those that have exceeded their AYP for two or more years and those that significantly close the achievement gap between their subgroup student populations. Both groups of schools must also demonstrate strong value-added scores. These schools will be recognized on the State's report card site. The State will utilize the same recognition process for LEAs that significantly close the achievement gap and/or exceed their AYP for two or more consecutive years.

From the two groups of recognized schools, two Title I schools will be recognized to represent Tennessee nationally for having made the greatest gains in closing the achievement gap and/or exceeding their AYP for two or more consecutive years. These schools will be recognized at State Title I conferences and representatives from the schools will be sent to the National Title I conference to represent the State. Representatives from these schools will be utilized as part of the State's School Support System.

Because of its unified single accountability system, both Title I and non-Title I schools, and LEAs will face similar sanctions. All state schools enter the same sanction category in year 2 of school improvement. Title I schools face additional sanctions at each category of school improvement. These requirements are summarized in Attachment A.

Links to Supporting Evidence:

<http://www.michie.com/tennessee/lpext.dll?f=templates&fn=main-h.htm&cp=tncode>

PRINCIPLE 2. All students are included in the State Accountability System.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|--|---|
| <p>2.1 How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?</p> | <p>All students in the State are included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>The definitions of “public school” and “LEA” account for all students enrolled in the public school district, regardless of program or type of public school.</p> | <p>Public school students exist in the State for whom the State Accountability System makes no provision.</p> |

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

All students enrolled in Tennessee public schools are required to participate in the Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program. Only students who have significant medical emergencies may be exempted from participation. LEAs arrange for make up sessions when students are absent on the testing dates.

Beginning with Spring 2003, answer sheets for all students have been required to be returned to the State for processing. The answer sheet for all students, including those that did not participate, will be coded with the required demographic information so that the State may calculate the participation rate for all students and all required subgroups.

The State calculates the participation rate by dividing the number of attempted tests by the number of submitted test answer sheets. An attempted test is one in which the student attempted at least to answer some question on these required subtests of the TCAP: reading, language arts, writing, and/or math. The State clearly communicates to LEAs in written guidance as well as during conferences and workshops that every child must attempt the test. To check for the reliability of this system, the State randomly audits schools' submitted answer sheets against the schools' reported enrollment for the first day of testing.

Links to Supporting Evidence:

TCAP Administration Manual – Elementary/Middle
http://state.tn.us/education/assessment/doc/ach_tam.pdf

TCAP Administration Manual – Secondary
<http://www.state.tn.us/education/assessment/doc/tsgweoctam.pdf>

TCAP Administration Manual – Writing
http://www.state.tn.us/education/assessment/doc/Writingtam_08.pdf

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|--|--|
| <p>2.2 How does the State define “full academic year” for identifying students in AYP decisions?</p> | <p>The State has a definition of “full academic year” for determining which students are to be included in decisions about AYP.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is consistent and applied statewide.</p> | <p>LEAs have varying definitions of “full academic year.”</p> <p>The State’s definition excludes students who must transfer from one district to another as they advance to the next grade.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is not applied consistently.</p> |

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

A full academic year is defined as continuous enrollment in a school, district, or the state from at least one day of the first reporting period (consisting of the first 20 days of the school year and reported October 31) until test administration. This information is required to be coded on the students' test answer sheets. In cases in which students are absent because of suspension, the suspended students are still considered enrolled in the school.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|---|---|
| <p>2.3 How does the State Accountability System determine which students have attended the same public school and/or LEA for a full academic year?</p> | <p>State holds public schools accountable for students who were enrolled at the same public school for a full academic year.</p> <p>State holds LEAs accountable for students who transfer during the full academic year from one public school within the district to another public school within the district.</p> | <p>State definition requires students to attend the same public school for more than a full academic year to be included in public school accountability.</p> <p>State definition requires students to attend school in the same district for more than a full academic year to be included in district accountability.</p> <p>State holds public schools accountable for students who have not attended the same public school for a full academic year.</p> |

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The TCAP answer sheet identifies students who have been in the school, district, or state continuously for less than a full academic year. When the State analyzes test results for the purposes of accountability, only students who were in the school, district, or state for the full academic year are included in the appropriate category(s).

Please see the State's response to Critical Element 2.2 for the definition of a full academic year.

PRINCIPLE 3. State definition of AYP is based on expectations for growth in student achievement that is continuous and substantial, such that all students are proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics no later than 2013-2014.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|---|---|--|
| <p>3.1 How does the State’s definition of adequate yearly progress require all students to be proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013-2014 academic year?</p> | <p>The State has a timeline for ensuring that all students will meet or exceed the State’s proficient level of academic achievement in reading/language arts³ and mathematics, not later than 2013-2014.</p> | <p>State definition does not require all students to achieve proficiency by 2013-2014.</p> <p>State extends the timeline past the 2013-2014 academic year.</p> |

³ If the state has separate assessments to cover its language arts standards (e.g., reading and writing), the State must create a method to include scores from all the relevant assessments.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Starting points, intermediate goals, and annual measurable objectives were set separately for reading/language arts and math in Summer 2010 such that they yield 100% proficiency for the State, LEAs, schools, and all required subgroups by 2013-14. Using the starting points for each content area and grade span, the amount of annual growth necessary to reach 100% within the 5 year period was calculated. Separate starting points, intermediate goals, and annual measurable objectives for math and reading/language arts were established for two levels: elementary-middle and high school levels. Reading/language arts were determined in the following manner: Grades 3 – 8 – Combining the results of the TCAP reading, language arts, and writing assessments (grades 5 and 8)

High School – Combining the results of the High School English and writing assessment (Grade 11)

The State has defined proficient on the Writing Assessments as scoring a 4 or above (out of 6) on the evaluation rubric.

Students who took the High School Math test in middle school will bank their scores until they reach high school. Those “banked” scores are included in the math AYP determination for the high school they attend.

All schools, Title I and non-Title I, which fail to meet annual measurable objectives in the same content area (math and reading/language arts) or the additional indicator (attendance rate or graduation rate) for two consecutive years are identified as in improvement status or moved to the next improvement category, according to the Accountability Chart found in Attachment A. All districts which fail to meet annual measurable objectives in the same content area (math and reading/language arts) or the additional indicator (attendance rate or graduation rate) for two consecutive years in both their elementary/middle school and high school levels are identified as in LEA Improvement status, or moved to the next improvement category, according to the Accountability Chart found in Attachment B. The State uses the “Same Subject, All Grade Spans” practice. Districts which contain only one grade span level, either elementary/middle or high school, and fail to meet annual measurable objectives in the same content area (math and reading/language arts) or the additional indicator for two consecutive years are identified in LEA Improvement or moved to the next improvement category, according to the Accountability Chart found in Attachment B.

The State rounds its AYP calculations to the nearest whole number.

| <p>CRITICAL ELEMENT</p> | <p>EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> | <p>EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> |
|---|--|--|
| <p>3.2 How does the State Accountability System determine whether each student subgroup, public school and LEA makes AYP?</p> | <p>For a public school and LEA to make adequate yearly progress, each student subgroup must meet or exceed the State annual measurable objectives, each student subgroup must have at least a 95% participation rate in the statewide assessments, and the school must meet the State's requirement for other academic indicators.</p> <p>However, if in any particular year the student subgroup does not meet those annual measurable objectives, the public school or LEA may be considered to have made AYP, if the percentage of students in that group who did not meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State assessments for that year decreased by 10% of that percentage from the preceding public school year; that group made progress on one or more of the State's academic indicators; and that group had at least 95% participation rate on the statewide assessment.</p> | <p>State uses different method for calculating how public schools and LEAs make AYP.</p> |

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

In order for schools and LEAs to make AYP, each must meet or exceed:

- A 95% participation rate in the required TCAP accountability tests for all students and for each student subgroup;
- Annual measurable objectives in reading/language arts and math for all students and for each student subgroup with the application of a 95% confidence interval, and,
- Performance objectives for the additional indicator for all students or show improvement in meeting the objectives.

If a school or LEA fails to meet annual measurable objectives, a school or LEA may make AYP if the subgroup not making AYP reduces the percent of below proficient students by 10% from the previous year, 19% from two years previously, or 27% from three years previously – and makes progress on the additional indicator.

Under flexibility granted through the growth model pilot program, elementary/middle schools and the elementary/middle level for districts may also meet annual measurable objectives using students' projected scores on future assessments. In the growth model, the State will use all 4th grade students' projected scores on the 7th grade assessment, 5th grade students' projected scores on the 8th grade assessment, and 6th – 8th grade students' projected scores on the high school assessment. The State will apply current year scores for 3rd grade students, students new to the State testing system, and students assessed under alternative standards. To meet AYP through this option, schools and districts must meet the annual measurable objectives for each student subgroup without the application of a confidence interval. More details at:

<http://www.state.tn.us/education/nclb/doc/NCLB%20GrowthModelProposal.pdf> .

AYP status for schools that cross both levels, elementary-middle and high school, are determined at both levels. Sanctions and rewards are applied only to the level(s) affected.

The elementary/middle additional indicator is attendance rate and the high school additional indicator is graduation rate.

Tennessee will calculate 2009-2010 AYP on the most current year data only due to the implementation of new assessments. Schools and districts are able to meet AYP by using their most current year data only. Tennessee will not allow averaging for the 2009-2010 AYP calculations due to the implementation of new assessments. In 2010-2011 when two-year data is available for assessments based on the same achievement levels, schools and districts will be able to use most current two-year averages. The following year in 2011-2012 when three-year data is available for assessments based on the same achievement levels, schools and districts will be able to use the most current three-year averages.

In calculating AYP for student subgroups, 45 or more students must be included to assure high levels of reliability.

All students' scores are used as an aggregate to determine the AYP of schools as a whole. All schools' scores are used as an aggregate to determine the AYP of LEAs.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|---|---|
| <p>3.2a What is the State's starting point for calculating Adequate Yearly Progress?</p> | <p>Using data from the 2001-2002 school year, the State established separate starting points in reading/language arts and mathematics for measuring the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the State's proficient level of academic achievement.</p> <p>Each starting point is based, at a minimum, on the higher of the following percentages of students at the proficient level: (1) the percentage in the State of proficient students in the lowest-achieving student subgroup; or, (2) the percentage of proficient students in a public school at the 20th percentile of the State's total enrollment among all schools ranked by the percentage of students at the proficient level.</p> <p>A State may use these procedures to establish separate starting points by grade span; however, the starting point must be the same for all like schools (e.g., one same starting point for all elementary schools, one same starting point for all middle schools...)</p> | <p>The State Accountability System uses a different method for calculating the starting point (or baseline data).</p> |

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

AYP starting points were determined in Summer 2010 by the higher of the two calculations described below:

1. Average TCAP proficiency percentages were calculated for each school at each grade span in reading/language arts and math separately. Schools were sorted by the required grade span and ranked from highest to lowest based on performance. Beginning with the lowest performing school and moving up, enrollments were aggregated until 20 percent of the State's enrollment for that grade span level was captured. The score of the school at the 20th percentile of enrollment was the score that was used for the starting point; or
2. The percentage of the lowest performing subgroup.

These AYP starting points were determined by the test results from school year 2009-2010 for the standards-based assessments in reading/language arts, writing, and mathematics for grades 3 through 8 for the elementary and middle school level.

These AYP starting points were determined by the test results from school year 2009-2010 for the High School Algebra I, English II, and 11th grade writing assessments for the high school level.

Two grade spans were determined: elementary/middle and high school.

These reading/language arts and math starting points will be applied to determine whether AYP had been attained for all schools and districts for school year 2009-2010.

For grades 3-8, the reading/language arts score were determined by averaging the Reading/Language Arts Composite Proficiency Score with the Writing Proficiency score as follows:

- Grades 5 and 8 at the weight of 1 part Reading/Language Arts Composite Proficiency Score and .5 part Writing Proficiency Score; and,
- Grades 3, 4, 6, and 7 at the weight of 1 part Reading/Language Arts Composite Proficiency Score.

For high school, the reading/language arts scores were determined by averaging the High School English Proficiency Score at the weight of 1 part and the 11th Grade Writing Proficiency Score at .5 part.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|---|---|--|
| <p>3.2b What are the State's annual measurable objectives for determining adequate yearly progress?</p> | <p>State has annual measurable objectives that are consistent with a state's intermediate goals and that identify for each year a minimum percentage of students who must meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State's academic assessments.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives ensure that all students meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement within the timeline.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives are the same throughout the State for each public school, each LEA, and each subgroup of students.</p> | <p>The State Accountability System uses another method for calculating annual measurable objectives.</p> <p>The State Accountability System does not include annual measurable objectives.</p> |

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Tennessee’s accountability system has incorporated all AYP requirements including annual measurable objectives that are applied to all public schools in the State. Annual measurable objectives and goals are the same for the State, every LEA, every school, and all required subgroups of students. Intermediate goals and annual measurable objectives were determined in Summer 2010. These were established to ensure that all students are proficient in reading/language arts and math by 2013-2014.

The State Board of Education adopted annual measurable objectives at its July 30, 2010 meeting.

Tennessee’s Targets for Reading/Language Arts and Math at the Elementary/Middle School Level Determined by the Percent of Students at the Proficient or Advanced Levels

| School Year | Reading/Language Arts Target | Math Target | Attendance Rate |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| 2002-2003 through 2003-2004 | 77% | 72% | 93% |
| 2004-2005 through 2006-2007 | 83% | 79% | 93% |
| 2007-2008 through 2008-2009 | 89% | 86% | 93% |
| 2009-2010 | 32% | 20% | 93% |
| 2010-2011 | 49% | 40% | 93% |
| 2011-2012 | 66% | 60% | 93% |
| 2012-2013 | 83% | 80% | 93% |
| 2013-2014 | 100% | 100% | 93% |

Tennessee’s Targets for Reading/Language Arts and Math at the High School Level Determined by the Percent of Students at the Proficient or Advanced Levels

| School Year | Reading/Language Arts Target | Math Target | Graduation Rate |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| 2002-2003 through 2003-2004 | 86% | 65% | 90% |
| 2004-2005 through 2006-2007 | 90% | 75% | 90% |
| 2007-2008 through 2008-2009 | 93% | 83% | 90% |
| 2009-2010 | 49% | 25% | 90% |
| 2010-2011 | 61% | 44% | 90% |
| 2011-2012 | 74% | 63% | 90% |
| 2012-2013 | 87% | 81% | 90% |
| 2013-2014 | 100% | 100% | 90% |

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|---|--|--|
| <p>3.2c What are the State's intermediate goals for determining adequate yearly progress?</p> | <p>State has established intermediate goals that increase in equal increments over the period covered by the State timeline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The first incremental increase takes effect not later than the 2004-2005 academic year. •Each following incremental increase occurs within three years. | <p>The State uses another method for calculating intermediate goals.</p> <p>The State does not include intermediate goals in its definition of adequate yearly progress.</p> |

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Intermediate AYP goals were determined in Summer 2010. As required by NCLB, the first incremental increase occurred during the 2004-05 school year. Subsequent increases will occur in not more than 3 years after that point. Refer to element 3.2b.

PRINCIPLE 4. State makes annual decisions about the achievement of all public schools and LEAs.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|--|--|
| 4.1 How does the State Accountability System make an annual determination of whether each public school and LEA in the State made AYP? | AYP decisions for each public school and LEA are made annually. ⁴ | AYP decisions for public schools and LEAs are not made annually. |

⁴ Decisions may be based upon several years of data and data may be averaged across grades within a public school [§1111(b)(2)(J)].

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

As required by both state and federal legislative requirements, AYP determinations are made annually for each public school and school district in the State.

Links to Supporting Documentation:

<http://state.tn.us/education/nclb/ayp/>

PRINCIPLE 5. All public schools and LEAs are held accountable for the achievement of individual subgroups.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|---|--|
| <p>5.1 How does the definition of adequate yearly progress include all the required student subgroups?</p> | <p>Identifies subgroups for defining adequate yearly progress: economically disadvantaged, major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency.</p> <p>Provides definition and data source of subgroups for adequate yearly progress.</p> | <p>State does not disaggregate data by each required student subgroup.</p> |

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Subgroup data are required for various AYP calculations including attendance rate, graduation rate and assessments. The TCAP administration collects the required subgroup data for assessments. The State's Education Information System (EIS) collects average daily attendance, average daily membership, and demographic data for subgroup attendance rates. The State also calculates graduation rates by race/ethnicity and in 2005-06 will implement a process to begin tracking individual student level data for calculating graduation rates for the other required subgroup populations.

The subgroups are defined as follows:

- Race/ethnicity – Beginning with the 2010-11 school year, Tennessee will report racial and ethnic data in the following major categories: Hispanic, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Black or African American, White
- Economically disadvantaged – Students eligible for free or reduced price lunch
- Students with disabilities – Students with disabilities as defined by IDEA receiving special education services
- Limited English Proficient – Students who are non-English language background and have not been reclassified as Fluent English proficient as defined by defined by State Board of Education policy 3.207, revised 8/22/2008.

Fluent English proficient are non-English language background students who show no difficulty in regular classroom performance and meet one of the following criteria:

1. upon initial enrollment in a Tennessee public school, scored Fluent English Proficient on all subsections of the state approved English as a Second Language screening assessment; or,
2. initially qualified as limited English proficient based on the state approved English as a Second Language screening assessment, received English as a Second Language services, and has now scored proficient on the state approved English Language Proficiency assessment.

Links to Supporting Documentation:

TCAP Administration Manual

<http://tennessee.gov/education/assessment/index.shtml>

Education Information System

<http://tennessee.gov/education/eis/>

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|---|--|---|
| <p>5.2 How are public schools and LEAs held accountable for the progress of student subgroups in the determination of adequate yearly progress?</p> | <p>Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for student subgroup achievement: economically disadvantaged, major ethnic and racial groups, students with disabilities, and limited English proficient students.</p> | <p>State does not include student subgroups in its State Accountability System.</p> |

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

State – All students aggregated across the state and all of the required subgroups must meet the annual performance objectives in reading/language arts and math with the application of a 95% confidence interval at the two levels, elementary-middle and high school to make AYP.

LEA – Each LEA as a whole and all of its required subgroups must reach annual performance objectives in reading/language arts and math with the application of a 95% confidence interval in order for the LEA to make AYP. Districts that cross both levels will be assessed for AYP status based on both levels.

School – Each school as a whole and all of its required subgroups must reach annual performance objectives in reading and math with the application of a 95% confidence interval in order for the school to make AYP. Schools that cross both levels will be assessed for AYP status based on both levels.

The State includes only scores from students who are continuously enrolled in the school or LEA for a full academic year. The State includes only subgroup populations in accountability and reporting decisions that have met the minimum number of students. The State ensures that 95% of all students and 95% of all subgroups (having met the minimum number of students) have participated in the assessment for a school or LEA as a requirement of AYP. The State applies the 1% flexibility provision at both the district and state level for the inclusion of proficient scores on alternative assessment for students with disabilities held to alternative standards.

Within a single school year AYP assessment cycle, in which students are “first time test takers” who retest subsequent to the official administration of an assessment, Tennessee will calculate AYP using the “best score” or results from subsequent test administrations. Tennessee’s school year begins on July 1 and ends on June 30th which deems the AYP assessment cycle as including, in this order, the summer, fall and spring assessment administrations. This moves the State from the prior practice of calculating only “first time test takers” for AYP purposes into the use of a “best score” for students taking multiple test administrations during the same school year AYP assessment cycle.

The State determines whether or not the LEA or the school meets the “Safe Harbor” provision of NCLB when the State determines that a subgroup has failed AYP.

| CRITICAL | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|---|---|--|
| <p>5.3 How are students with disabilities included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?</p> | <p>All students with disabilities participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or an alternate assessment based on grade level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.</p> <p>State demonstrates that students with disabilities are fully included in the State Accountability System.</p> | <p>The State Accountability System or State policy excludes students with disabilities from participating in the statewide assessments.</p> <p>State cannot demonstrate that alternate assessments measure grade-level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.</p> |

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

All students with disabilities participate in the TCAP with appropriate accommodations or the TCAP –Alternate. All TCAP and TCAP-Alternate results for students with disabilities are included as part of the AYP equation.

Scores from the TCAP-Alternate are reported in the four levels used by the State: below basic, basic, proficient, and advanced.

The scores for students with disabilities who take the alternate assessment are included in the assessment data in the accountability system within the parameters defined by federal statute and regulations. The State applies the 1% flexibility provision at both the district and state level for the inclusion of proficient scores on the alternative assessment for students with disabilities held to alternative standards.

Tennessee has developed criteria that define most severely cognitively disabled. Only those students meeting the criteria will be eligible to participate in the alternative assessment. Tennessee will permit districts to exceed the 1% cap on the number of proficient and advanced scores based on the alternate achievement standards that can be included in AYP calculations if the LEA establishes that the incidence of students with the most significant disabilities, as defined by the State, exceeds the limit and if the LEA documents circumstances that explain the higher percentage. Without approval of the waiver requesting the extension of the 1% cap, proficient scores exceeding this cap must be changed to below proficient for accountability purposes.

Tennessee has developed a modified academic achievement standards assessment for an additional 2% of students based on final USEDE regulations. Beginning in school year 2009-10, only eligible students, as determined by their IEP team, will participate in the modified achievement standards assessments. The scores for students with disabilities who take the modified achievement standards assessment will be included in the assessment data in the accountability system so long as the number of those proficient and advanced scores does not exceed 2% of all students in the grades assessed at the LEA and State levels. The 2.0 percent cap is necessary to ensure that modified academic achievement standards are used appropriately. Proficient scores exceeding this cap must be changed to below proficient for accountability purposes.

Beginning with data from school year 2009-10, Tennessee will no longer calculate a proxy to determine the percentage of special education that is equivalent to 2% of all students assessed and will no longer add the proxy to the percent of students with disabilities who are proficient or advanced.

Links to Supporting Evidence:

<http://state.tn.us/education/assessment/tsaccom.shtml>

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|--|--|
| <p>5.4 How are students with limited English proficiency included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?</p> | <p>All LEP students participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or a native language version of the general assessment based on grade level standards.</p> <p>State demonstrates that LEP students are fully included in the State Accountability System.</p> | <p>LEP students are not fully included in the State Accountability System.</p> |

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

To ensure compliance with NCLB, all limited English proficient (LEP) students are included in TCAP administration **with either the regular or accommodated assessment**. The state has developed an inclusion policy and a list of approved accommodations for LEP students. LEP students take the TCAP science and math assessment subtests and **the English as a Second Language screening assessment** the first academic year they are in an American school.

The Department has developed and implemented an English Linguistically Simplified Assessment (ELSA) form of the TCAP assessment for LEP students to measure their content knowledge in reading/language arts and math. This accommodated assessment is aligned with the State's content standards. All LEP students are required to participate in the TCAP program with allowable accommodations.

All LEP and Monitored Former Limited English Proficient (MFLEP) students are eligible to take the ELSA. Students participating in the ELSA must test in all required content areas with the ELSA. Students tested with the ELSA, who are not eligible to take the ELSA, will count in AYP calculations as non-participating and non-proficient. Scores are reported in the four levels used by the State: below basic, basic, proficient, and advanced.

The State will continue to provide LEP students who are in the first year in a U.S. school an option that may exempt them from one administration of the language arts subtest. Their participation in the TCAP assessments is included in the participation rate but not in the AYP determination.

Students who are identified as LEP and monitored for two years after they test proficient (Transition 1 and Transition 2 or MFLEP) are not counted in the LEP subgroup to meet the minimum N, but their scores are counted in that subgroup when the minimum N count is achieved by a school or district.

Links to Supporting Documentation:

ELL Policy and Accommodations

<http://www.state.tn.us/education/assessment/tsaccom.shtml>

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|---|---|--|
| <p>5.5 What is the State's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes? For accountability purposes?</p> | <p>State defines the number of students required in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes, and applies this definition consistently across the State.⁵</p> <p>Definition of subgroup will result in data that are statistically reliable.</p> | <p>State does not define the required number of students in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes.</p> <p>Definition is not applied consistently across the State.</p> <p>Definition does not result in data that are statistically reliable.</p> |

⁵ The minimum number is not required to be the same for reporting and accountability.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The minimum size of subgroups vary based on the purposes of the calculation. The purposes for adopting a minimum subgroup size are for reporting results and calculating accountability for results.

Reporting Results

The minimum number of students in a group required for TCAP reporting is an annual minimum n-count of 10.

Calculating Accountability for Results

For the purpose of reporting AYP, the minimum N count is 1% of the tested students or 45, whichever is greater. This value provides an acceptable balance between the requirement for statistical reliability in the AYP calculations and holding schools accountable for the maximum number of students. If a school or LEA meets or exceeds the minimum number of students in a required subgroup and meets the 95% participation rate requirement, then that school or LEA must meet annual performance objectives set by the State with the application of a 95% confidence interval.

Impact analyses conducted in Tennessee using subgroup population data indicate that the selection of a required minimum n-count of 45 does not adversely impact the percent of inclusion of any subgroup population. Tennessee uses n-counts generated from two grade spans; K – 8, and 9 – 12. Distribution of the total student population as well subgroups designated for reporting by NCLB indicate the following impact of 45 as a minimum n-count:

| Classification | Total # schools | Total Number of Students | Average # of students per school | # of schools meeting n-count | # of students reported based upon n-count |
|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| All students | 1306 | 421,648 | 323 | 1273 | 420,951 |
| White | 1270 | 299,655 | 236 | 1122 | 297,441 |
| Black | 1129 | 107,747 | 95 | 498 | 99,769 |
| Asian | 735 | 5,005 | 7 | 17 | 977 |
| Hispanic | 997 | 8,025 | 8 | 17 | 1162 |
| Native American | 536 | 1,277 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Low income | 1306 | 184,431 | 141 | 1114 | 179,628 |
| Special Needs | 1309 | 51,827 | 40 | 426 | 31,418 |
| Limited Eng. Prof. | 452 | 2,614 | 6 | 6 | 342 |

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|--|--|
| <p>5.6 How does the State Accountability System protect the privacy of students when reporting results and when determining AYP?</p> | <p>Definition does not reveal personally identifiable information.⁶</p> | <p>Definition reveals personally identifiable information.</p> |

⁶ The Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) prohibits an LEA that receives Federal funds from releasing, without the prior written consent of a student’s parents, any personally identifiable information contained in a student’s education record.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The minimum number of students in a LEA or school group required for *reporting results*, but not for determining AYP or participation rates, is 10. Regardless of the n-count, under no circumstances is the data reported result in the identification of individual student performance, i.e., the reporting of 0% proficient. Criteria established for necessary AYP and/or participation rate n-counts of 45 were determined based upon rationale presented in 5.5.

When all students in a subgroup perform at the same level (for example, all are not proficient or all are proficient), then Tennessee reports the data as <5% of the particular subgroup was not proficient on the particular measure or conversely that >95% of the students were proficient on the particular measure.

PRINCIPLE 6. State definition of AYP is based primarily on the State’s academic assessments.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|---|--|--|
| <p>6.1 How is the State’s definition of adequate yearly progress based primarily on academic assessments?</p> | <p>Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on assessments.⁷</p> <p>Plan clearly identifies which assessments are included in accountability.</p> | <p>Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on non-academic indicators or indicators other than the State assessments.</p> |

⁷ State Assessment System will be reviewed by the Standards and Assessments Peer Review Team.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The State's definition of AYP includes primarily academic indicators:

1. For grades 3-8:
 - Reading/language arts/writing and math results; and,
 - Attendance rate.
2. For high school;
 - High School Reading/Language Arts and Writing assessment results and High School Math; and,
 - Graduation rate.

Reading/language arts in grades 3-8 includes the standards-based assessment and the performance-based writing assessment.

Reading/language arts in high school includes the standards-based Reading/Language Arts assessment and the 11th grade performance based writing assessment.

PRINCIPLE 7. State definition of AYP includes graduation rates for public High schools and an additional indicator selected by the State for public Middle and public Elementary schools (such as attendance rates).

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|---|--|---|
| <p>7.1 What is the State definition for the public high school graduation rate?</p> | <p>State definition of graduation rate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calculates the percentage of students, measured from the beginning of the school year, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the state’s academic standards) in the standard number of years; or, • Uses another more accurate definition that has been approved by the Secretary; and • Must avoid counting a dropout as a transfer. <p>Graduation rate is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause⁸ to make AYP.</p> | <p>State definition of public high school graduation rate does not meet these criteria.</p> |

⁸ See USC 6311(b)(2)(I)(i), and 34 C.F.R. 200.20(b)

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Tennessee's definition of graduation rate includes only those students who receive diplomas within the standard number of years including summer school terms. Beginning with the 2009-10 school year, Tennessee will calculate graduation rates by all required subgroups (race/ethnicity, economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, and limited English proficient.) The graduation rate numerator only includes students who receive a regular diploma in the standard number of years. The numerator does not include students who obtain a GED, a special education diploma, or certificate of attendance.

Because 2009-10 is the first school year the Department will calculate graduation rates for all required subgroups, the Department will continue to use the event dropout rate for economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, and limited English proficient to show improvement from the prior year for the safe harbor provision. Because two years of adjusted cohort graduation rate data will be available beginning with the 2010-11 school year, the Department will use the graduation rate to show improvement for all subgroups. For high schools not serving grade 12 that do not have a graduation rate, the event dropout rate will continue to be used as the additional indicator.

The Department does not count transfers as dropouts and includes specific guidance in the Attendance Manual to local educational agencies. Tennessee's Education Information System (EIS) calculates average daily attendance and average daily membership for the state's district funding formula. It assigns each student a unique identifier and collects each student's enrollment, exiting, and completion information. The system is precise and monitored by state personnel as the per pupil expenditure follows the student from system to system. Each student is tracked from school to school and system to system with his identifying number for the entire state. This process guarantees that no student who has dropped out of school will be counted as a transfer.

The State Board of Education adopted a graduation rate measurable objective as 90% or improvement. A school or district may meet the 90% by using the current year data, the most recent two years' worth of data, or a three-year rolling average. The Department applies previous-year graduation rates to AYP.

If the 90% measurable objective is not met, a school or district may meet improvement based on the annual target of the prescribed graduation rate improvement track. A school or district may also meet improvement if all 3 of the following conditions are met: 1) the graduation rate is within 2 percentage points of the prescribed graduation improvement track, and; 2) the graduation rate is maintained or improved from the prior year, and; 3) overall improvement is shown on the event dropout rate.

The 2009-10 school year graduation rate calculation is based on the National Governor's Association (NGA) adjusted cohort formula based on the students' year entered ninth grade.

(Regular diplomas earned in 4 years for current cohort* / All members of current cohort)

* With the NGA adjusted cohort graduation rate, the standard number of years for students with disabilities, students with limited English proficiency and students attending middle college high schools is defined as 5 years plus any summer school terms including the summer school term after 12th grade. These students will also be included in the cohort. Students in these categories earning a regular diploma within 5 years will be included in both the numerator and denominator of the calculation.

Beginning with the 2010-11 school year, the graduation rate calculation is based on the US DOE 4-year adjusted cohort formula based on the students' year entered ninth grade.

(Regular diplomas earned in 4 years for current cohort** / All members of current cohort)

** With the US DOE 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, the standard number of years for all students is defined as 4 years plus any summer school terms including the summer school term after 12th grade. Only students entering ninth grade 4 years prior will be included in the cohort. Only students earning a regular diploma within 4 years will be included in the numerator.

Links to Supporting Evidence:

<http://tennessee.gov/education/schapproval/attendancemanual/>

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|---|--|
| <p>7.2 What is the State's additional academic indicator for public elementary schools for the definition of AYP? For public middle schools for the definition of AYP?</p> | <p>State defines the additional academic indicators, e.g., additional State or locally administered assessments not included in the State assessment system, grade-to-grade retention rates or attendance rates.⁹</p> <p>An additional academic indicator is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause to make AYP.</p> | <p>State has not defined an additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools.</p> |

⁹ NCLB only lists these indicators as examples.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The additional indicator at the elementary and middle school levels is attendance rate.

The State collects attendance rate at the elementary and middle school levels disaggregated by the required subgroups.

The State Board of Education adopted an attendance rate measurable objective of 93% or improvement at its June 23, 2004 meeting. A school or district may meet this objective by using the current year data, the most recent two years' worth of data, or a three-year rolling average.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|--|---|
| <p>7.3 Are the State's academic indicators valid and reliable?</p> | <p>State has defined academic indicators that are valid and reliable.</p> <p>State has defined academic indicators that are consistent with nationally recognized standards, if any.</p> | <p>State has an academic indicator that is not valid and reliable.</p> <p>State has an academic indicator that is not consistent with nationally recognized standards.</p> <p>State has an academic indicator that is not consistent within grade levels.</p> |

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The State has collected and analyzed dropout and attendance data for many years with increased accuracy. As the State establishes its system for collecting and analyzing data for the graduation rate, it will ensure that the process will meet a strict test for reliability and validity. The other indicator for elementary/middle school, attendance, will meet the strict tests of reliability and validity required through our data collection system.

PRINCIPLE 8. AYP is based on reading/language arts and mathematics achievement objectives.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|--|--|
| <p>8.1 Does the state measure achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics separately for determining AYP?</p> | <p>State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs separately measures reading/language arts and mathematics.¹⁰</p> <p>AYP is a separate calculation for reading/language arts and mathematics for each group, public school, and LEA.</p> | <p>State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs averages or combines achievement across reading/language arts and mathematics.</p> |

¹⁰ If the state has more than one assessment to cover its language arts standards, the State must create a method for including scores from all the relevant assessments.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

A separate determination is made annually in reading/language arts and math. An LEA or school must reach performance objectives in both content areas with the application of a 95% confidence interval in order to make AYP.

PRINCIPLE 9. State Accountability System is statistically valid and reliable.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|---|--|
| <p>9.1 How do AYP determinations meet the State's standard for acceptable reliability?</p> | <p>State has defined a method for determining an acceptable level of reliability (decision consistency) for AYP decisions.</p> <p>State provides evidence that decision consistency is (1) within the range deemed acceptable to the State, and (2) meets professional standards and practice.</p> <p>State publicly reports the estimate of decision consistency, and incorporates it appropriately into accountability decisions.</p> <p>State updates analysis and reporting of decision consistency at appropriate intervals.</p> | <p>State does not have an acceptable method for determining reliability (decision consistency) of accountability decisions, e.g., it reports only reliability coefficients for its assessments.</p> <p>State has parameters for acceptable reliability; however, the actual reliability (decision consistency) falls outside those parameters.</p> <p>State's evidence regarding accountability reliability (decision consistency) is not updated.</p> |

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The criterion referenced assessments utilized to underpin the accountability process specified in NCLB have been developed specifically to measure student proficiency levels relative to the state curriculum framework. The alignment of the assessment items comprising the annual tests are subject to state approval before each administration. This process provides content validity.

Adequate Yearly Progress necessary to reach 100% by the 2013-2014 school year was computed utilizing the percentages of student subgroups in Tennessee whose participation rates equal or exceed 95% and was based upon success in the attainment of proficiency standards objectively established by the collective deliberation of experts and practitioners in the appropriate curricular areas. A scientifically based on going analysis of performance and progress will inform the state of the appropriateness of both the utilization of the assessment and the instruction relative to the approved curricular frameworks. These analyses should provide construct validity.

The State studies the decisions that have been made on AYP determinations on an annual basis. The State reviews the validity and reliability of those determinations and makes adjustments based on this review.

Because of the Department's review of the AYP determinations made for the first time on 2002-2003 data, the Department had proposed and subsequently received approval to make revisions to its original accountability plan. Because 47% of Tennessee schools and 92% of its districts were identified as not making AYP based on the 2002-2003 data, the State contended that its AYP model needed to include the application of a 95% confidence interval to improve the validity and reliability of its AYP decisions. When impact analysis was done, it was determined that identification of schools and districts as failing AYP based on 2002-2003 data would decrease substantially. Only 21.8% of elementary/middle schools would have been identified as failing instead of 46.5%. High schools failing AYP would decrease from 56% to 31.1%. Districts failing elementary/middle level would decrease from 88.3% to 77.4% while at the high school level the reduction would be 68.3% to 40.7%.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|---|--|
| 9.2 What is the State's process for making valid AYP determinations? | State has established a process for public schools and LEAs to appeal an accountability decision. | State does not have a system for handling appeals of accountability decisions. |
| | | |

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Assessments are reviewed annually before administration to assure alignment with state content standards. Sample results are analyzed to determine that assessment scales validly reflect performance for students at each 5th percentile level of performance (i.e., 5th, 10th, ...80th...).

Any school may appeal to the district and districts to the state decisions made regarding AYP. In the case of AYP decisions regarding schools, the LEA must consider the appeal for transmission to the State. If the LEA agrees with the appeal and submits it to the State, the State considers the appeal. The decision is made and conveyed to the school within the 30 days timeframe. Under State law, the State is responsible for the final determination of schools in improvement categories.

Similarly, if a district appeals a decision regarding AYP, the State must make a final determination within 30 days of the date of the appeal.

The State provides technical assistance to schools and LEAs with the appeals process.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|---|--|---|
| <p>9.3 How has the State planned for incorporating into its definition of AYP anticipated changes in assessments?</p> | <p>State has a plan to maintain continuity in AYP decisions necessary for validity through planned assessment changes, and other changes necessary to comply fully with NCLB.¹¹</p> <p>State has a plan for including new public schools in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a plan for periodically reviewing its State Accountability System, so that unforeseen changes can be quickly addressed.</p> | <p>State's transition plan interrupts annual determination of AYP.</p> <p>State does not have a plan for handling changes: e.g., to its assessment system, or the addition of new public schools.</p> |

¹¹ Several events may occur which necessitate such a plan. For example, (1) the State may need to include additional assessments in grades 3-8 by 2005-2006; (2) the State may revise content and/or academic achievement standards; (3) the State may need to recalculate the starting point with the addition of new assessments; or (4) the State may need to incorporate the graduation rate or other indicators into its State Accountability System. These events may require new calculations of validity and reliability.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Tennessee has implemented a standards-based assessment system in grades 3-8 in reading/language arts, math, science, and social studies. The State has established starting points for reading/language arts and math for elementary/middle school level determined by the results of the grades 3, 5, and 8 in Summer 2003. The starting point for science was established in Summer 2004.

Tennessee annually reviews how AYP decisions are applied regarding validity and reliability to determine any revisions necessary in its accountability system

Link to Supporting Documentation:

<http://www.state.tn.us/education/assessment/>

PRINCIPLE 10. In order for a public school or LEA to make AYP, the State ensures that it assessed at least 95% of the students enrolled in each subgroup.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|--|---|
| <p>10.1 What is the State's method for calculating participation rates in the State assessments for use in AYP determinations?</p> | <p>State has a procedure to determine the number of absent or untested students (by subgroup and aggregate).</p> <p>State has a procedure to determine the denominator (total enrollment) for the 95% calculation (by subgroup and aggregate).</p> <p>Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for reaching the 95% assessed goal.</p> | <p>The state does not have a procedure for determining the rate of students participating in statewide assessments.</p> <p>Public schools and LEAs are not held accountable for testing at least 95% of their students.</p> |

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Tennessee determined participation rates for the first time in Spring 2003. Only schools and LEAs that meet the 95% participation rate for all students and each subgroup meet AYP requirements unless the size of the subgroup does not meet the minimum number set for participation rate purposes (45). To meet this requirement, the State will use the most current year, the most current two years, or the most current three years participation rate data.

Schools are responsible for completing answer sheets for any student enrolled in grades and subjects included in the assessment program. The participation rate for all students and required subgroups are determined by the number of students participating in the assessment divided by the number of students enrolled (as indicated by the number of answer sheets). Only students who have a significant medical emergency may be exempted from testing and not counted in the participation rate calculation. Students with invalid assessment scores are counted only in the denominator of the participation rate calculation and are not counted in the numerator. These data are randomly audited for accuracy.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|---|---|---|
| <p>10.2 What is the State's policy for determining when the 95% assessed requirement should be applied?</p> | <p>State has a policy that implements the regulation regarding the use of 95% allowance when the group is statistically significant according to State rules.</p> | <p>State does not have a procedure for making this determination.</p> |

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The State bases its 95% calculation upon the student membership documentation provided by each LEA and school during testing. Schools and LEAs in which fewer than 95% of any subgroup fails to participate in the state assessment fail AYP, unless the size of the subgroup does not meet the minimum number set for accountability purposes (i.e. 45). These data are randomly audited for accuracy.

Appendix A**Required Data Elements for State Report Card****1111(h)(1)(C)**

1. Information, in the aggregate, on student achievement at each proficiency level on the State academic assessments (disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged, except that such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.
2. Information that provides a comparison between the actual achievement levels of each student subgroup and the State's annual measurable objectives for each such group of students on each of the academic assessments.
3. The percentage of students not tested (disaggregated by the student subgroups), except that such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.
4. The most recent 2-year trend in student achievement in each subject area, and for each grade level, for the required assessments.
5. Aggregate information on any other indicators used by the State to determine the adequate yearly progress of students in achieving State academic achievement standards disaggregated by student subgroups.
6. Graduation rates for secondary school students disaggregated by student subgroups.
7. Information on the performance of local educational agencies in the State regarding making adequate yearly progress, including the number and names of each school identified for school improvement under section 1116.
8. The professional qualifications of teachers in the State, the percentage of such teachers teaching with emergency or provisional credentials, and the percentage of classes in the State not taught by highly qualified teachers, in the aggregate and disaggregated by high-poverty compared to low-poverty schools which (for this purpose) means schools in the top quartile of poverty and the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.

Attachment A Tennessee Accountability Chart for Schools

| Target | School Improvement 1 (1 st Year Improvement Status) | School Improvement 2 (2 nd Year Improvement Status) | Corrective Action (3 rd Year Improvement Status) | Restructuring 1 (4 th Year Improvement Status) | Restructuring 2 – Alternative Governance (5 th Year Improvement Status) | State/LEA Reconstitution Plan |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| After 1st Year Not Making AYP (Beginning Year 2) | After 2nd Year Not Making AYP (Beginning of Year 3) | After 3rd Year Not Making AYP (Beginning of Year 4) | After 4th Year Not Making AYP (Beginning of Year 5) | After 5th Year Not Making AYP (Beginning of Year 6) | After 6th Year Not Making AYP (Beginning of Year 7) | After 7th Year Not Making AYP (Beginning of Year 8) |
| | <p>TCA-49-1-602 The commissioner of education shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Publicly identify all schools that are placed in improvement status; and ◆ Study all schools placed in improvement status. <p>publicly identify all schools that are placed in improvement status.</p> <p>NCLB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Public Notification and Dissemination ◆ Public School Choice ◆ Revise SIP (including 10% of funding used for professional development each year school identified) ◆ Plan with Outside Expert ◆ Technical Assistance ◆ Peer Review of SIP | <p>TCA-49-1-602 The commissioner of education shall have the authority to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Approve the allocation of state discretionary grants to the school; and/or ◆ Provide technical assistance to the school through an outside expert. <p>The director of each LEA shall have responsibility for the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Prompt Parent Notification; and ◆ Revision of SIP <p>NCLB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Public Notification and Dissemination ◆ Public School Choice ◆ Supplemental Services ◆ Technical Assistance | <p>TCA-49-1-602 The commissioner of education shall have the authority to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Approve LEA allocation of financial resources to school; ◆ Appoint a local community review committee to approve and monitor the SIP; and ◆ Implement at least one (1) of the following Corrective Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Replace or reassign staff ◆ Mandate a new research-based curriculum ◆ Significantly decrease management authority at school ◆ Appoint instructional consultants ◆ Reorganize internal management structure <p>The director of each LEA shall have responsibility for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Prompt Parent Notification; ◆ Principal Performance Contract; ◆ Provide Remediation; ◆ Public School Choice; ◆ Revision of SIP <p>NCLB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Public Notification and Dissemination ◆ Public School Choice ◆ Supplemental Services ◆ Technical Assistance ◆ Corrective Action (implement at least 1 of the following:): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Replace staff ◆ New curriculum ◆ Significantly decrease management authority at the school ◆ Appoint outside expert ◆ Reorganize internal organization | <p>TCA-49-1-602 The commissioner of education shall have the authority to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Approve LEA allocation of financial resources to school; ◆ Approve LEA allocation of personnel resources to school; ◆ Present options for school to plan for alternative governance which may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Contract with IHE ◆ Removing school from jurisdiction of LEA ◆ Restructuring as public charter school ◆ Replacing school’s staff, including principal, relevant to failure <p>The director of each LEA shall have responsibility for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Prompt Parent Notification; ◆ Principal Performance Contract; ◆ Provide Remediation; ◆ Public School Choice; ◆ Prepare alternative governance plan from options provided by commissioner <p>NCLB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Public Notification and Dissemination ◆ Public School Choice ◆ Supplemental Services ◆ Technical Assistance ◆ Continue to Implement Corrective Action ◆ Prepare a Plan and Make Necessary Arrangements for Alternative Governance (Charter School, Replace Staff, Contract for Private Management, Other Major Restructure) | <p>TCA-49-1-602 The commissioner of education shall have the authority to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Approve LEA allocation of financial resources to school; ◆ Approve LEA allocation of personnel resources to school <p>The director of each LEA shall have responsibility for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Prompt Parent Notification; ◆ Principal Performance Contract; ◆ Provide Remediation; ◆ Public School Choice; ◆ Implement alternative governance plan from options provided by commissioner <p>NCLB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Prompt Notification of Affected Teachers & Parents ◆ Technical Assistance ◆ Implement Alternative Governance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Reopen as public charter school ◆ Replace all or most of relevant school staff ◆ Contract with a private management company ◆ State takeover ◆ Any other major restructuring | <p>NCLB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Prompt Notification of Affected Teachers & Parents ◆ Technical Assistance ◆ Implement Alternative Governance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Reopen as public charter school ◆ Replace all or most of relevant school staff ◆ Contract with a private management company ◆ State takeover ◆ Any other major restructuring |

Attachment B
Tennessee Accountability Chart for School Systems / LEAs

| Target | LEA Improvement 1 (1 st Year Improvement Status) | LEA Improvement 2 (2 nd Year Improvement Status) | LEA Corrective Action (3 rd Year Improvement Status) | LEA Restructuring 1 (4 th Year Improvement Status) | LEA Restructuring 2 – Alternative Governance (5 th Year Improvement Status) | State/LEA Reconstitution Plan |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| After 1st Year Not Making AYP (Beginning Year 2) | After 2nd Year Not Making AYP (Beginning of Year 3) | After 3rd Year Not Making AYP (Beginning of Year 4) | After 4th Year Not Making AYP (Beginning of Year 5) | After 5th Year Not Making AYP (Beginning of Year 6) | After 6th Year Not Making AYP (Beginning of Year 7) | After 7th Year Not Making AYP (Beginning of Year 8) |
| | <p>TCA-49-1-602 The commissioner of education shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Publicly identify all LEAs that are placed in improvement status; and ◆ Study all LEAs placed in improvement status. <p>NCLB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Parent Notification and Dissemination ◆ Develop or Revise TCSPP within 3 months (including 10% of funding used for professional development each year system identified) ◆ Implement TCSPP expeditiously (but no later than beginning of next school year) ◆ Technical Assistance | <p>TCA-49-1-602 The commissioner of education shall have the authority to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Approve the allocation of state discretionary grants to schools within the LEA; and ◆ Provide technical assistance to the LEA through an outside expert. <p>The director of each LEA shall have responsibility for the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Prompt Parent Notification; and ◆ Revision of TCSPP <p>NCLB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Parent Notification and Dissemination ◆ Develop or Revise TCSPP within 3 months (including 10% of funding used for professional development each year system identified) ◆ Implement TCSPP expeditiously (but no later than beginning of next school year) ◆ Technical Assistance | <p>TCA-49-1-602 The commissioner of education shall have the authority to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Approve LEA allocation of financial resources to schools within LEA; ◆ Appoint a local community review committee to approve and monitor the TCSPP; and ◆ Implement at least one (1) of the following Corrective Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Replace LEA personnel relevant to failure to make adequate yearly progress; ◆ Mandate a new, research-based curriculum; ◆ Appoint outside management or instructional consultants; or ◆ Reorganize internal management structure <p>The director of each LEA shall have responsibility for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Prompt Parent Notification; ◆ Provide Remediation; and ◆ Revision of TCSPP <p>NCLB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Parent Notification and Dissemination ◆ Technical Assistance ◆ SDE shall take at least one of the following corrective actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Deferring programmatic funds or reducing administrative funds ◆ New curriculum ◆ Replace LEA personnel relevant to failure ◆ Remove particular schools from LEA jurisdiction ◆ Appoint receiver / trustee ◆ Abolish / restructure LEA ◆ Public LEA Choice | <p>TCA-49-1-602 The commissioner of education shall have the authority to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Approve LEA allocation of financial resources to schools within LEA; ◆ Approve LEA allocation of personnel resources to schools within LEA; ◆ Continue to Implement at least one (1) of the following Corrective Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Replace LEA personnel relevant to failure to make adequate progress; ◆ Mandate a new, research-based curriculum; ◆ Appoint outside management or instructional consultants; or ◆ Reorganize internal management structure <p>The director of each LEA shall have responsibility for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Prompt Parent Notification; ◆ Provide Remediation; and ◆ Revision of TCSPP <p>NCLB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Parent Notification and Dissemination ◆ Technical Assistance ◆ SDE shall take at least one of the following corrective actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Deferring programmatic funds or reducing administrative funds ◆ New curriculum ◆ Replace LEA personnel relevant to failure ◆ Remove particular schools from LEA jurisdiction ◆ Appoint receiver / trustee ◆ Abolish / restructure LEA ◆ Public LEA Choice | <p>TCA-49-1-602 The commissioner of education shall have the authority to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Assume any or all powers of governance for LEA; provided, however the LEA will continue to be accountable for the match required by the BEP funding formula for students served; ◆ Recommend to the state board that the director of the LEA be replaced; and ◆ Recommend to the state board that some or all of the local board of education members be replaced <p>NCLB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Parent Notification and Dissemination ◆ Technical Assistance ◆ SDE shall take at least one of the following corrective actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Deferring programmatic funds or reducing administrative funds ◆ New curriculum ◆ Replace LEA personnel relevant to failure ◆ Remove particular schools from LEA jurisdiction ◆ Appoint receiver / trustee ◆ Abolish / restructure LEA ◆ Public LEA Choice | <p>NCLB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Parent Notification and Dissemination ◆ Technical Assistance ◆ SDE shall take at least one of the following corrective actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Defer programmatic funds or reducing administrative funds ◆ New curriculum ◆ Replace LEA personnel relevant to failure ◆ Remove particular schools from LEA jurisdiction ◆ Appoint receiver / trustee ◆ Abolish / restructure LEA ◆ Public LEA Choice |

Contact for more information:

Dr. Debra E. Owens
Tennessee Department of Education
5th Floor-Andrew Johnson Tower
710 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, Tennessee 37243

Phone: (615) 532-6297
Fax: (615) 253-5706
E-mail: Debbie.Owens@tn.gov