# ESEA Flexibility

## Request

November 14, 2011

U.S. Department of Education
Washington, DC 20202

OMB Number: Approval pending

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is pending. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 336 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537.

# Table Of Contents

Insert page numbers prior to submitting the request, and place the table of contents in front of the SEA's flexibility request.


| Contents | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| Cover Sheet for ESEA Flexibility Request | | |
| Waivers | | 5 |
| Assurances | | 7 |
| Consultation | | 9 |
| Evaluation | | 12 |
| Overview of SEA's ESEA Flexibility Request | | 12 |
| **Principle 1: College- and Career-Ready Expectations for All Students** | | 14 |
| 1.A | Adopt college-and career-ready standards | 14 |
| 1.B | Transition to college- and career-ready standards | 14 |
| 1.C | Develop and administer annual, statewide, aligned, high-quality assessments that measure student growth | 29 |
| **Principle 2: State-Developed Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support** | | 31 |
| 2.A | Develop and implement a State-based system of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support | 31 |
| 2.B | Set ambitious but achievable annual measurable objectives | 37 |
| 2.C | Reward schools | 46 |
| 2.D | Priority schools | 48 |
| 2.E | Focus schools | 60 |
| 2.F | Provide incentives and supports for other Title I schools | 66 |
| 2.G | Build SEA, LEA, and school capacity to improve student learning | 67 |
| **Principle 3: Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership** | | 71 |
| 3.A | Develop and adopt guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems | 71 |
| 3.B | Ensure LEAs implement teacher and principal evaluation and support systems | 74 |

## TABLE OF CONTENTS, CONTINUED

For each attachment included in the *ESEA Flexibility Request*, label the attachment with the corresponding number from the list of attachments below and indicate the page number where the attachment is located. If an attachment is not applicable to the SEA's request, indicate "N/A" instead of a page number. Reference relevant attachments in the narrative portions of the request.


| LABEL | LIST OF APPENDICES | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Stakeholder Engagement Log | A-1 |
| 2 | Common Core Standards Implementation Timeline | A-5 |
| 3 | Public Accountability: Snapshot of Current Report Card | A-8 |
| 4 | Tennessee's New Accountability System and AMOs | A-9 |
| 5 | State-level AMO Targets | A-12 |
| 6 | Reward Schools Methodology | A-15 |
| 7 | Priority Schools Methodology | A-19 |
| 8 | Focus Schools Methodology | A-22 |
| 9 | Accountability System: Resources and Timeline for Implementation | A-29 |
| 10 | Principal Evaluation Processes and Timelines | A-30 |
| 11 | Final Report of the Teacher Evaluation Advisory Committee (TEAC) | A-34 |
| 12 | Tennessee's Plan to Measure Student Growth in Untested Subjects and Grades | A-36 |
| 13 | Early Evidence from Tennessee's Teacher Evaluation Field Test | A-38 |
| 14 | TEAM Educator Rubric | A-65 |
| 15 | Sample Administrator Evaluation Observation Form | A-71 |
| 16 | Sample Application for Approval of Alternate Qualitative Evaluation Instrument/Process Developer Form | A-75 |
| 17 | Sample TEAM Updates | A-78 |
| 18 | TEAM Data System: Expanded Options for 15% Approved Achievement Measures | A-86 |
| 19 | TEAM Data System Overview | A-88 |



| LABEL | LIST OF ATTACHMENTS | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Notice to LEAs | A-89 |
| 2 | Comments on request received from LEAs (if applicable) | A-95 |
| 3 | Notice and information provided to the public regarding the request | A-98 |
| 4 | Evidence that the State has formally adopted college- and career-ready content standards consistent with the State's standards adoption process | A-99 |
| 5 | Memorandum of understanding or letter from a State network of institutions of higher education (IHEs) certifying that meeting the State's standards corresponds to being college- and career-ready without | N/A |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | the need for remedial coursework at the postsecondary level (if applicable) | |
| 6 | State's Race to the Top Assessment Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) (if applicable) | A-111 |
| 7 | Evidence that the SEA has submitted high-quality assessments and academic achievement standards to the Department for peer review, or a timeline of when the SEA will submit the assessments and academic achievement standards to the Department for peer review (if applicable) | N/A |
| 8 | A copy of the average statewide proficiency based on assessments administered in the 2010–2011 school year in reading/language arts and mathematics for the "all students" group and all subgroups (if applicable). | A-117 |
| 9 | Table 2: Reward, Priority, and Focus Schools | A-122 |
| 10 | A copy of any guidelines that the SEA has already developed and adopted for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems (if applicable). | A-134 |
| 11 | Evidence that the SEA has adopted one or more guidelines of local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems | A-139 |

## COVER SHEET FOR ESEA FLEXIBILITY REQUEST

| Legal Name of Requester: | Requester's Mailing Address: |
|---|---|
| Kevin S. Huffman | Tennessee Department of Education<br>6th Floor, Andrew Johnson Tower<br>710 James Robertson Parkway<br>Nashville, TN 37243 |

State Contact for the ESEA Flexibility Request

Name: Kevin S. Huffman

Position and Office: Tennessee Commissioner of Education

Contact's Mailing Address:
Tennessee Department of Education
6th Floor, Andrew Johnson Tower
710 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, TN 37243
Telephone: 615-741-5158

Fax: 615-532-4791

Email address: Kevin.S.Huffman@tn.gov

| Chief State School Officer (Printed Name):<br>Kevin Huffman | Telephone:<br>615-741-5158 |
|---|---|
| Signature of the Chief State School Officer:<br><br>X_____ | Date:<br>November 14, 2011 |

The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to meet all principles of the ESEA Flexibility.

## Waivers

By submitting this flexibility request, the SEA requests flexibility through waivers of the ten ESEA requirements listed below and their associated regulatory, administrative, and reporting requirements by checking each of the boxes below. The provisions below represent the general areas of flexibility requested; a chart appended to the document titled *ESEA Flexibility Frequently Asked Questions* enumerates each specific provision of which the SEA requests a waiver, which the SEA incorporates into its request by reference.

☒ 1. The requirements in ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(E)-(H) that prescribe how an SEA must establish annual measurable objectives (AMOs) for determining adequate yearly progress (AYP) to ensure that all students meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement on the State's assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics no later than the end of the 2013–2014 school year. The SEA requests this waiver to develop new ambitious but achievable AMOs in reading/language arts and mathematics in order to provide meaningful goals that are used to guide support and improvement efforts for the State, LEAs, schools, and student subgroups.

☒ 2. The requirements in ESEA section 1116(b) for an LEA to identify for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, as appropriate, a Title I school that fails, for two consecutive years or more, to make AYP, and for a school so identified and its LEA to take certain improvement actions. The SEA requests this waiver so that an LEA and its Title I schools need not comply with these requirements.

☒ 3. The requirements in ESEA section 1116(c) for an SEA to identify for improvement or corrective action, as appropriate, an LEA that, for two consecutive years or more, fails to make AYP, and for an LEA so identified and its SEA to take certain improvement actions. The SEA requests this waiver so that it need not comply with these requirements with respect to its LEAs.

☒ 4. The requirements in ESEA sections 6213(b) and 6224(e) that limit participation in, and use of funds under the Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) and Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) programs based on whether an LEA has made AYP and is complying with the requirements in ESEA section 1116. The SEA requests this waiver so that an LEA that receives SRSA or RLIS funds may use those funds for any authorized purpose regardless of whether the LEA makes AYP.

☒ 5. The requirement in ESEA section 1114(a)(1) that a school have a poverty percentage of 40 percent or more in order to operate a schoolwide program. The SEA requests this waiver so that an LEA may implement interventions consistent with the turnaround principles or interventions that are based on the needs of the students in the school and designed to enhance the entire educational program in a school in any of its priority and

focus schools, as appropriate, even if those schools do not have a poverty percentage of 40 percent or more.

☒ 6. The requirement in ESEA section 1003(a) for an SEA to distribute funds reserved under that section only to LEAs with schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. The SEA requests this waiver so that it may allocate section 1003(a) funds to its LEAs in order to serve any of the State's priority and focus schools.

☒ 7. The provision in ESEA section 1117(c)(2)(A) that authorizes an SEA to reserve Title I, Part A funds to reward a Title I school that (1) significantly closed the achievement gap between subgroups in the school; or (2) has exceeded AYP for two or more consecutive years. The SEA requests this waiver so that it may use funds reserved under ESEA section 1117(c)(2)(A) for any of the State's reward schools.

☒ 8. The requirements in ESEA section 2141(a), (b), and (c) for an LEA and SEA to comply with certain requirements for improvement plans regarding highly qualified teachers. The SEA requests this waiver to allow the SEA and its LEAs to focus on developing and implementing more meaningful evaluation and support systems.

☒ 9. The limitations in ESEA section 6123 that limit the amount of funds an SEA or LEA may transfer from certain ESEA programs to other ESEA programs. The SEA requests this waiver so that it and its LEAs may transfer up to 100 percent of the funds it receives under the authorized programs among those programs and into Title I, Part A.

☒ 10. The requirements in ESEA section 1003(g)(4) and the definition of a Tier I school in Section I.A.3 of the School Improvement Grants (SIG) final requirements. The SEA requests this waiver so that it may award SIG funds to an LEA to implement one of the four SIG models in any of the State's priority schools.

*Optional Flexibility:*

An SEA should check the box below only if it chooses to request a waiver of the following requirements:

☒ The requirements in ESEA sections 4201(b)(1)(A) and 4204(b)(2)(A) that restrict the activities provided by a community learning center under the Twenty-First Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) program to activities provided only during non-school hours or periods when school is not in session (*i.e.*, before and after school or during summer recess). The SEA requests this waiver so that 21st CCLC funds may be used to support expanded learning time during the school day in addition to activities during non-school hours or periods when school is not in session.

## ASSURANCES

By submitting this application, the SEA assures that:

☒ 1. It requests waivers of the above-referenced requirements based on its agreement to meet Principles 1 through 4 of the flexibility, as described throughout the remainder of this request.

☒ 2. It will adopt English language proficiency (ELP) standards that correspond to the State's college- and career-ready standards, consistent with the requirement in ESEA section 3113(b)(2), and that reflect the academic language skills necessary to access and meet the new college- and career-ready standards, no later than the 2013–2014 school year. (Principle 1)

☒ 3. It will develop and administer no later than the 2014–2015 school year alternate assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities that are consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.6(a)(2) and are aligned with the State's college- and career-ready standards. (Principle 1)

☒ 4. It will develop and administer ELP assessments aligned with the State's ELP standards, consistent with the requirements in ESEA sections 1111(b)(7), 3113(b)(2), and 3122(a)(3)(A)(ii). (Principle 1)

☒ 5. It will report annually to the public on college-going and college credit-accumulation rates for all students and subgroups of students in each LEA and each public high school in the State. (Principle 1)

☒ 6. If the SEA includes student achievement on assessments in addition to reading/language arts and mathematics in its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system and uses achievement on those assessments to identify priority and focus schools, it has technical documentation, which can be made available to the Department upon request, demonstrating that the assessments are administered statewide; include all students, including by providing appropriate accommodations for English Learners and students with disabilities, as well as alternate assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.6(a)(2); and are valid and reliable for use in the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system. (Principle 2)

☒ 7. It will report to the public its lists of reward schools, priority schools, and focus schools at the time the SEA is approved to implement the flexibility, and annually thereafter, it will publicly recognize its reward schools. (Principle 2)

☒ 8. It will report annually to the public and each LEA will annually report to its SEA and to the public, beginning no later than the 2014–2015 school year, on the aggregate distribution of teachers and principals by performance level, including the percentage of teachers and principals by performance level at the State, LEA, and school level, and by school poverty quartile within the State and LEA. (Principle 3)

☒ 9. Prior to submitting this request, it provided student growth data on their current students and the students they taught in the previous year to, at a minimum, teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs, or it will do so no later the deadline required under the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund. (Principle 3)

☒ 10. It will evaluate and, based on that evaluation, revise its own administrative requirements to reduce duplication and unnecessary burden on LEAs and schools. (Principle 4)

☒ 11. It has consulted with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in its request.

☒ 12. Prior to submitting this request, it provided all LEAs with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on the request and has attached a copy of that notice (Attachment 1) as well as copies of any comments it received from LEAs (Attachment 2).

☒ 13. Prior to submitting this request, it provided notice and information regarding the request to the public in the manner in which the State customarily provides such notice and information to the public (*e.g.*, by publishing a notice in the newspaper; by posting information on its website) and has attached a copy of, or link to, that notice (Attachment 3).

☒ 14. It will provide to the Department, in a timely manner, all required reports, data, and evidence regarding its progress in implementing the plans contained throughout this request.

**If the SEA selects Option A or B in section 3.A of its request, indicating that it has not yet developed and adopted all guidelines for teacher and principal evaluation and support systems, it must also assure that:**

*N/A* ☐ 15. It will submit to the Department for peer review and approval a copy of the guidelines that it will adopt by the end of the 2011–2012 school year. (Principle 3)

## CONSULTATION

An SEA must meaningfully engage and solicit input from diverse stakeholders and communities in the development of its request. To demonstrate that an SEA has done so, the SEA must provide an assurance that it has consulted with the State's Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in the request and provide the following:

1. A description of how the SEA meaningfully engaged and solicited input on its request from teachers and their representatives.

The Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) has solicited input from a broad range of stakeholders, including teachers, other educators, and community leaders in the process of creating this application. Furthermore, the vast majority of components described in this application stem directly from our Race to the Top plan, including all of Principles 1 and 3, and a significant number of the goals, processes, and interventions in Principle 2. The state's work in building stakeholder support for Race to the Top is also described below, since our Race to the Top plan is foundational to this waiver request.

We have engaged with teachers and their representatives throughout the ESEA flexibility request application process. After we submitted our original letter requesting a waiver from current ESEA requirements in July 2011, the Commissioner gave speeches in front of educators across the state to explain the goals of the waiver. In preparation for this application, TDOE officials held meetings seeking input from the Superintendents' Study Council, the leadership of the Tennessee Education Association (TEA), Tennessee's Committee of Practitioners (which includes teachers, parents, school administrators, and TEA members), the state's English as a Second Language (ESL) task force (a committee of stakeholders from across the state, including teachers, administrators, and superintendents), and the Tennessee School Boards Association. We held a targeted community forum co-hosted by Stand for Children, Tennessee State Collaborative on Reforming Education (SCORE), United Ways of Tennessee, and Urban Leagues of Tennessee, in which more than 450 people participated, including many educators. We also presented an overview of the application to all 136 superintendents from across the state and the TEA leadership, and held individual consultations with leading urban and rural superintendents to ensure that we captured their unique needs. Finally, we are partnering with Teach Plus, a network of teachers that seeks to ensure teacher voices are part of the policy discussion.

The feedback from these consultations has been valuable in shaping important aspects of our application, particularly in helping us to check against unintended consequences and design a system that is as aligned as possible to the ongoing work of LEAs and schools. For example, we decided to include a safe harbor provision from a "Miss" designation on Achievement AMOs for LEAs thatperform strongly on growth data in the Tennessee Value Added Assessment System (TVAAS); this was a direct result of educators highlighting the many small, rural LEAs in our state where AMOs around growth in proficiency may be skewed because of genuine differences in individual cohorts, but while LEAs may still demonstrate their strong performance on value-added data with the same cohort of students. In addition, we made the decision to include not only Title I schools but all schools on our Focus schools list, based on feedback from some superintendents, given the charge to raise student achievement across all schools, and because there were many non-Title I schools in their LEAs with substantial achievement gaps between subgroups of students. Finally, comments and questions from community

leaders reinforced the importance of focusing on closing achievement gaps, which is reflected throughout our proposed new accountability system. A summary of comments received from educators can be found in Attachment 2.

Furthermore, this application is, at heart, about our efforts to implement and fully realize the goals of our Race to the Top application. Tennessee's Race to the Top application was created with broad community and teacher input. The application itself was supported and signed on to by all 136 LEAs and major stakeholder groups across the state, including the Tennessee Education Association (the largest teachers' union in the state), the Principals' Study Council, school leaders, the Tennessee Supervisors' Study Council, Tennessee Organization of School Superintendents, Tennessee School Boards Association, and the Coalition of Large School Systems.

Teachers and their representatives have continued to play a key role as we have worked to implement the initiatives outlined in our Race to the Top application. As we prepared for implementation of Common Core State Standards (CCSS), teams of teachers have worked with outside experts to complete "crosswalks" which analyze the alignment between current state standards and CCSS by topic and depth of rigor. These efforts are described in greater detail under Principle 1 below.

Educators also played a key role in the Tennessee Diploma Project and accompanying efforts to raise standards and set more rigorous and realistic assessment cut-off scores for proficiency levels on state assessments (described in greater detail below under Principle 1). These efforts were supported by the First to the Top Coalition, which included the Tennessee Education Association among many other stakeholder groups.

In addition, teachers and principals have been intimately engaged throughout the process of designing and implementing our teacher and principal evaluation models. The Tennessee Evaluation Advisory Committee (TEAC), a 15-member body that included five teachers, two principals, and one superintendent, met more than 20 times over the course of a year and developed the guidelines and criteria for teacher and principal evaluation that the State Board of Education (SBE) adopted. In addition, teachers make up the development teams which continue to contribute recommendations around alternative growth measures for non-tested grades and subjects. When multiple observation models were tested in the 2010-11 school year, more than 8,000 teachers across 84 LEAs participated in the field testing. All of these interactions around evaluation are described in much greater detail under Principle 3 below.

2. A description of how the SEA meaningfully engaged and solicited input on its request from other diverse communities, such as students, parents, community-based organizations, civil rights organizations, organizations representing students with disabilities and English Learners, business organizations, and Indian tribes.

We have engaged with a wide variety of education stakeholders as we developed and finalized our application for ESEA flexibility. TDOE officials met with the state's ESL Task Force (a statewide group of teachers, consultants, and district officials working with English Learners), representatives from the special education advocacy community including Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (STEP) and the Disability Law and Advocacy Center of Tennessee, Tennessee Business Roundtable, and legislators. In addition, the community forum described above was co-hosted by four large, diverse, and

important advocacy groups, Stand for Children, Tennessee SCORE, United Ways of Tennessee, and Urban Leagues of Tennessee, and represented an important opportunity for their members and constituents to raise questions and hear directly from the Commissioner on his thinking. Please see Appendix 1 for a summary of our recent engagement.

Furthermore, this application represents the next step in our efforts to implement and fully realize the goals of our Race to the Top application, which were supported and signed on to by an incredibly broad group of stakeholders from across the state. These stakeholders included:

- the state's political leadership, including the Tennessee General Assembly, the state's delegation to the U.S. Congress, and Mayor Karl Dean of Metropolitan Nashville;
- education non-profit organizations, including the Charter School Growth Fund, the Knowledge is Power Program, New Leaders for New Schools, Teach For America, and The New Teacher Project;
- business groups, including the Tennessee Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the Greater Memphis Chamber, Memphis Tomorrow, the Tennessee Business Roundtable, Junior Achievement;
- civil rights organizations, including the Tennessee State Conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Tennessee Urban League Affiliates, and the Memphis Urban League,
- Tennessee Parent Teacher Association, Stand for Children, Volunteer Tennessee, TN SCORE, Alignment Nashville
- Philanthropic groups, including the Public Education Foundation, Public School Forum of East Tennessee, the Ayers Foundation, Benwood Foundation, Cal Turner Family Foundation, Hyde Family Foundations, James Stephen Turner Family Foundation, Lyndhurst Foundation, Niswonger Foundation, and Memphis Philanthropic Partners;
- Higher education institutions and affiliated organizations, including the Tennessee Higher Education Commission, the University of Tennessee system, Tennessee State University, Tennessee Tech University, University of Memphis, Cleveland State Community College, Dyersburg State Community College, Motlow State Community College, Nashville State Community College, Roane State Community College, Volunteer State Community College, Walters State Community College, the Tennessee State Board of Regents, Tennessee Technology Center at Dickson, Tennessee Technology Center at Dickson, and Tennessee Technology Center at Oneida/Huntsville);
- Science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM)-focused centers, businesses, and organizations, including BioTN Foundation, Vanderbilt Center for Science Outreach, Millard Oakley STEM Center at Tennessee Tech University, Center for Excellence in Math and Science Education at Eastern Tennessee State University, Tennessee Math, Science and Technology Education Center at Middle Tennessee State University, BioMimetic Therapeutics, Inc., Eastman Chemical Co., Memphis Bioworks Foundation, Bridgestone Americas, St. Jude Children's Research Hospital, Smith & Nephew, Nashville Health Care Council, and Tennessee Biotechnology Association.

Numerous stakeholder groups also played a key role in supporting the Tennessee Diploma Project and accompanying efforts to raise standards and set more rigorous and realistic cut-off scores for state assessments (described in greater detail below under Principle 1) as part of the First to the Top Coalition. The First to the Top Coalition included corporations and business groups, philanthropic groups, education organizations, advocacy groups, and civil rights groups. For a full list, see

http://www.expectmoretn.org/about/.

## Evaluation

The Department encourages an SEA that receives approval to implement the flexibility to collaborate with the Department to evaluate at least one program, practice, or strategy the SEA or its LEAs implement under principle 1, 2, or 3. Upon receipt of approval of the flexibility, an interested SEA will need to nominate for evaluation a program, practice, or strategy the SEA or its LEAs will implement under principles 1, 2, or 3. The Department will work with the SEA to determine the feasibility and design of the evaluation and, if it is determined to be feasible and appropriate, will fund and conduct the evaluation in partnership with the SEA, ensuring that the implementation of the chosen program, practice, or strategy is consistent with the evaluation design.

☒ Check here if you are interested in collaborating with the Department in this evaluation, if your request for the flexibility is approved.

## Overview of SEA's Request for the ESEA Flexibility

Provide an overview (about 500 words) of the SEA's request for the flexibility that:

1. explains the SEA's comprehensive approach to implement the waivers and principles and describes the SEA's strategy to ensure this approach is coherent within and across the principles; and

2. describes how the implementation of the waivers and principles will enhance the SEA's and its LEAs' ability to increase the quality of instruction for students and improve student achievement.

Tennessee sits at a critical juncture in education. As the first winner (along with Delaware) of the Race to the Top competition, we have a compelling vision, plan and goals designed to make our state the fastest improving state in the country in educational outcomes. At the same time, we simply must attain this lofty vision for the good of the state; our students currently rank 46th among states in math proficiency levels, and 41st in reading.[1] We are requesting this waiver so that we are able to meaningfully improve instruction and raise achievement for all students in Tennessee.

We have, over the last two years, made a number of critical changes and commitments that are foundational for our efforts to improve outcomes for children. We significantly raised academic standards, thereby ensuring that our state proficiency rates paint a realistic picture of college- and career- readiness. We committed to use data and qualitative assessments to evaluate teachers and

[1] 2011 NCES NAEP Data for 4th grade.

principals and have begun implementation state-wide, in an effort to provide meaningful feedback to improve instruction. We agreed to implement the Common Core standards to ensure even more rigorous coursework over time. We created an Achievement School District to work in our chronically lowest performing schools. We took multiple steps to create additional high performing schools, including the creation of exemplar STEM academies and associated regional hubs; lifting the cap on charter schools; and using distance learning to provide geographically isolated students access to rigorous high-level coursework. These initiatives are foundational to the state's winning Race to the Top plan.

Perhaps most importantly of all, we set rigorous proficiency goals to measure our progress as a state, and we used those proficiency goals to set LEA targets. These goals are our line in the sand. They represent significant, steady growth in student achievement that would change Tennessee's educational trajectory as a state. We have proposed increasing our reading and math proficiency rates by around 20 percent over a five year arc, and growing graduation rates to 90 percent while simultaneously increasing course rigor.

These are goals that our 136 superintendents believe in and can manage against. They meet our LEAs where they are, rather than forcing an arbitrary framework on them. They call upon each LEA, each school, to grow from its current starting point, continuously improving each year until we, across 1,700 schools serving 950,000 students, achieve the fastest rate of improvement in the country.

Our Race to the Top plan and, in particular, our ability to manage against that plan is significantly undermined by the current No Child Left Behind rules and regulations. Last year, around half of Tennessee schools failed to make AYP. This year, that number would be around 80 percent. In setting unrealistic goals, and requiring rigidity of plans to reach those goals, No Child Left Behind now has created two unintended consequences in Tennessee. First, it has set goals that virtually all educators across the state believe are unrealistic and unattainable. We are asking educators to do the impossible, and then labeling them as failures when they don't achieve those unrealistic outcomes.

Second, there is an enormous opportunity cost associated with the current federal rules. Tennessee's LEAs and schools believe that they can improve significantly over the coming years. They believe that it is realistic and appropriate to hold them accountable for student growth. They believe that they can simultaneously grow achievement levels for students while closing gaps between groups of students. Moreover, they have committed to plans through Race to the Top that are ambitious and challenging and designed to drive continuous improvement across the system. These plans include implementing the Common Core standards, providing ongoing feedback and evaluation to adults at all layers of the system, and improving achievement measurably for all children.

As this application for regulatory relief makes clear, Tennessee has the goals, the plan and the political will to make rapid improvements in educational outcomes. We cannot allow outdated federal rules and regulations to stand in the way.

# Principle 1: College- and Career-Ready Expectations for All Students

## 1.A Adopt College- and Career-Ready Standards

Select the option that pertains to the SEA and provide evidence corresponding to the option selected.

| **Option A** | **Option B** |
|---|---|
| ☒ The State has adopted college- and career-ready standards in at least reading/language arts and mathematics that are common to a significant number of States, consistent with part (1) of the definition of college- and career-ready standards.<br><br>i. Attach evidence that the State has adopted the standards, consistent with the State's standards adoption process. (Attachment 4) | ☐ The State has adopted college- and career-ready standards in at least reading/language arts and mathematics that have been approved and certified by a State network of institutions of higher education (IHEs), consistent with part (2) of the definition of college- and career-ready standards.<br><br>i. Attach evidence that the State has adopted the standards, consistent with the State's standards adoption process. (Attachment 4)<br><br>ii. Attach a copy of the memorandum of understanding or letter from a State network of IHEs certifying that students who meet these standards will not need remedial coursework at the postsecondary level. (Attachment 5) |

## 1.B Transition to College- and Career-Ready Standards

Provide the SEA's plan to transition to and implement no later than the 2013–2014 school year college- and career-ready standards statewide in at least reading/language arts and mathematics for all students and schools and include an explanation of how this transition plan is likely to lead to all students, including English Learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students, gaining access to and learning content aligned with such standards. The Department encourages an SEA to include in its plan activities related to each of the italicized questions in the corresponding section of the document titled *ESEA Flexibility Review Guidance*, or to explain why one or more of those activities is not necessary to its

plan.

**Introduction**

Tennessee has demonstrated the political will and capacity to significantly change state-level standards through our work over the last two years. Furthermore, we previously committed to implement the Common Core Standards in our Race to the Top application, passed the necessary rules, and have begun implementation. Our work raising standards is emblematic of the need for regulatory relief. By doing the hard work of raising our state standards and proficiency levels, we made it harder for schools to achieve AYP. We did the right thing for kids, but are now impeded in our efforts to improve instruction and increase student achievement by the outdated rules and standards of No Child Left Behind.

While the following section details our implementation plan and provides ample documentation demonstrating our commitment, we can answer the underlying question about Tennessee's commitment to higher standards in one word: Yes. Yes, we believe in and are implementing higher standards. Yes, we think it will make a difference in the lives of all children. And yes, we believe that eliminating implausible federal goals and layers of federal compliance paperwork will better equip us to manage our state system against tougher standards.

In 2010, the state of Tennessee committed to raise standards and expectations for all students by adopting the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), which were approved by the State Board of Education (SBE) in July of that year. The purpose is clear: in Tennessee's Race to the Top (RTTT) application, we explained that adopting new standards with correspondingly aligned assessments and training would improve student achievement. In addition, we pledged to transform public education for *every* student, regardless of location or demographic. Tennessee's CCSS implementation plan intends to do just that: reach every student, from K-12, regardless of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, disability status, or English language proficiency. Adopting the CCSS will also lead to improved instruction and teacher quality; ultimately, the increased emphasis on rigorous content and critical thinking in the classroom will inspire more of the most talented and ambitious college students to choose a career in teaching.

Our plan draws in teachers, principals, LEA-level administrators, the Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE), higher education, families, communities, stakeholder organizations, and others—all of whom play an important role in reaching our goal of having every student graduate from high school at a college- and career-ready (CCR) level.

The college- and career- ready focus must permeate every academic area. We reject the false choice between college- and career-readiness, as if one can only emphasize one to the detriment of the other. Career and Technical Education (CTE) and Advanced Placement (AP) classes should operate under the same principle (and thus both play crucial roles in the CCR agenda): providing students the skills to succeed at the postsecondary level.

The following CCSS implementation plan operates according to several core philosophies that will inform our work at every stage of this process over the next several years:

- **Inclusiveness**: As the CCSS standards for English Language Arts (ELA) make clear, "all students must have the opportunity to learn and meet the same high standards if they are to access the knowledge and skills necessary in their post-high school lives." Tennessee's plan has the

same high expectations for *all* students, while recognizing the need for support and accommodations for students with disabilities and English Learners (ELs) to be able to achieve at such a rigorous level. We explain in further detail below how we will support struggling student populations in reaching these ambitious but achievable CCR goals.

- **Targeting the areas of greatest need**: There is one general subgroup for which we intend this plan to have the greatest impact: low-achieving students. Closing gaps is an overarching state goal expressed in each waiver principle, and the CCSS plays a prominent role in raising expectations and achievement for underperforming students. Within this targeted area, math will be a particular focus: math tends to be the greatest weakness for our students, and math instruction the greatest weakness for our teachers. Because of this, the implementation timeline provided in Appendix 2, which explains how we will introduce the CCSS statewide and applies to all students and teachers, moves most aggressively on math standards.
- **Partnership**: The section below on stakeholder engagements emphasizes the crucial role of communication and partnership with all stakeholder groups. We also rely heavily on outside expertise: throughout the process, TDOE has collaborated extensively with Achieve, Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC), and Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). Our Commissioner sits on PARCC's governing board, and TDOE has been heavily involved in the CCSS project from the beginning. We will continue to draw from the expertise and technical support of these partner organizations.
- **Driving with data:** Only by collecting, reviewing, and analyzing actionable data will we know the success of implementation; only by acting on that data will our implementation efforts succeed. Several sections below explain the key role that data, especially educator feedback loops, plays in this plan.
- **Lead with strength; support with generosity:** CCSS implementation is too big an endeavor to leave up to chance. TDOE must set a strong CCR vision and devise a careful, thorough plan. But we also recognize that there are areas of implementation that TDOE cannot fully control: each LEA, school, administrator, teacher, student, and external stakeholder exerts his or her own level of independence and influence on the process. There are certain non-negotiable elements: most of these are the key implementation events in Appendix 2's timeline. But TDOE's plan also leaves considerable room for LEAs (and, by extension, schools, principals, and teachers) to exercise their expertise in deciding the best way to accomplish goals, with TDOE providing support and guidance.
- **Ensuring progress:** TDOE recognizes the incredible difficulty of this work. Simply stating our intentions and providing the proper information and training ensures nothing. It is at the very end of the implementation chain—in the classroom — where our success will be determined. Involving every classroom, teacher, and student throughout the state in not just understanding but leading this transition is a colossal undertaking. Thus, to drive our goals and to ensure the successful implementation of the following plan, under its forthcoming realignment, TDOE will establish a new office to oversee the implementation of CCSS and PARCC assessments over the next several years. This office will also be responsible for monitoring effectiveness at each stage of implementation. For more details, please see the final section on monitoring/sustaining progress.
- **Flexibility:** In requesting ESEA flexibility, we intend to be flexible ourselves. No plan, however detailed, can anticipate every single challenge or unexpected snags and development. TDOE is open to a process of constant improvement and will continue to tweak the plan as needed.

**Foundation for CCSS Implementation**

Tennessee has already laid the foundation for the work of implementating college- and career-ready standards and aligninghigh quality assessments through our work as part of Achieve's American Diploma Project (ADP) network. Our version, known as the Tennessee Diploma Project (TDP), raised the bar for all students in the state by revising standards in RLA, math, and science, and setting new graduation requirements to ensure more students graduate at a CCR level through a true collaboration consisting of K-12, higher education, the business and philanthropic community, Governor's Office staff, and Achieve.

The State Board of Education (SBE) adopted the new standards and graduation requirements in January 2008, setting out an ambitious goal: "All students will have access to a rigorous curriculum that includes challenging subject matter, emphasizes depth rather than breadth of coverage, emphasizes critical thinking and problem solving, and promotes responsible citizenship and lifelong learning." This current school year's junior class will be the first students to be held to the new graduation requirements. In order to graduate, students now must take Algebra II as well as a math course in all four years of high school, take a third year of lab science, and complete 22 credits instead of the previous minimum of 20. To give meaning and credibility to the new, more rigorous TDP standards, Tennessee also revamped its TCAP assessment system to provide a more accurate indicator of student performance. The state moved to a four-level proficiency model, adding the below basic category to basic, proficient, and advanced, and reset the cut scores associated with the top two levels to more closely align with national standards for NAEP and the ACT.

Student achievement scores predictably plummeted after the above changes were implemented for the spring 2010 TCAP exams. Instead of ignoring the results or backing down, the state engaged in a public awareness campaign called "Expect More, Achieve More" (http://www.expectmoretn.org/), with media events held around the state to educate the public and prepare parents and students for the shock of low scores. In acknowledging that the state had been using inflated scores for years, the state was able to tout its new standards and more demanding graduation requirements as the path forward towards a more honest, robust conversation about raising expectations for all students. By way of example, the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced on the 7th grade math TCAP dropped from 90.3 percent in 2009 to 28.5 percent in 2010, the first year of data after the standards were raised. While full implementation of CCSS may cause an additional shift in results, Tennessee's state proficiency levels now mirror proficiency on NAEP at 4th and 8th grades, and ACT at the high school level. They are, in a word, realistic.

Since the process began over four years ago, Governor Haslam and Commissioner Huffman have joined as strong supporters of the TDP and are working to continue to drive higher expectations for all students. Thanks to the work the state engaged in for the TDP, the CCSS are closely aligned with existing state standards, and because of the process of engaging stakeholders and achieving such widespread collaboration across political divides, the public has a clear understanding of the need to make such difficult but necessary decisions in order to achieve ambitious improvements for our students. The state is now well prepared for the final stage in its transition to a complete, CCR-aligned education system based on the CCSS, and to drive that transition with a strong support plan for implementation.

Tennessee has planned a phased implementation over the next three years, briefly outlined in table A below:

**Table A: Timeline for CCSS implementation**

| | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2013-14 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Grades K-2 | Math and ELA | | |
| Grades 3-8 | | Math (partial) | Math (full) and ELA |
| Grades 9-12 | | | Math and ELA |

We began this year with K-2 to help lay foundational work for the coming years. Additionally, for this year's kindergartners, the 3rd grade PARCC assessment in 2014-15 will be their first standardized test, so it makes sense to begin their education with CCSS. We will then follow with partial implementation of 3-8 math standards in 2012-13, and full implementation of the remaining 3-8 math standards, 9-12 math standards, and 3-12 ELA standards in 2013-14. This staggered approach will allow us to field test assessment changes and fully train teachers on expected assessment changes and instructional best practices to support student achievement. We will then be fully prepared in 2014-15 for transition to PARCC assessments.

**Analyzing standards alignment for CCSS implementation**

To analyze the extent of alignment between the state's current content standards and the CCSS, TDOE has collaborated with Achieve to develop a "Crosswalk" process. The Crosswalks were conducted by teams of Tennessee teachers working closely with Dr. Marie O'Hara from Achieve, who made point-by-point comparisons between the CCSS and the existing Tennessee curriculum standards using Achieve's Crosswalk tool. The resulting Crosswalk documents identify matches between individual Common Core standards and the Tennessee curriculum standards. For example, 97 percent of the CCSS ELA standards have a match in Tennessee's ELA standards, with 90 percent being rated as an excellent or good match. The math standards are more closely aligned in the early grades, with no grade-level difference in Kindergarten and only a 1 percent difference in 1st grade; however, 59 percent of 8th grade CCSS math standards are taught earlier in Tennessee standards.

To complete the Crosswalk process, TDOE will partner with Achieve to create a Crosswalk for high school math and return to the Crosswalk for K-8 math once more to ensure its rigor and accuracy, and then seek validation from external experts. TDOE will convene a committee of LEA content experts and math specialists/coaches to complete this work, and this team will also help develop the content of math professional development (PD) and the second round of K-2 summer training.

We are committed to thoroughly training all educators on the adjustments they can expect in standards and assessments prior to the roll-out of changes. We will use findings from the Crosswalk, especially points of departure from Tennessee standards, to ensure that grade-level PD is rigorous and targets the biggest discrepancies. The state will also use Depth of Knowledge and the Revised Bloom's Taxonomy to revisit the Crosswalk and highlight areas where CCSS requires a higher order of thinking. TDOE will determine the handful of "biggest shifts" in math and ELA: 3-6 specific, concrete, and far-reaching changes in both the standards and corresponding classroom instruction that will have the greatest power to drive student achievement *immediately*, even in the early years of implementation before fully-aligned assessments.

The Crosswalk is available for teachers and administrators to cross-reference their grade level curricula, instructional materials, and activities to the CCSS. A version pared down to essential

features is publicly available at http://www.tncurriculumcenter.org/common_core.

However, we also realize the fundamental differences between CCSS and previous state standards: with a renewed emphasize on close, critical reading of nonfiction and informational texts in ELA and the intricately spiraled standards in math; a focus on deep, intensive engagement with fewer standards as opposed to superficial coverage of many; and the need for teachers to master their content areas in order to teach such higher order concepts, the CCSS represents a radical shift in classroom instruction. The Crosswalk process runs the risk of masking these crucial differences: Common Core standards with words and language familiar from state standards do not necessarily reflect similar cognitive demands. In order to help educators teach the standards with fidelity, TDOE is creating a multi-year, multi-stage PD plan which is outlined in Appendix 2 and explained in further detail in the PD section below.

The training has already begun for K-2 teachers, who are the first cohort to transition to CCSS through the staged process. Though implementation was voluntary, all but four LEAs agreed to begin fully teaching the CCSS in K-2 classrooms this year, and the rest will follow next year. During summer 2011, TDOE conducted six CCSS awareness training sessions across the state for over 4,000 supervisors and principals. Partnering with Achieve, we communicated the reasons behind adopting CCSS, explained the basic structure of the standards, and explained the essential differences between CCSS and traditional math and ELA instruction. In addition, we provided training on using the online TNCurriculumCenter, and a trainer from Battelle for Kids presented on Formative Instructional Practices.

The state then held eight sessions on classroom implementation for 1,800 K-2 educators. Teams of six teachers from each LEA, or multiple teams from one LEA, met in groups to unpack each of the standards, identify learning targets, translate the standards into student friendly language, identify the difficulty level of each standard, and create a rubric on required learning to ensure foundational knowledge, mastery, and knowledge going beyond mastery. K-2 teachers were also introduced to the Crosswalks so that they can use them to analyze similarities and differences between state standards and the CCSS and aid their classroom transitions. The teams were then charged with returning to their LEA to share these tools with other educators through in-school trainings. Six experts on early childhood have been assigned to state regions as consultants to provide on-site technical assistance and additional training throughout the CCSS transition period.

**Expanding access to college-level and dual enrollment courses**

The state also understands that to prepare each student at a CCR level, we cannot rely solely on improved standards. We also need to ensure more students have access to college-level coursework in high school to prepare them for the rigorous demands of postsecondary learning. To that end, one of Tennessee's five RTTT goals is higher rates of college enrollment and success. In order to drive this goal, we will track an indicator of the number of students enrolling in advanced, college credit-

bearing coursework. The state has already seen the expansion of AP and IB programs in recent years,[2] and TDOE is also conducting a deep diagnostic review of AP and International Baccalaureate (IB) course offerings in each LEA to identify potential needs.

TDOE intends to incentivize LEAs to work with their local Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) to expand postsecondary credit offerings and is working to expand dual enrollment and dual credit. There is already some exciting work occurring in this area in CTE. LEAs are actively pursuing CTE articulation of credit, dual enrollment, and/or dual credit opportunities between secondary and postsecondary institutions, using career clusters to identify programs of study.[3] Secondary and post-secondary institutions have also received grants at the local level in varying amounts to implement workable articulation, dual credit, and dual enrollment opportunities. In addition, LEAs are using Perkins funding to implement innovative programs such as career academies, "Fast Track", Virtual Enterprise, Project Lead the Way, and Integrated Systems Technology. To track all this, many LEAs are actively using CTE performance data results to plan CTE programs.

Our goal of expanding access to advanced courses will be greatly aided by The Northeast Tennessee College and Career Ready Consortium (NETCO), comprised of 15 mostly rural LEAs and led by the Niswonger Foundation, which was awarded an Investing in Innovation grant. The foundation plans to make over 45,000 new "seats" available to students in AP, dual enrollment, distance learning, and online learning courses, and to ensure that over 30 percent of students in the region graduate from high school with at least half a year of college credit (for more information, see http://www.niswongerlearningcenter.org/course/view.php?id=12).

**Stakeholder engagement**

As we continue to move forward with CCSS implementation, the state will craft a comprehensive stakeholder engagement plan which will include a committee of representatives from key groups. The purpose of this plan will be to ensure constant and consistent communication about CCSS in order to garner public support and combat negative misperceptions. The plan will be modeled after the prominent and successful "Expect More, Achieve More" awareness campaign that the state used after the Tennessee Diploma Project raised standards and expectations and led to a predicted drop in test scores. CCSS poses a similar opportunity when families and other stakeholders need to be aware why it is necessary to raise standards again, and how these new standards may reveal deficiencies in

[2] The state has already seen the number of students taking AP tests rise from 13,155 in 2006-07 to 17,907 in 2010-11. The state is also committed to expanding access to low-income students: for the current 2011-12 school year, 3,943 applications have already been approved for fee reimbursements for AP exams using federal grant money, up from 442 in 2006. IB programs are expanding rapidly as well. Since the first Tennessee IB Programme (DP) school in 2000, the number of DP schools has grown to 12. The total number of IB schools—including 8 Middle Years Programme schools and 3 Primary Years Programme schools—has tripled since 2007 alone. IB Diploma candidate numbers show dramatic growth, and the trend is expected to continue. Feasibility studies will be conducted at schools where stakeholders indicate interest in determining whether the programme(s) fit their student learning needs. TDOE holds open houses, parent information sessions, and discussion round tables to answer questions about IB and spread the word.

[3] In the 2009-10 school year, 2,231 students took CTE dual enrollment courses—a 56.8 percent increase over the previous year. By earning postsecondary credits in high school, these students saved an estimated total of $1,146,450 in tuition. 14.9 percent of the 2009-10 graduating seniors attempted a dual enrollment course at some point in their high school careers and enrolled in a Tennessee public institution of higher learning (excluding Tennessee Technical Colleges).

student preparedness but will ultimately lead to more students being prepared for college and career.

The engagement plan will include summer training on CCSS for external stakeholders, who include families, communities, the SBE, local boards of education, politicians, community-based and civil rights organizations, and advocacy groups like SCORE. The CCSS engagement plan will target differentiated strategies for each key group of stakeholders; for instance, while educators need the more detailed, technical information provided in professional development (PD) and discussed throughout this plan, parents and the general public need a broader message about the link between CCSS and the CCR agenda and how students benefit from the change. The purpose of the engagement plan will be to ensure that all stakeholders are aware of the necessity to adopt CCSS, the essential ways in which CCSS will change and improve classroom instruction, and the alignment between CCSS and our goals of helping more students graduate high school prepared to enroll in and graduate from postsecondary education, and successfully enter the workforce.

The state has already developed several tools that will ensure the public is not only aware of the new standards and their importance but even participates in their implementation. For instance, in collaboration with the office of First Lady Crissy Haslam, TDOE recently launched a free, publicly available early grades reading toolkit at http://www.readtennessee.org/. The website has entire sections devoted to families and communities, with interactive tools to help parents read to their young children and thus harness the power of families to improve students' academic skills. TDOE has partnered with Achieve, whose experts will vet the site to ensure it is aligned with CCSS. A similar math toolkit is now under construction in collaboration with authors of the math CCSS at Arizona State University. We will also continue to deploy resources such as the national PTA's CCSS guide for parents in order to reach more families.

For our crucial engagement with higher education, please see the "Expanding access to college-level and dual enrollment courses" section above and the "Student transition to higher education section" below.

**Serving the needs of all students**

As previously emphasized, we intend to hold all students to the same high expectations for achieving the standards and learning targets; our plan also allows for appropriate supports and accommodations for English learner (EL) students and students with disabilities (SWD).

Tennessee's current English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards are aligned to the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA), a test which is administered to all ELs annually. However, it is not clear to what extent the ELDA corresponds with state standards in the content areas. In order to better align ELP instruction and assessments with the CCSS, and in order to ensure that ELs are capable of mastering the CCSS, Tennessee is committed to adopting new ELP standards and considering a new ELP assessment. As a member of the Common English Language Acquisition Standards (CELAS) state consortium, Tennessee is collaborating with 16 other states and CCSSO to develop the new set of standards aligned with the CCSS. The consortium's work also includes convening experts to analyze the "gaps" in language proficiency ELs might experience in confronting the linguistic complexity of the CCSS, and developing new assessments aligned to the new standards. The new standards developed by CELAS will thus be able to address the needs of ELs by requiring teachers to provide direct support when it comes to accessing the CCSS. After the completion of this work by summer 2012, the state's ESL task force—a committee of stakeholders from across the state,

including teachers, administrators, and superintendents—will decide whether to adopt the new standards. Tennessee is also a member of the Worldwide International Design Assessment (WIDA) consortium, which is designing its own new assessments. With the help of the ESL task force, Tennessee will either adopt assessments from the CELAS or WIDA consortiums or design its own ELP assessment for the 2014-15 school year depending on which option is most closely aligned with the intent of the new ELP standards and with the content of the CCSS. Finally, TDOE's recent decision to extend accommodations to English Learners for up to two years after exiting the English as a Second Language (ESL) program will help those who have achieved proficiency but still occasionally struggle with the demands of mastering a new language to continue to learn the linguistically demanding content of the CCSS standards. TDOE will continue to engage closely and communicate with families of ELs and advocacy groups on these developments.

Students with disabilities fall into two assessment categories: the 2 percent of all students who are unable to take the Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program (TCAP) standardized test because of disability take a modified test called the MAAS (Modified Academic Achievement Standards); the 1 percent of the student population classified as having significant cognitive disabilities submit an IEP portfolio. We recognize the need to help these students achieve at a CCR level and improve the rigor of these assessments. To that end, Tennessee has joined, along with 18 other states, the National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC; see http://www.cehd.umn.edu/nceo/projects/NCSC/NCSC.html), a consortium which intends to develop a new system of supports—including assessment, curriculum, instruction, and PD to help them graduate high school ready for postsecondary options. NCSC will create a framework aligned with CCSS that uses scaffolded learning progressions to bring these students towards an understanding of the core CCSS concepts. The bases of these scaffolded learning progressions, known as Common Core Connectors will be made available to states for the 2012-13 school year, and will be followed by lesson plans on key CCSS concepts. As a partner state, Tennessee has convened a 30-member community of practitioners—including LEA special education supervisors, special education teachers, TDOE staff, and other stakeholders (e.g. advocacy groups)—which participates in the NCSC work group focusing on PD; however, the state will have access to the work done by other states in assessment, curriculum, and instruction. After NCSC completes its work by the 2014-15 school year, the community of practitioners will advise TDOE on whether to adopt the new assessment system and related materials.

Students who do not fall into the 1 percent with significant cognitive disabilities will be required to take regular PARCC assessments in 2014-15. Because PARCC tests will be administered online, SWD populations will be able to take advantage of the principles of universal design, as accommodations, such as large text and read-aloud, can be built into the test items themselves. In order to help these students with the rigor of CCSS, we will convene a special committee of TDOE staff and external organizations and stakeholders to create a comprehensive student support plan, which explicitly enumerates the accommodations offered to support the needs of SWD students with the new standards to be fully implemented by the 2013-14 school year. The committee will begin by reviewing the CCSS from the perspective of students with a wide range of learning disabilities, and will make a recommendation to the state in time for the 2012-13 school year on whether to continue administering the MAAS through 2013-14 or adopt a transitional assessment to gradually bring the 2 percent of MAAS-tested students toward a PARCC-like model. The committee will then conduct a review of current research and compile a kit of best practices for teachers to use for teaching the CCSS to SWD. The set of strategies will be incorporated into PD for all teachers, not only those

teaching in EL or special education classrooms. The state will also provide PD for special education teachers on writing standards-based IEPs correlated to CCSS.

Due to the rigorous nature of the standards, it is inevitable that some students, including those without learning disabilities or language deficiencies, will still struggle with new, higher expectations. The state will thus convene a committee to devise an intervention and support plan which will focus on providing remedial and "bridge" coursework in twelfth grade for students who are not on track to graduate at the CCR level. The committee will also study the correlation between CCR and certain early signs (like attendance and course completion) to determine the "flags" that indicate when a student is unlikely to meet the CCR goal. We will then be able to use our robust data systems to provide student-level information to teachers, counselors, and administrators, who can provide early interventions. Training in this kind of intervention will be a crucial part of the summer PD sessions outlined in Appendix 2.

**Aligning curriculum/instructional materials**

The state plays an important role in driving the implementation of CCSS across its 136 LEAs; however, it is not the state's intention to dictate specific curricular or instructional decisions. TDOE sees its role as one of assistance, guidance, and targeted support when necessary. To that end, we have developed the following resources:

- A website (www.tncurriculumcenter.org) to host materials, including alignment tools and pacing guides to assist educators in the transition from current state standards to the CCSS.
- Professional Learning Communities (PLCs): each LEA has selected a representative who will be directing implementation efforts for that LEA. These implementation directors are the first step in organizing PLCs at the LEA and school level specifically focused on the implementation of the CCSS. The PLCs will drive the most important changes at the classroom level by convening teams of educators teaching common courses to discuss best practices for teaching the new standards and share new material.
- TDOE will disseminate all instructional materials made available from PARCC, such as the Model Content Frameworks, model instructional units, item and task prototypes, online PD modules, and K-2 formative tools.
- TDOE will develop a team of educators and other in-state experts to review textbooks and other curricular and instructional materials offered by vendors and, working in conjunction with Achieve and using publishing criteria from PARCC and CCSSO, will report on the degree of alignment. TDOE will then provide guidelines to LEAs on purchasing products from vendors to ensure these products are legitimately aligned with the CCSS.
- Battelle for Kids has already provided TVAAS (value-added) training for teachers and will continue to provide resources for the CCSS.
- Teacher committees, under the direction of TDOE, will create and provide materials aligned with the CCSS.
- The Read Tennessee website has extensive CCSS content, including a rich array of sample teaching strategies, activities, and resources for each K-3 CCSS ELA standard.
- The Tennessee Electronic Center (www.tnelc.org) will provide a variety of vetted podcasts of Tennessee teachers teaching lessons aligned to CCSS as well as explanatory PowerPoint presentations.

In order to manage the magnitude of the task, TDOE will rely on the nine Field Service Centers (FSCs) spread throughout the state to provide ongoing support on a much more intimate level. TDOE will

also look into creating a comprehensive website to gather all of the above materials in one, easy portal.

One curricular decision that PARCC leaves up to states is whether to transition to an integrated Math I-IV progression in high school. Currently, Tennessee does not plan to make changes to its "traditional" math course pathways (with discrete courses in Algebra and Geometry, etc). As we receive more information from PARCC on the structure and content of its high school math assessments, we will consider ways to ensure that math curricula are closely aligned to the CCSS in each high school course.

**Professional development: training educators on new standards and assessments**

Appendix 2 outlines the sequence of professional development (PD), which will be phased over the next three years in multiple stages in order to serve specific educator needs and specific clienteles. The state fully recognizes that, in the past, PD in Tennessee, whether offered by the state, LEAs, or outside organizations, has often been of poor quality. Running PD the same old way will not result in achieving our CCSS implementation goals. Therefore, all PD related to CCSS implementation will be designed to focus on educator engagement with rigorous content, meaning that attendees will be directly involved in their own learning and deep critical thinking (e.g., by delving into the content standards, creating deliverable products to take back to their schools and share with others, or judging materials provided by vendors and making recommendations for LEA adoption using PARCC resources). We will also focus PD on the areas that will lead to the greatest shifts in instruction, particularly the 3-6 "biggest shifts" identified through the Crosswalk process. We will make use of multiple methods to suit educator needs, including summer institutes (similar to those held in previous summers on the Tennessee Diploma Project); regional trainings at field service centers; annual trainings for new administrators, teachers, and school counselors; additional training through the Electronic Learning Center; and further training for high priority schools and LEAs. The state will also explore options for providing PD through webinars or online courses in order to enable more educators to participate and receive enhanced training beyond the main summer sessions. In addition, time-bound PD sessions must be followed up with opportunities for teachers to continue and reinforce their learning. This can be accomplished through networking and sharing of practice through email lists, blogs, and wikis; follow-up or refresher trainings at a smaller and more local scale; and opportunities for teachers to enhance their learning through coursework or attending and presenting at professional conferences. Finally, each PD session must not only give attendees a chance to provide feedback via immediate surveys and other methods, but it must also be followed up by longer-term monitoring of the trainings' effects in the classroom through data and analysis. For more information, see the final section on "Monitoring and sustaining progress."

In terms of specific topics, professional development will be particularly targeted towards math as a content area, given the current state of achievement, somewhat less overlap in the alignment of current standards and CCSS in that area, and the depth and rigor of the CCSS for math. Also, as Appendix 2 indicates, PD for the CCSS literacy standards in history, social studies, science, and technical subjects for grades 6-12 will also be provided. We believe that literacy training for all content areas will greatly enhance not only student literacy skills (particularly given the CCSS emphasis on informational text), but also content learning. In addition, as noted above, a special committee of TDOE staff and external organizations and stakeholders convened to support the transition of students with disabilities to CCSS will also be reviewing current research and compiling a kit of best practices for teachers to use for teaching the CCSS to SWD, to be incorporated into PD for

all teachers. Finally, the ESL task force will help locate and/or develop resources, particularly for those schools and LEAs with significant populations of ELs.

While the above description of professional development applies in general to teachers and principals, additional smaller shifts in focus will be made for principals in particular. The Tennessee Instructional Leadership Standards (TILS—described further under Principle 3) require principals to be knowledgeable instructional leaders who can support high expectations for all students. TDOE will therefore be providing additional PD to principals to ensure they are intimately familiar with the CCSS and able to assess the fidelity of teachers' implementation in the classrooms. We will be providing PD for all elementary and middle school principals next summer on the 3-8 math standards, in preparation for their partial implementation next school year, to ensure they understand the training their teachers will be receiving, as well as the kinds of instructional shifts they should be seeing in classrooms as a result.

To support teachers and principals beyond in-person PD, TDOE officials trained in the CCSS will be available to answer questions by phone and email so that teachers can receive immediate and knowledgeable feedback from experts. A list of these experts will be made available on the websites mentioned above.

**Transition to new assessment/accountability systems**

Tennessee began the process of raising the rigor of its assessments by resetting the cut scores on its End of Course (EOC exams) and TCAP achievement exams for math, reading and language Arts (RLA), and science for grades 3-8 for assessment results from 2009-10 and all forthcoming school years. While the old proficient cut was closely matched to correspond to a GPA of D-, the new cut was matched to a B. The new cuts were based on Achievement Level Descriptors closely matched to those used by NAEP. The changes resulted in a sizable difference in the number of students scoring at a proficient or advanced level, with an expected drop.

PARCC assessments represent the next and final step in truly aligning our assessments with CCR standards. To prepare both students and teachers for PARCC assessments in 2014-15, TDOE will develop a comprehensive assessment plan to drive a gradual transition of its current state assessments toward a more rigorous, CCSS-aligned format. The assessment plan will take into consideration feedback from educators and assessment experts in determining how changes to assessments will correspond to student achievement scores and TVAAS data. In short, while Tennessee transitions to the CCSS, we will ensure that assessment appropriately captures what Tennessee teachers are delivering in their classrooms with predictability and transparency.

The assessment alignment process has already begun, with TDOE holding discussions with Pearson and its subsidiary, ETS. ETS, using an assessment crosswalk, is identifying "gap items" between the CCSS and Tennessee state standards, and using these findings to develop new CCSS-aligned items for the transition to PARCC. TDOE will also collaborate with Achieve, which has begun identifying the most important changes in CCSS and will provide guidance to vendors on developing new test items, in deciding which standards these new items will refer to, especially in math. When possible, the new items will be aligned with the standards to which the 3-6 "biggest shifts" pertain. They will also allow state tests to shift emphasis from low-level multiple choice questions to constructed response items requiring higher order thinking skills. The TCAP RLA exams will feature more informational text passages while maintaining the same length and structure. In cases where there is a misalignment in

grade level between the old and the new standards, TCAP achievement tests will be modified to reflect the learning expected by the CCSS.

Over the next two years, the state will add to its TCAP exams these new CCSS-aligned items as field test items, which are randomly assigned to students, and which will grow in number as we approach 2014-15. While field test items do not count toward a student's test score, they can be evaluated so that the state can monitor student performance. The state plans to begin field testing items this spring for 3-8 math and in the 2012-13 school for the remaining grades and subjects, including CCSS prompts on the TCAP writing test, with the goal of having these new items analyzed and vetted for use as operational items administered to all students in the 2013-14 school year.

Overall, students and teachers will become familiar with the more rigorous, performance-based items that will appear in PARCC assessments and the presence of these new items will correspond with CCSS instruction. In all cases, teachers will be fully trained on all new standards before they will be assessed in classroom evaluations or their students will be assessed with summative exams. Finally, teachers, administrators, and supervisors have already received periodic updates on the development of the PARCC assessment model, and these updates will continue.

**Transitioning technology to support new assessment/accountability systems**

Administering online PARCC assessments to all students within three years represents an enormous challenge for LEAs. TDOE must take the lead in spreading awareness of the technological demands of PARCC and engaging stakeholders with information, support, and a sense of urgency. In cooperation with PARCC, TDOE will distribute purchasing guidelines with minimum technological specifications to LEAs to enable them to ramp up their technological capacity in preparation for administering computer-based PARCC assessments in 2014-15. TDOE will work with LEAs to conduct an in-depth study of capacity, with particular focus on broadband access and number of computer terminals, in order to determine which LEAs will need assistance in meeting these guidelines. Our Chief Information Officers (CIOs) will then craft a plan summarizing LEA capacity and including annual metrics to measure the scaling-up efforts, which TDOE can then use to monitor the pace of transition. In those cases where lack of funding is an issue, we will assist LEAs in creating partnerships with local businesses and non-profits to improve their technological capacity.

As part of its RTTT program, the state is currently developing robust data systems which will allow teachers, schools, LEAs, and the state to track and learn from student progress and other indicators at each level. Overall, TDOE is focusing on a P-12 system - including the EWDS, teacher evaluation, a more robust student information system, and an expanded TVAAS data reporting system - and a P-20 statewide longitudinal data system. The data systems will allow the state to monitor the ways in which CCSS instruction drives student progress, learn from the CCSS-aligned field test items how well students are achieving the standards, and study the extent to which teachers are delivering CCSS-quality instruction (from teacher evaluation data). We will use this data in a timely and purposeful manner to modify our implementation plan when necessary (for more detail, see the final section on monitoring and sustaining progress).

**Teacher preparation, licensing, and evaluation**

Another essential component of the transition to CCSS and common assessments relates to training of new teachers and principals before entering the classroom. It is imperative that pre-service teachers and principals are provided with the necessary tools to enter a school on day one ready to

implement the CCSS and assess student progress in meeting those standards. To this end, the State has launched two projects for teacher and principal training programs: (1) Integrating Common Core into Pre-Service Training, and (2) Integrating TVAAS into Pre-Service Training. TDOE, in collaboration with the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC), has undertaken a number of key activities to ensure a solid foundation for these projects:

- A small team of Deans of Colleges of Education in public and private universities has been assembled to develop the plan for CCSS integration.
- Research has been gathered from institutions with success in standards integration into pre-service curriculum as well as national organizations focused on implementation.
- Interviews have been conducted with several institutions regarding current practice on standards integration.
- After sending out an RFP (Request for Proposals), the state will choose a vendor and convene a committee to work with the vendor to develop a statewide curriculum for integrating CCSS into pre-service training. The curriculum will provide a common tool for all programs to use, but will allow for enough flexibility so that it can meet the specific needs of individual programs and LEAs.

Additionally, THEC is in negotiations with the SAS Institute to develop modules, curriculum, and assessments for TVAAS data training in pre-service curricula. Once the negotiations are complete and the contract is approved, the modules and associated curriculum will be ready for implementation in fall 2012 with faculty training in summer 2012. THEC and SAS Institute have already held six training sessions state-wide to develop higher education faculty member's understanding of TVAAS.

By the 2014-15 school year, all new public school teachers and principals who received training at Tennessee institutions of higher education will be prepared to teach the CCSS. The state will also revise its licensure requirements by:

- Requiring new teacher and principal candidates to demonstrate mastery of CCSS content through a skills assessment or portfolio project.
- Updating reciprocation procedures to ensure that out-of-state teachers wishing to gain Tennessee licensure have received appropriate training in CCSS content or, alternatively, pledge to attend PD or take the relevant coursework.
- Requiring teachers entering the school system through alternative certification pathways to be trained in CCSS content.

**Student transition to higher education**

TDOE is working closely with IHEs and IHE oversight, including THEC, the University of Tennessee (UT) system, and the Tennessee Board of Regents (TBR) to leverage the enormous role higher education can play in aiding our efforts to implement the standards with strength and quality and in helping our students succeed at the postsecondary level.

In addition to its abovementioned work with teacher and principal pre-service training, THEC has focused the resources of the Improving Teacher Quality grant program on providing Common Core PD to in-service teachers, and will provide high quality workshops in the math and English CCSS throughout the state in 2012.

Tennessee is also a PARCC governing state, and THEC has been actively engaged during the previous year with campus faculty to prepare for implementation of the PARCC initiative. In addition, THEC will

engage faculty who teach first year standards in using Algebra II and English III PARCC assessment results to determine if students are eligible for entry into credit-bearing courses during the freshman year of college or if remedial studies will be required, and to more closely align credit-bearing freshmen courses with the CCSS.

To prepare for implementation, a Tennessee PARCC steering committee was formed consisting of math and English faculty from across the state. These faculty members have participated in the development of the PARCC assessment and serve as representatives at their institutions regarding PARCC. Following formation of the steering committee, THEC convened a statewide PARCC Summit to engage with a larger group of faculty and educate them regarding the CCSS. This Summit was attended by over 30 math and English faculty from almost every public university, and all participants were fully briefed on the CCSS and the PARCC initiative. Of note, Dr. Carl Hite, President of Cleveland State Community College, serves as a member of the PARCC Advisory Committee on College Readiness, and formally represents Tennessee higher education in all PARCC discussions that center on college readiness.

**Resources**

Currently, the Race to the Top funds allotted to CCSS implementation include $2.9million, split between $1.5 million for K-12 and $1.4 million budgeted for higher education. Anticipating that additional resources will be needed, the new CCSS implementation office will first assess how TDOE might be able to leverage state training funds (including a current professional development grant with approximately $200,000 remaining), current state contracts and resources that have or will be developed for or in conjunction with other states to support training for educators. In addition, the office will devote substantial time to determining what additional specific resources are needed for professional development and developing new assessment items, in conjunction with Achieve, PARCC, and Pearson/ETS. The department anticipates that the resource demands will be greater than the current available dollars. As we identify specific needs, the CCSS implementation office will work closely with the FTTT Oversight office to create a budget amendment for the U.S. Department of Education Race to the Top office.

**Monitoring/sustaining progress**

TDOE understands that it is not enough to merely create a plan and set it in motion. We must ensure, at every small step along the way, that implementation is working and that we are making progress. The new CCSS/PARCC oversight office will drive the process by setting annual numerical performance indicators: targets that quantify the thoroughness and reach of its implementation efforts. For instance, we will track the number of teachers trained, the success rate on new field test items, the number of instructional website hits, and the evaluation scores of teachers on the standards and objectives indicator from the instruction rubric. There will be indicators to match each implementation stage represented by the above headings, and TDOE will develop a rubric to judge the progress and success of each stage. When applicable, we will ask LEAs to report on their own progress, which will provide another set of data to inform our own progress evaluations. The results will be published publically and used to inspire excellence, provide pressure where needed, and inform policy changes when targets are not met.

Next, the office will establish feedback loops in order to learn from practitioners on the ground about the success of PD through surveys and interviews. To assure the quality and effectiveness of PD, the office will send trained observers to each PD initiative to gather data and make suggestions for

improvement. Tennessee's extensive value-added data system (TVAAS) will allow the CCSS office to analyze whether teachers who received training can effect improvements in student performance on standardized tests. We will also collect feedback through field visits to classrooms and interviews at school sites in order to determine the fidelity of teacher implementation and learn of any obstacles or struggles teachers encounter. Similar to the method used by the TEAM office, the CCSS oversight office will establish an online question and answer system made available to all educators and stakeholders and will commit to responding to all questions with 24 hours.

The office will also set long-term indicators for measuring achievement of our overall goal of having all students graduate with CCR skills. For the first time, PARCC assessments will give us a legitimate, comprehensive, detailed, and annual measurement of our students' performance in relation to students in other states. Additionally, the state will leverage its extant RTTT goals which focus on CCR—the percentage of students taking advanced coursework, meeting ACT benchmarks, enrolling in postsecondary education, and persisting and succeeding in college—to measure the overall success of the CCSS implementation plan. The new P-20 data system will eventually prove a valuable resource, allowing us to trace students' progress through the educational system and through postsecondary education and the workforce—once this system is in place, TDOE will be able to set new, robust accountability measures to measure the long-term progress of our CCR goals.

**Conclusion**

With the deep belief that students rise to the level of expectation, we view the evolution of college and career ready standards as an important step forward for the students of Tennessee. This transition builds on our recent work to raise standards and increase transparency about student performance and it creates an opportunity for educators and all those who support the work of instruction to align around a common vision of excellence and expectation for the preparation of all children to be able to compete in an increasingly global economy. Furthermore, it allows us to revisit and examine with new eyes the full suite of instructional materials and practices to ensure they are supporting the highest possible student achievement and attainment of our common vision. This work is of the utmost importance to the future of Tennessee and we intend to support it as a chief priority of the department across the next three years.

## 1.C Develop and Administer Annual, Statewide, Aligned, High-Quality Assessments that Measure Student Growth

Select the option that pertains to the SEA and provide evidence corresponding to the option selected.

| Option A | Option B | Option C |
|---|---|---|
| ☒ The SEA is participating in one of the two State consortia that received a grant under the Race to the Top Assessment | ☐ The SEA is not participating in either one of the two State consortia that received a grant under the Race to the | ☐ The SEA has developed and begun annually administering statewide aligned, high-quality assessments that measure |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| competition.<br><br>i. Attach the State's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) under that competition. (Attachment 6) | Top Assessment competition, and has not yet developed or administered statewide aligned, high-quality assessments that measure student growth in reading/language arts and in mathematics in at least grades 3-8 and at least once in high school in all LEAs.<br><br>i. Provide the SEA's plan to develop and administer annually, beginning no later than the 2014–2015 school year, statewide aligned, high-quality assessments that measure student growth in reading/language arts and in mathematics in at least grades 3-8 and at least once in high school in all LEAs, as well as set academic achievement standards for those assessments. | student growth in reading/language arts and in mathematics in at least grades 3-8 and at least once in high school in all LEAs.<br><br>i. Attach evidence that the SEA has submitted these assessments and academic achievement standards to the Department for peer review or attach a timeline of when the SEA will submit the assessments and academic achievement standards to the Department for peer review. (Attachment 7) |

For Option B, insert plan here

# PRINCIPLE 2: STATE-DEVELOPED DIFFERENTIATED RECOGNITION, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND SUPPORT

## 2.A DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT A STATE-BASED SYSTEM OF DIFFERENTIATED RECOGNITION, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND SUPPORT

2.A.i Provide a description of the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system that includes all the components listed in Principle 2, the SEA's plan for implementation of the differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system no later than the 2012–2013 school year, and an explanation of how the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system is designed to improve student achievement and school performance, close achievement gaps, and increase the quality of instruction for students.

Tennessee recognizes and supports the principle that the USED has an interest in ensuring that states implement effective accountability systems so that all children have the opportunity to succeed in school and in life. Through Race to the Top, we have created a framework and process for ensuring that all LEAs, schools and classrooms are focused on advancing student achievement for all children. Our current and proposed action steps further the principles outlined by the Council of Chief State School Officers in its recent recommendations for state accountability to the USED, and represent a system that is tight on top-line goals, supported by effective state policy and management, but driven by local innovation and execution.

Tennessee's accountability and reporting system is rooted in the following beliefs about federal, state and local responsibilities.

Federal: We believe that the USED has the responsibility to require states to maintain rigorous state-established top-line goals for both student achievement and for closing the gap between different sub-groups of students. The USED has the responsibility to monitor annual progress against these goals, and to report and highlight the progress of states against these goals. In the case of Tennessee, the USED also signs off on implementation of TDOE's Race to the Top plan, which includes most key reforms designed to improve state results. Additionally, through this waiver, the USED retains a significant accountability lever: the ability to withdraw the waiver from the state and return the state to the current federal mandates if the state fails to make progress against its goals.

State: We believe that the state has the responsibility to set all interim benchmark goals, to define our measurement system, and to report to the USED. While the federal government can and should require states to maintain rigorous state-established top-line goals, it is the state's responsibility to figure out the interim measures that will lead to achieving the top-line goals. The state also has the responsibility of defining the measurement tool, including how to measure growth in outcomes and reduce gaps in student achievement. Additionally, the state has the responsibility of signing off on LEA goals, measuring LEA and school-level progress every year (disaggregated by student sub-groups), and reporting LEA and

school results publicly. Because the state is responsible for ensuring the attainment of state-level goals, the state also has the duty to support LEAs that are failing to make progress against goals, and to intervene in the lowest-performing schools.

LEAs: We believe that LEAs should receive greater freedom and flexibility when they are successful, support when they demonstrate progress but are failing to reach ambitious goals, and intervention when their results regress or demonstrate growing gaps between groups of students. LEAs are responsible for setting achievement targets, subject to state approval, and for implementing the reforms needed to hit these targets. LEAs are responsible for managing their schools to ensure that they make progress against goals. When schools fail to make progress, LEAs have the obligation to work with the state to develop plans for improvement. When schools perform at the very bottom of the state performance curve, the state has the obligation to remove LEA oversight. In all other cases, though, the LEA has management responsibility, and maintains accountability for student growth and outcomes.

**Outline of Tennessee's proposed accountability system**

The core elements of the accountability plan TDOE proposes in place of the current NCLB provisions provides for the following:

- In place of the annual designation of AYP for LEAs and schools, a state accountability system requiring, in aggregate, significant growth in student achievement in core subjects, and cutting the achievement gap between different sub-groups of students.
- In place of an AYP structure that eventually designates most schools in the state eligible for state takeover, an accountability structure that identifies the top performing schools for recognition and creates meaningful, tailored interventions for the bottom 5 percent of schools in absolute performance and the 10 percent of schools with the largest achievement gaps state-wide.
- Flexibility in spending allowing LEAs to expand services for low-income students, and freedom that strongly encourages and rewards success by offering greater flexibility for schools and LEAs reaching ambitious targets.

Already, through Race to the Top, Tennessee has committed as a state to significantly raise student achievement levels and has created a process in which LEAs set student achievement growth goals in collaboration with TDOE. We propose to use that framework for an accountability system focused on increasing student achievement proficiency levels by a steady rate each year, while reducing achievement gaps by a significant but realistic level each year.

We also are guided by several key principles. First, through aligning our goals across all layers of the education system, we are better able to measure what works, provide information and resources from the state to LEAs, and position LEAs to operate with flexibility to innovate in the effort to achieve ambitious goals. We do not believe that direct state intervention in schools generally is an effective strategy for driving improvement (unless substantial changes in operations are made, as in the Achievement School District). We do believe that holding LEAs accountable for results, and providing information and resources, will help feed a continuous improvement cycle when goals are aligned.

Second, we premise our goals on growth against the current baseline. While the current AYP targets are predicated on every LEA reaching 100 percent proficiency at the same time, we believe these goals are both unrealistic and de-motivating. However, we do believe that all students, classes, schools and LEAs have equal capacity to improve against their current baseline. As a result, our goals call for each LEA to

have targets of advancing proficiency levels at a steady and ambitious rate over the next four years, and for our LEAs to ask all schools to do the same. Additionally, as described in Principle 3, our teacher and principal evaluation framework uses student growth through value-added scores, ensuring that across the state, we maintain a focus on advancing each child against the current baseline results. This focus on growth against our current performance level meets each child, teacher, principal and LEA superintendent in the right place and creates accountability that is fair but ambitious.

Third, we believe that the same standards should apply for all schools. When we identify the lowest performing schools in the state or the schools with the largest achievement gaps, we should apply those standards to all schools rather than just to Title I schools, and all schools should have access to targeted state support for improvement. While the majority of Tennessee's 1700 schools are Title I schools, we believe that the state should have meaningful accountability for all schools.

**State accountability, LEA accountability, and school accountability**

Through Race to the Top, Tennessee has committed to grow student achievement, high school graduation and post-secondary attendance rates across the state. This application for flexibility identifies overall goals for student achievement in grades 3-8 reading language arts and math and high school core subjects, as well as specific goals for 3rd grade and 7th grade, high school graduation and postsecondary going as approved by the State Board of Education. These goals reflect changes in the overall levels of proficiency identified in the original Race to the Top application due to increased rigor in the state's standards and assessments.

In particular, Tennessee has set the following top-line goals as critical barometers of our progress:

- Increase third grade reading language arts proficiency from 42 percent in 2009-10 to 60 percent by 2014-15.
- Increase seventh grade math proficiency from 29 percent in 2009-10 to 51 percent by 2014-15
- Increase graduation rates (while simultaneously increasing standards and requirements for graduation) from 82 percent in 2009-10 to 90 percent in 2014-15
- Increase post-secondary enrollment from 46 percent in 2009-10 to 51 percent in 2014-15[4]

LEAs are setting goals in these areas as well, reflecting growth that rolls up to the state's overall goals, and these goals reflect growth in proficiency levels at a rate of around 3 to 5 percent annually on average or approximately 20 percent over five years.

Tennessee, like all states, has a large achievement gap across different groups of students. We believe in the potential of all children and believe that these gaps can and must be closed. We also think that it is critically important to set goals that reflect the difficulty of simultaneously closing achievement gaps and growing achievement for all students. Through this application, we are proposing a measure that would ensure that all students grow achievement levels significantly, but that groups performing at the lowest levels currently (non-white students, economically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities and English Learners) grow proficiency levels faster than other students.

The current AYP measurement process has three main shortcomings in terms of LEA accountability. First, it sets standards for schools that are now generally unattainable. Second, it is a pass-fail system,

[4] Post-secondary enrollment is defined here as graduates of Tennessee public high schools enrolling in Tennessee public or private institutions only.

with little room for nuanced intervention depending on local needs. Third, the measurements used in the system are in many cases opaque, decreasing public understanding of LEA and school goals.

Through this proposal, we aim to measure LEA and school progress in a way that alleviates each of these issues.

<u>LEA accountability</u>
We believe that the most important state function vis-à-vis performance targets is to ensure that LEAs set appropriate goals, provide public, state-level reporting of progress against goals, and provide support to LEAs as they manage their progress locally. We believe that state intervention must be narrowly defined and targeted. Our experience through the past decade suggests that the state is ill-equipped to engage in detailed planning and management with hundreds of schools across the state, and is better positioned to support LEA management of school systems.

At the same time, TDOE can and should engage to support students in habitually failing schools. Additionally, the state can and should support school-level planning processes when LEAs are failing to improve student performance through their own management.

In the following section, we detail the assessments that we will use for state, LEA and school-level AMOs. These AMOs are predicated on the twin pillars of our accountability proposal: we will improve overall student achievement levels at an ambitious but achievable rate; and we will ensure that the students who are farthest behind grow the fastest.

We will ask each LEA to set goals under a category of Achievement measures and a category of Gap Closure measures that aggregate to our state-level goals in both categories. LEAs will then be measured through the following basic system:

- The state will publish the goals for each LEA, and for schools within the LEA.
- The state will report on progress against those goals.
- When LEAs hit the majority of their goals, the state will continue to support them and provide flexibility where possible to innovate.
- When LEAs miss half or more of their goals, the state will provide differentiated levels of intervention, depending on the LEA progress. LEAs that are making progress, but at a slower rate of growth than desired, will have a lower tier of intervention. LEAs that are moving backwards in achievement will have a higher level of intervention, including public identification on the list of LEAs in need of improvement, with increased state engagement and decreased LEA flexibility.
- Regarding gap closure AMOs specifically:
    - When LEAs reach their achievement gap closure goals (i.e., successfully show that the students with the greatest needs advance the fastest), the state will continue to support them and provide flexibility where possible.
    - When LEAs miss achievement gap goals, the state will provide differentiated levels of intervention. LEAs that are demonstrating increased student achievement, but are failing to reach gap-closure goals, will have a lower tier of intervention. LEAs in which any sub-group is moving backwards in student achievement in both elementary/middle school and high school levels will have a higher level of intervention, including public identification on the list of LEAs in need of improvement, with increased state engagement and decreased LEA flexibility.

- LEAs that meet both the aggregate student achievement goal and the gap reduction goal for a given year would be commended to an exemplary LEA list, freed from state goal-setting processes and reporting requirements for that year, and, where possible, granted increased latitude in funding flexibility.
- LEAs that improve in overall achievement and gap reduction but do not "achieve" across either or both Achievement and Gap Closure categories will have to submit a detailed analysis of the results along with plans for the coming year to achieve goals, subject to TDOE discussion and approval. This process will be developed by TDOE.

<u>School accountability</u>

In compliance with the rules of this application for regulatory relief, Tennessee proposes to have two types of school-level accountability: 1) absolute accountability for growth against current baselines; and 2) relative accountability in which schools are measured against their peers.

In absolute accountability for progress, Tennessee believes that the state role generally should be helping LEAs in goal-setting, publishing results for all schools, and providing transparent information for parents. State-to-school interventions should be limited to the system of relative accountability, where the state may engage (often in conjunction with LEAs) with priority, focus, and reward schools. Therefore, Tennessee's accountability for school growth is centered on the following activities.

- **Transparency:** To ensure transparency regarding Tennessee's accountability plan and student achievement, annually, TDOE will publish a report card grading all schools on an A, B, C, D, F scale. The report card will share information about student achievement scores in aggregate and by subgroup, trajectory of growth based on longitudinal data (value-added scores using Tennessee's TVAAS data), rates of participation in testing, and the size of all achievement gaps. TDOE already issues a report card for every school in the state. See Appendix 3 for current report card.
- **Absolute Performance Accountability (AMOs):** By holding LEAs accountable for LEA AMOs that are aggregated from school performance, we are creating a system where LEAs are responsible for and incented to identify and intervene with schools that are missing their AMOs. LEAs that are not achieving their goals overall are required to submit an LEA plan for improvement that specifies interventions the LEA will take with specific schools. Through LEA-led planning, and through transparent reporting of progress, the state will ensure progress in <u>all</u> schools for <u>all</u> children.
- **Relative Performance Accountability (Priority, Focus, and Reward schools):** Tennessee has demonstrated a strong commitment to turning around the state's lowest performing schools through the creation of the Achievement School District. In compliance with this application, Tennessee is also proposing additional processes to drive increased performance in chronically low performing schools and the schools with the largest achievement gaps in the state. Our focus at the state level will be measurement, public accounting, and targeting financial and planning resources to support improvement. Finally, Tennessee proposes to recognize and reward our top performing and fastest growth schools in the state. Details about each category are summarized below and detailed in subsequent sections.
    - *<u>Priority:</u>* Schools in the bottom 5 percent of overall performance across tested grades and subjects will face one of four interventions: (1) placement in the Achievement School District, (2) turnaround under the governance of an LEA innovation zone, (3) turnaround through one of the federal School Improvement Grant plans, subject to approval by the state; or (4) LEA-led school improvement planning processes, subject to

direct ASD intervention in the absence of improved results.

- *Focus:* Ten percent of schools with the largest achievement gaps, subgroup performance below a 5 percent proficiency threshold, or high schools with graduation rates less than 60 percent that are not already identified as priority schools, will be identified publicly and LEAs will need to submit a plan to TDOE for how to address achievement gaps in all their identified focus schools. LEAs will also have the opportunity to submit a more comprehensive proposal for a competitive grant that in most cases will address interventions specifically focused on improving the performance of English Learners and students with disabilities
- *Reward:* Schools in the top 5 percent of overall performance and schools in the top 5 percent of fastest growth – a total of 10 percent of schools in all – will be recognized publicly, receive financial rewards, and have more opportunities to serve as leaders across the state. Specifically, reward schools will have the opportunity to apply for a substantial competitive grant that will enable them to share best practices broadly.

**Conclusion**

The attached Appendix 4 depicts the overall accountability system and demonstrates the flow of LEA accountability and school accountability for student achievement results. Overall, we have created a system predicated on the general belief that LEAs are best positioned to manage schools against goals, and state intervention should happen in a limited way and only when LEAs are failing to make progress for groups of students or overall. Descriptions of the relative accountability system—Reward, Focus, and Priority Schools—are in the following sections.

This proposed accountability structure reinforces the goals, priorities, and plan outlined in the state's Race to the Top proposal and provides the flexibility and tailored interventions necessary to ensure that TDOE can significantly increase student achievement and reduce achievement gaps across the state.

*Please note:* The accountability system and other aspects of this waiver application are contingent upon the legislature passing the necessary changes in state law in the upcoming session. State legislators have been informed of the changes we are seeking, and understand that state laws incorporating elements of the current accountability system (e.g., definitions of AYP), need to be changed if the state is no longer subject to current ESEA accountability frameworks. TDOE staff members, led by the assistant commissioner for legislation and external affairs will work closely with legislators in the upcoming session to make the necessary changes to ensure that this system will be implemented in LEAs and schools no later than the 2012-13 school year.

Furthermore, once ESEA flexibility for Tennessee is approved, TDOE's FTTT office will work with the U.S. Department of Education Race to the Top office to propose a budget amendment to align some of the dollars allocated on turnaround work to the state's new accountability system.

2.A.ii Select the option that pertains to the SEA and provide the corresponding information, if any.

| Option A | Option B |
|---|---|
| ☐ The SEA only includes student | ☒ If the SEA includes student achievement |

| | |
|---|---|
| achievement on reading/language arts and mathematics assessments in its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system and to identify reward, priority, and focus schools. | on assessments in addition to reading/language arts and mathematics in its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system and to identify reward, priority, and focus schools, it must:<br><br>a. provide the percentage of students in the "all students" group that performed at the proficient level on the State's most recent administration of each assessment for all grades assessed; and<br><br>b. include an explanation of how the included assessments will be weighted in a manner that will result in holding schools accountable for ensuring all students achieve college- and career-ready standards. |

A) See Attachment 8

B) TDOE will focus our accountability assessments predominantly on reading/language arts and mathematics, with some exceptions for science.

Science assessments will be used when determining:

- **Priority school lists:** Biology I in High School (representing 20 percent weight calculation); TCAP Science in grades 3-8 (representing 33 percent weight in calculation)
- **Focus school lists:** TCAP Science in grades 3-8 (representing 33 percent weight in calculation)
- **Reward school lists:** Biology I in High School (representing 20 percent weight in calculation), TCAP Science in grades 3-8 (representing 33 percent weight in calculation)

We have decided to include a more comprehensive set of assessments that includes science for priority identification (and the corresponding reward identification based on the same methodology) because of the high stakes interventions associated with "Priority" and because we believe that including science both enhances the rigor of our assessment and encourages high achievement in all subject areas, particularly given the importance of science in guiding future job prospects for students. We have also included TCAP science in identifying focus lists because we believe it is important to include at least three areas of assessment for each grade level. High schools have graduation rates to consider in addition to Algebra and English; TCAP science provides a third category of assessment for grades 3-8. We have chosen not to include the social studies assessments, except in composite TVAAS scores, because the standards and cut scores have not been changed commensurate with the other assessments and there is therefore insufficient differentiation in outcomes.

## 2.B Set Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives

Select the method the SEA will use to set new ambitious but achievable annual measurable objectives (AMOs) in at least reading/language arts and mathematics for the State and all LEAs, schools, and subgroups that provide meaningful goals and are used to guide support and improvement efforts. If the SEA sets AMOs that differ by LEA, school, or subgroup, the AMOs for LEAs, schools, or subgroups that are further behind must require greater rates of annual progress.

| Option A | Option B | Option C |
|---|---|---|
| ☐ Set AMOs in annual equal increments toward a goal of reducing by half the percentage of students in the "all students" group and in each subgroup who are not proficient within six years. The SEA must use current proficiency rates based on assessments administered in the 2010–2011 school year as the starting point for setting its AMOs.<br><br>i. Provide the new AMOs and an explanation of the method used to set these AMOs. | ☐ Set AMOs that increase in annual equal increments and result in 100 percent of students achieving proficiency no later than the end of the 2019–2020 school year. The SEA must use the average statewide proficiency based on assessments administered in the 2010–2011 school year as the starting point for setting its AMOs.<br><br>i. Provide the new AMOs and an explanation of the method used to set these AMOs. | ☒ Use another method that is educationally sound and results in ambitious but achievable AMOs for all LEAs, schools, and subgroups.<br><br>i. Provide the new AMOs and an explanation of the method used to set these AMOs.<br>ii. Provide an educationally sound rationale for the pattern of academic progress reflected in the new AMOs in the text box below.<br>iii. Provide a link to the State's report card or attach a copy of the average statewide proficiency based on assessments administered in the 2010–2011 school year in reading/language arts and mathematics for the "all students" group and all |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | subgroups. (Attachment 8) |

Tennessee is focused on two primary measures in our accountability system: Raising absolute proficiency for all students and closing the achievement gap between groups of students. As such, we have developed an accountability system that holds LEAs and schools accountable to: (A) Achievement targets, and (B) achievement Gap Closure targets.

We determined achievement targets based on growing the number of students who are proficient or advanced on state assessments by approximately 3 to 5 percent each year, or 20 percent over a five year trajectory, using our Race to the Top measures and state board-approved benchmarks as the primary barometer. Additionally, we have set a target of closing achievement gaps for students in key under-performing sub-groups (non-white students, economically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, and English Learners) by approximately 6 percent annually, or 50 percent over eight years. In effect, these targets satisfy a modified "Option A": in eight years, the percentage of students in the "all students" group and in each subgroup who are not proficient will be reduced by half. Additionally, in eight years, the achievement gap will also be halved. We believe that an eight-year timeline is ambitious but feasible, and we believe that LEAs and schools will manage aggressively against the benchmarks because they believe they are feasible.

An explanation of our AMOs is detailed below. Please refer to Appendix 5 to see the numeric targets for the State AMOs.

(A) Achievement Targets

At the 3-8 grade levels[5] we have set Achievement AMOs for percent of students who are proficient or advanced[6] in:

- 3rd grade Math
- 3rd grade RLA
- 7th grade Math
- 7th grade RLA
- 3-8 grades aggregated for Math
- 3-8 grades aggregated for RLA

At the high school level we have set Achievement AMOs for percent of students who are proficient or advanced in:

- End-of-course exam for Algebra I[7]

[5] Assessments are not currently administered in kindergarten, first grade, or second grade.

[6] Tennessee state assessments measure proficiency on four levels: (1) Advanced, (2) Proficient, (3) Basic, and (4) Below Basic

[7] We have developed higher level Algebra II and English III exams (that more closely correspond to college- and career- ready standards) but do not yet have baseline data from which we are able to assess and develop AMO

- End-of-course exam for English II[8]Graduation rates

TDOE, in collaboration with LEAs and other stakeholders, determined this set of Achievement measures based on alignment with our Race to the Top goals. We will continue to measure and report out on all Race to the Top goals, which also include college going and credit accumulation goals (see full list at: http://www.tn.gov/firsttothetop/goals.html), but determined a more narrow set of achievement AMOs so that LEAs and schools would be able to focus on state assessments administered at the school level. Understanding that AMOs drive behavior, we have also decided to add aggregate grades 3-8 Math and RLA measures to mitigate an over-emphasis on 3rd and 7th grades.

Following the principles of our current state-wide, state board-approved student achievement goals, we have determined that approximately 3 to 5 percent annual growth in proficiency levels across all subjects and grade levels struck the right balance between what is ambitious and achievable. These goals are consistent with our current Race to the Top plan and with our LEA-level goals in core subject areas. Additionally, we have asked for input from stakeholders in the state and from research experts. This process is briefly described below:

- TDOE convened approximately 20 internal and external stakeholders (including representatives from the Tennessee Higher Education Commission, Tennessee State Board of Education, Governor Haslam's office) as an AMO setting committee. Participants were given baseline data for each of the new AMOs, as well as information regarding the previously established First to the Top AMOs. Participants were given the guidelines to determine goals at the intersection of ambition and attainability.
- The AMO setting committee's proposed growth targets were vetted by research conducted on the achievement gains made by other states. The Center for Education Policy (CEP) has conducted several national studies examining the types of gains experienced on state assessments. One such study (*State Test Score Trends Through 2008-09, Part 1: Rising Scores on State Tests and NAEP* - September 2010) found that between 2005 and 2009 median average yearly gains on state reading tests were 0.8 and 1.8 percentage points for 4th and 8th grade, respectively. Median average yearly gains on state math tests were 1.3 and 1.8 percentage points for 4th and 8th grade. Additionally, another CEP report (*State Test Score Trends Through 2008-09, Part 5: Progress Lags in High School, Especially for Advanced Achievers* - October 2011) analyzing high school achievement tests found that between 2002 and 2009, 55 percent of the 38 states analyzed saw gains between 0.1 and 1.9 percentage points in reading, while 53 percent saw the same percentage point gains in math. Report Card data for a number of other Race to the Top state recipients was analyzed for the 3 most recent years' data and average yearly gains were between 1 and 2 percentage points. Together this research provides strong support for the ambitiousness of Tennessee's AMOs

---

targets that we can ensure are ambitious and achievable. However, we do intend to add AMOs for these assessments for the 2012-13 school year when sufficient data is available, based on our 2011-12 baseline.

[8] Ibid

and annual progress of 3 to 5 percent growth.

We will also allow provisions for safe harbor based on growth, as demonstrated by Tennessee's value-added growth measure (TVAAS). Safe harbor aligns with the emphasis we have placed on TVAAS in teacher and principal evaluations (and the focus on growing every student, every year), while enabling the primary achievement goals that we have set to align with Race to the Top goals (and the focus on growing school and LEA performance). Additionally, Tennessee has many small, rural LEAs and schools, and the use of proficiency targets alone can lead to data that skews based on shifts in individual student cohorts. Using value-added growth as a safe harbor protects LEAs and schools that advance student performance for individual students.

(B) <u>Achievement Gap Closure targets</u>

We have also determined a state goal to achieve at least a 6 percent annual reduction (and 50 percent reduction over eight years) in the achievement gap between student sub-groups: White and Non-White students; Economically disadvantaged (ED) and non-ED students; English learners (ELs) and non-ELs; and students with disabilities (SWD) and non-SWD.

At the 3-8 grade levels, we have based achievement gap closure targets for 3-8 aggregate math and 3-8 aggregate reading. At the high school level, we have based achievement gap closure targets on Algebra I and English II exams (and will add Algebra II and English III when we have baseline data across the state at the conclusion of the 2011-12 year). We believe that this is a manageable set of assessments that provide a solid demonstration of the degree of achievement gaps in a school and LEA.

It is important to note that our achievement gap closure goals also satisfy the requirement set forth in this waiver application to establish subgroup-level AMOs. The combination of school- and LEA- wide achievement targets in the range of 3 to 5 percent annual growth and 6 percent annual gap closure targets imply subgroup level achievement targets (as exhibited in Appendix 5), that in effect require subgroups that are farther behind to make greater rates of annual progress. We will continue to measure progress of each sub-group against AMO targets, but we nonetheless think it is important to focus on gap closure AMOs rather than subgroup achievement AMOs because:

- While we acknowledge that sub-groups are performing at different rates of proficiency today, we believe communicating different expectations of proficiency for different subgroups at the state level sends the wrong message.
- At the same time, while we aspire towards one day being able to set the same proficiency targets for all subgroups, doing so today would ignore the pervasive achievement gaps that currently exist. Setting the same target for all sub-groups is unrealistic in a framework focused on consistent growth against baselines, and therein, also sends the wrong message.
- We believe that communicating a gap closure measure, in conjunction with achievement measures, focuses the communication on the right messages: we believe all schools and LEAs should realize an ambitious and achievable annual growth rate of approximately 3 to 5

percent across different measures and that this should be done while closing achievement gaps.

For both sets of AMO targets, we are asking LEAs and schools to grow at the same rate in terms of an increase in percentage of proficient and advanced students each year (for Achievement targets) and a decrease in achievement gaps between sub-groups of students (for Gap Closure targets), but for LEAs and schools that are further behind in overall performance or in the size of their achievement gaps, this will represent a faster rate of growth against their baselines. For example, an LEA that currently has 20 percent of its students scoring proficient or advanced on the aggregate 3-8 math measure currently, and sets an AMO of 24 percent in that category, would be aiming for an increase of 4 percent that actually represents 20 percent growth over its baseline. In contrast, an LEA that currently has 64 percent of its students proficient/advanced in the same category with an AMO of 68 percent would be aiming for the same increase in percentage proficient/advanced, but that increase represents only 6.25 percent growth over its baseline. The LEA that is further behind must grow at a faster rate (20 percent vs. 6.25 percent) to achieve the same percentage increase in proficient/advanced. The same principle holds true for LEAs and schools that have larger achievement gaps in trying to achieve their Gap Closure AMOs.

**Consequences of failing AMOs**

Setting targets that strike an honest balance between ambitious and achievable means that even high-functioning schools will not achieve every target. Therefore, we believe the ability to allow schools and LEAs to miss some AMOs without being identified as "failing" is important.

As described above, we consider Achievement measures and Gap Closure measures as two distinct categories of AMOs. We will assess LEAs and schools based on whether they "achieve" or "miss" the Achievement category (aggregated) and whether they "achieve" or "miss" the Gap Closure category (aggregated).

To "achieve" in the Achievement category, an LEA/school must achieve more targets than it misses. If an LEA misses half or more targets (because all students improved in achievement but did not improve enough or because students' achievement declined), then this would constitute a "miss".

To "achieve" in the Gap Closure category, an LEA/school must:

- Achieve more targets than it misses
- An LEA must not widen achievement gaps because the same subgroup declined in achievement in 3 or more gap target areas (3-8 Math, 3-8 RLA, Algebra I, and English II)[9] , or because subgroups declined in achievement in half or more targets[10]

[9] For example: an LEA must not widen its gap between Economically Disadvantaged students and Non-ED students because ED students declined in achievement in 3-8 Math, 3-8 RLA, or some combination of moving backwards in 2 or more High School measures

Missing either of the above stipulations would result in a "miss" in the Gap Closure category.

Every LEA and school will be evaluated based on the combination of "achieve"/"miss" for Achievement and Gap Closure. However, in line with TDOE's overarching philosophy that the state can best intervene at the LEA level, TDOE will only engage directly with LEAs. TDOE will expect LEAs to engage meaningfully with their schools (and will support LEAs in this endeavor as necessary).

TDOE's interventions with LEAs are outlined as follows:

| **If an LEA …** | **Then, it will:** |
|---|---|
| Achieves both Achievement and Gap Closure categories | • Be commended to an exemplary LEA list<br>• Be allowed to maintain plans at the LEA level without approval from the state<br>• Be granted increased latitude in funding flexibility (where possible) |
| Misses Achievement but Achieves Gap Closure | ***If achievement declined in half or more targets; OR declined in either 3-8 math, 3-8 RLA, or the majority of HS targets:***<br>• LEA will be placed on public list of LEAs in need of improvement<br>• LEA must meet with TDOE to support the creation of an aggressive plan for corrective action<br><br>***In all other cases:***<br>• LEA must submit a detailed analysis of the results along with plans for the coming year to achieve goals, subject to TDOE approval |
| Achieves on Achievement but Misses Gap Closure | ***If gaps widened because the same subgroup had achievement declines in a majority of its gap target areas, or because subgroups declined in achievement in half or more targets :***<br>• LEA placed on public list of LEAs in need of improvement<br>• LEA must meet with TDOE to support the creation of an aggressive plan for corrective action<br><br>***In all other cases:***<br>• LEA must submit a detailed analysis of the results along with plans for the coming year to achieve goals, subject to TDOE approval |
| Misses both Achievement and Gap Closure categories | • Be placed on public list of LEAs in need of improvement (for all students and sub-group achievement failures)<br>• Meet with TDOE officials in-person to support the creation of an aggressive plan for corrective action |

Please refer to Appendix 4 for a visual representation of AMO failure and consequences. Please also note the safe harbor provisions as well as other assessment standards below.

**Process for setting LEA and school AMOs**

Upon state board approval of the proposed state AMOs, TDOE will engage with LEAs to determine LEA targets based on the same general philosophy: approximately 3 to 5 percent annual growth for all students beginning with LEA-specific 2010-11 baselines and 6 percent annual gap closure across subgroups. LEAs will similarly engage with schools to establish school level AMOs. An LEA's school-level AMOs will, in aggregate, meet or exceed the LEA level AMOs; LEA-level AMOs will, in aggregate, meet or exceed State-level AMOs.

Please refer to Attachment 8 to review a copy of the average statewide proficiency based on assessments administered in the 2010-11 school year in reading language arts and math for the "all students" group and all subgroups; or to Appendix 5 which outlines TDOE's proposed statewide AMOs.

**Assessment standards**

Note: assessments will have to fulfill the following standards (for all systems of accountability):

N-Count

For purposes of accountability, TDOE will use an N count of 30 because the prior N count of 45 masks many subgroups at a school level. A sample size or N count of 30 or greater is commonly used to ensure a greater probability that the sampling distribution of the mean will be approximately normally distributed and the results of the analysis can be inferred to the general population.[11] For example, New Jersey uses an N count of 30 for accountability, and Colorado uses an N count of 20 or less, depending on the measure. Research on NCLB N counts (conducted in 2005) demonstrates that a total of 26 states established N counts of 30 or less for subgroup accountability[12].

For purposes of transparency and reporting, TDOE will continue to report data for students in a LEA or school group, with a minimum number of 10.

Participation Rate

- Schools or LEAs must have at least a 95 percent participation rate in the required TCAP accountability tests for all students and for each student subgroup;
- If a school does not meet this participation rate, the school will automatically fail both its

[11] Marion et. al. "Making Valid and Reliable Decisions in Determining Adequate Yearly Progress." Series: *Implementing the State Accountability System Requirements Under The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. ASR-CAS Joint Study Group on Adequate Yearly Progress. Council of Chief State School Officers. December 2002.

[12] Porter et. al. "The Effects of State Decisions About NCLB Yearly Progress Targets." Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice. 2005.

achievement and gap closure measures

If a school or LEA meets or exceeds the minimum number of students in a required subgroup and meets the 95 percent participation rate requirement, then that school or LEA must meet annual performance objectives set by the State with the application of a 95 percent confidence interval.

Tennessee determined participation rates for the first time in Spring 2003. Only schools and LEAs that meet the 95 percent 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 (30). To meet this requirement, the State will use the most current year, the most current two years, or the most current three years of 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.

Test Taker Scores

The State will include scores from every student enrolled and tested (every test taker (ETT)) in the school or LEA at the time of assessment administration whether or not enrolled for a full academic year.

Safe Harbor

We propose to have two safe harbor provisions: 1) student growth results from Tennessee Value Added Assessment System (TVAAS); and 2) reduction of the percent below proficient.

TDOE proposes to utilize our student growth results from TVAAS to align with the emphasis we have placed on TVAAS in teacher and principal evaluations (and the focus on growing every student, every year). Additionally, Tennessee has many small, rural LEAs and schools, and the use of proficiency targets alone can lead to identification based on shifts in individual student cohorts. Using value-added growth as a safe harbor provision protects LEAs and schools that advance individual students' performance.

We will also maintain our current provision for safe harbor allowing that a school or LEA may achieve a goal if the percentage of below proficient students (either all students or a particular subgroup depending on the measure) declines by 10 percent from the previous year, 19 percent from two years previously, or 27 percent from three years previously.

English Learners

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

accountability determination.

Students who are identified as English learners and monitored for two years after they test proficient (Transition 1 and Transition 2 or Monitored Former Limited English Proficient (MFLEP)) are not counted in the EL 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 LEA.

Students With Disabilities

Tennessee will continue to permit LEAs to exceed the 1 percent 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 requesting the extension of the 1 percent cap, proficient scores exceeding this cap must be changed to below proficient for accountability purposes. 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 percent of all students in the grades assessed at the LEA and State levels.

## 2.C Reward Schools

### 2.C.i Describe the SEA's methodology for identifying highest-performing and high-progress schools as reward schools.

TDOE will identify Reward Schools annually based on highest overall proficiency and/or highest overall progress.

To ensure that the State looks at all schools, regardless of their Title I status, we have included all schools in the pool from which we identify Reward Schools. We have also set a target to identify 10 percent of Tennessee schools that exhibit high proficiency and/or high progress based on TVAAS. We believe that highlighting a large number of schools (169 schools, equivalent to 10 percent of all schools) will increase motivation – both for schools to attain and maintain high levels of proficiency as well as for schools that may be starting from much lower levels of proficiency but have the most opportunity to make substantial gains. Whereas the priority and focus lists allow us to identify schools that face additional challenges and to provide resources to have schools better overcome those challenges, we view the reward list as an opportunity to recognize a large number of schools that achieved different types of success.

We have identified two categories of Reward schools, each category representing 5 percent of All Schools for a total of 10 percent:

**Achievement-based Reward Schools (5 percent):**

- Represent the 5 percent with the highest overall achievement based on percent proficient or

advanced proficiency levels across assessments in school
    - High schools will be assessed based on an equally weighted composite[13] of:
        - Graduation rates
        - End-of-course Algebra I (Percent proficient and advanced)
        - End-of-course English I (Percent proficient and advanced)
        - End-of-course English II (Percent proficient and advanced)
        - End-of-course Biology I (Percent proficient and advanced)
    - Elementary/Middle schools will be assessed based on a TCAP aggregate, which includes and equally weights:
        - Math (Percent proficient and advanced)
        - Reading/Language Arts (Percent proficient and advanced)
        - Science (Percent proficient and advanced)
- Within-school gaps must be smaller than the state median, or if they are larger than the state median they must be narrowing[14]

**Progress-based Reward Schools (5 percent):**

- Represent the 5 percent of schools with the highest growth based on TVAAS value-added scores
    - Elementary/Middle schools will be assessed based on TVAAS growth composite index scores, which include TCAP Math, Science, RLA, Social Studies (and Algebra I if taken at the Middle school level)
    - High schools will be assessed based on TVAAS growth composite index scores, which include Algebra I, Biology I, U.S. History, English I, and English II
- Within-school gaps must be smaller than the state median, or if they are larger than the state median they must be narrowing [15]

Schools that serve some portion of both high school grades and elementary/middle grades, will be assessed as both school types.

Please refer to Appendix 6 for a step by step outline of TDOE's reward identification methodology.

2.C.ii Provide the SEA's list of reward schools in Table 2.

2.C.iii Describe how the SEA will publicly recognize and, if possible, reward highest-performing and high-progress schools.

TDOE compiled feedback from LEA personnel about how the State and LEAs can acknowledge high

---

[13] We have developed higher level Algebra II and English III which we will include when we have sufficient data.

[14] This analysis is based on the "gap index" we describe in focus schools; The USED states: "A school may not be classified as a 'highest-performing' school if there are significant achievement gaps across subgroups that are not closing in the school" and "A school may not be classified as a 'high-progress school' if there are significant achievement gaps across subgroups that are not closing in the school." (US Department of Education, *ESEA Flexibility*, September 23, 2011)

[15] Ibid

performing schools at the Federal Programs Directors' Conference we hosted in October 2011. We have also gathered feedback on this subject through a meeting with the Superintendents' Study Council, and a webinar hosted with superintendents from all 136 LEAs across the state. Three resounding themes emerged, from which we have designed our reward system.

1. Meaningful public recognition and honoring:
The annual list of Reward schools will be posted on TDOE's website, the state report card, and publicized through media outlets across the state. Letters of acknowledgement will also be sent to LEAs listing their reward schools and highlighting ways the LEAs can publicize and reward their high performing schools.

2. Financial rewards:
Beyond public recognition, TDOE will also provide financial rewards. TDOE will create a competitive grant process for reward schools to share their best practices with other schools which we expect will strengthen their existing programs. Each school, with the approval of its LEA, will be eligible to apply for funds. Financial rewards will allow the school to create a thorough description of their instructional improvement program and provide funds for publication, travel and visitation. Grant decisions will be based on innovation and opportunities for scalability.

3. Leadership opportunities among schools:
Reward schools will also be honored as leaders across the state. We believe that the designation of being a Reward school is an opportunity to serve as a key strategic partner in the work to raise achievement levels across the state; the best way to drive improvement across all schools is by leveraging the thinking, best practices, and credibility of those schools that are already doing a great job.

To this end, Reward schools will be asked to consider serving as Ambassadors to other schools, meaning a Reward school would: analyze its best practices; share best practices with neighboring schools by hosting visiting staff or conducting school visits to other schools; create mentorship opportunities between its staff and neighboring schools' staff. TDOE will provide the necessary financial and other resources to support Reward schools to carry out these additional functions.

We anticipate that we will be able to allocate approximately $2 million toward reward schools annually beginning in 2012-13.[16]

## 2.D PRIORITY SCHOOLS

2.D.i Describe the SEA's methodology for identifying a number of lowest-performing schools equal to at least five percent of the State's Title I schools as priority schools.

[16] Once ESEA flexibility for Tennessee is approved, the state will propose an amendment to its Race to the Top plan to align some of the dollars allocated on turnaround work to the state's new accountability system. Any dollar figures cited are contingent upon: the continuation of SIG funding, Race to the Top approval, and/or the reallocation of other state funds.

Priority schools will be identified every 3 years based on an evaluation of all Schools' (expanding beyond just Title I schools) 3-year achievement data. Schools must have a minimum of two years of data (i.e. they must have been in operation for 2 years) to be considered.

In order to identify the bottom 5 percent of schools in overall achievement, we will consider the performance of all students on the following state assessments.

High schools will be assessed based on an equally weighted composite[17] of:

- Graduation rates[18]
- End-of-course Algebra I (Percent proficient and advanced)
- End-of-course English I (Percent proficient and advanced)
- End-of-course English II (Percent proficient and advanced)
- End-of-course Biology I (Percent proficient and advanced)

Elementary/Middle schools will be assessed based on a TCAP aggregate, which includes and equally weights:

- Math (Percent proficient and advanced)
- Reading/Language Arts (Percent proficient and advanced)
- Science (Percent proficient and advanced)

Schools that serve some portion of both high school grades and elementary/middle grades, will be assessed as both school types.

Because Title I schools predominate in the bottom five percent of all schools, expanding the "Priority" mandate to identify five percent of all Schools results in a greater number of Title I schools identified as Priority. In the draft Priority list submitted with this application based on current data, we have identified a total of 85 priority schools all of which are Title I schools, representing nearly 8 percent of all Title I schools. While the decision to include all schools requires greater state intervention and support covering a greater number of schools, we believe this is the right thing to do because it ensures: (1) all schools are held to the same standards, and (2) more of the lowest performing schools get the additional support they need to be successful.

Please refer to Appendix 7 for a step by step outline of TDOE's priority identification methodology.

## 2.D.ii Provide the SEA's list of priority schools in Table 2.

[17] We have developed higher level Algebra II and English III which we will include when we have sufficient data.

[18] To mitigate unintended consequences from using graduation rate as an indicator by itself, we have included graduation rates as part of the composite measure for high schools. Any high school with a graduation rate of less than 60 percent that is not identified through this priority methodology is automatically included on the focus list, as is mandated by the ESEA flexibility application guidance.

## 2.D.iii Describe the meaningful interventions aligned with the turnaround principles that an LEA with priority schools will implement.

In the short-term, identified priority schools will face one of four types of interventions:

1) Enter the TDOE-run Achievement School District (ASD)
2) Enter an LEA-run "innovation zone" (that affords schools flexibilities similar to those provided by the ASD) that an LEA has applied to create and that TDOE has approved
3) Apply and be approved by TDOE to adopt one of four SIG turnaround models
4) Undergo LEA-led school improvement planning processes, subject to direct ASD intervention in the absence of improved results.

By 2014-15, the bottom five percent of schools will all be served through one of the first three categories. Each of the first three categories, as described below, meets the U.S. Department of Education's turnaround principles for interventions, including:

- Strong leadership by reviewing principals and providing operational flexibility
- Strong instruction by reviewing teachers and providing professional development
- Flexibility to redesign learning time and instructional program
- Focus on data and on school environment
- Ongoing community engagement

Over time, as the ASD expands capacity and as LEAs establish effective innovation zones, we envision all priority schools to be served by one of these channels.

**The Achievement School District**

Overview of the Organization

In January 2010 the Tennessee legislature enacted the First to the Top Act – the most sweeping education law passed in Tennessee in over two decades. Among the most notable components of this new, bipartisan legislation was the creation of The Achievement School District ("ASD" or "the district"), a wholly new division of the State's Department of Education. The ASD is a key component of Tennessee's strategy to address the persistently poor performance of some of its schools. Modeled after the Recovery School District in Louisiana, the ASD has the ability to take over and operate persistently poor performing schools, or to authorize charter schools.

Further affirmation of Tennessee's bold vision for reforming public education for its schoolchildren followed in the form of two substantial federal grants. First, in March 2010, Tennessee was named as one of only two states to receive a grant award in the first round of the federal Race to the Top competition. Next, in August, and in partnership with Louisiana's Recovery School District and New Schools For New Orleans, Tennessee's Department of Education was awarded $30 million in the highly competitive Investing in Innovation (i3) federal grant program designed to support and expand high-quality charter schools.

ASD Design

The primary functions of the ASD fall into five categories: oversight, facilitation, human capital, operations and support. Below is a table that shows the kinds of activities that fall under each category. This list is not exhaustive, but is meant to illustrate the ASD's main oversight and facilitation functions (occurring at the state-level) and human capital, operations, and support functions (at the school level).

**State Level Work**

| *Oversight* | *Facilitation* |
|---|---|
| • Identify schools to enter the ASD<br>• Select intervention strategies (charter or direct-run)<br>• Hold all schools accountable for results and, when necessary, for compliance | • Develop policy<br>• Oversee public affairs |

**School Level Work**

| *Human Capital* | *Operations* | *Support* |
|---|---|---|
| • Employ teachers and leaders to work in ASD schools<br>• Administer HR programs<br>• Oversee performance management systems | • Transportation<br>• Food Service<br>• Technology<br>• Maintenance<br>• Purchasing | • Instructional Services<br>• Professional Development<br>• Grants Administration |

Per the table above, the ASD will employ two primary intervention strategies to dramatically increase student achievement – (1) convert the school into a charter school, or (2) replace the LEA and manage the daily operations of the school.

*Charter Conversions*. The ASD will use best-in class charter operators to transform schools wherever possible. In this scenario, the ASD's role will be to:

- Identify, recruit and cultivate highly effective charter management organizations, both home-grown and nationally recognized, to turnaround schools as a first option.
- Grant flexibility in exchange for a high degree of accountability for outcomes
- Provide transition support via i3 funding to ensure the charter operator has ample planning time and support for a successful school launch
- Evaluate performance every 2 years leading to a robust renewal process

*Direct-run Conversions*. In addition to authorizing high-quality charter operators, the ASD will scale up priority interventions by also directly running great schools. In this scenario, the ASD's role will be to:

- Invest heavily in recruiting and in human capital management in order to secure a highly effective school staff
- Hire the turnaround team (principal and lead teachers) at least six months in advance to allow for a robust induction program.
- Employ charter-like flexibility and autonomy over hiring, budget, schedule, and program.
- Maintain tight control over scope and sequence, assessments, professional development, and performance management.

Among the identified priority schools, the ASD will determine which schools to absorb based on two factors: (1) student achievement growth, and (2) feeder pattern analysis. Priority schools that are geographically clustered with the worst growth will be the first contenders for an ASD conversion outlined above.

*School Support Team*. The ASD will support its charters and direct-runs schools through a lean and flexible school support team. The approach to building the school support team will be:

- Outsource all functions that non-ASD entities can perform well
- Maximum flexibility and authority in staffing
- Utilize exceptional generalists who can shift to different roles at different times
- Invest in key capacity ahead of growth

*Stakeholder Engagement*. The ASD is committed to open, honest engagement with stakeholders. The ASD role in engaging communities through the turnaround process will be:

- Listen and learn even as we share our convictions and expectations
- Empower communities to provide input at all stages of the turnaround process (e.g. school identification, charter operator selection, principal/teacher hiring)

To this end, the ASD has already hosted community forums at four ASD-eligible schools this year, gathering input from hundreds of parents and community members.

Schools will enter the ASD for a period of at least five years with return of the management of the school subject to both the school and the home-LEA meeting performance goals.

Consistent with state law, the use of the full per-pupil funding, facilities and transportation services for all students within the school would be accessible to the ASD.

<u>ASD Autonomy</u>

In order for the ASD to optimize its ability to successfully improve student achievement in the Priority Schools, it must operate as a nimble, service-oriented organization that moves resources quickly in order to support the turnaround efforts in its charter and direct-run schools. The additional autonomy the ASD requires are as follows:

*Funding*. The ASD must control the local, state, and federal funding attributable to each school placed in its jurisdiction, and must have the same authority to seek, expend, manage, and retain funding as that of an LEA .

*Facilities.* The ASD must have the right to use any school building and all facilities and property otherwise part of the school and recognized as part of the facilities or assets of the school prior to its placement in the ASD.

*People.* In the ASD direct-run schools, the employees of the school may be deemed employees of the ASD. The ASD must have the authority to select, hire, and assign staff to positions in the school as needed to support the highest-possible quality faculty in the school. All existing staff within and ASD school will be required to re-apply for a position with the ASD. The ASD must have the same salary autonomy and flexibility afforded to any LEA.

*Procurement.* The ASD must have the same authority and autonomy afforded to any LEA under state law regarding the procurement of goods and services. This includes but is not limited to personal,

professional, consulting, and social services; and the procurement and/or leasing of property.

Current Status of ASD

Since winning the Race to the Top award in March 2010, the Tennessee Department of Education has been moving ahead with its ambitious reform agenda. Year 1 of the grant was designated as a planning year for the ASD and one in which low performing schools and LEAs are being assessed for entry into the new District.

The election of a new Governor on November 2, 2010, and the subsequent state-level leadership transition resulted in a large portion of the planning year occurring with the Superintendent position open. On April 5, 2011 Governor Haslam swore in Kevin Huffman as the Commissioner of Education. A month later, Commissioner Huffman hired Chris Barbic to serve as the first superintendent of the Achievement School District. Barbic started in this new role on August 1, 2011.

Prior to serving as Superintendent, Barbic founded YES Prep Public Schools, a Houston-based charter management organization (CMO) that exists to increase the number of low-income Houstonians who graduate from a four-year college prepared to compete in the global marketplace and committed to improving disadvantaged communities. Barbic led YES Prep for thirteen years and grew it from a single campus serving 300 students to a charter management organization of ten schools on track to serve 10,000 low-income students in Houston. YES Prep is often recognized as one of the highest-performing CMOs in the country and has served as a model for preparing low-income students for success in the collegiate environment.

Over the course of the last three months, the ASD team has been working on the following:

*Co-Managing 5 Campuses.* The ASD is currently working jointly with four Memphis City Schools and one Hamilton County School (Chattanooga) to influence decisions about staff, academics, non-academics, culture, and budget/finance. In this role, the ASD is providing "coordinated" supports and services to schools and helping the co-managed schools make smart choices with their SIG resources. The ASD is closely monitoring the schools' progress in order to determine whether or not each school is a candidate for charter or direct-run conversion.

*Building the Launch Plan.* The ASD spent the first two months building out a launch plan. The launch plan includes:

- Guiding principles
- Goals
- Growth scenarios
- Strategic Priorities
- Potential risks
- Monthly planning calendar (18 months out)
- Workforce and organizational development plan
- Budget template
- Stakeholder engagement framework

*Building Capacity.* The workforce plan mentioned above is driving the staffing plan for the ASD. While

the ASD will be a lean and nimble support office, it must have the capacity to effectively authorize and manage the charter and direct-run conversions. During the course of the first three months, the ASD has hired a Chief Strategy Officer, a Charter Portfolio Director, and a Data Director.

*Engaging the Community.* A key strategic priority is open and honest communication with the community. The ASD team has met with dozens of stakeholders and has held four community forums in Memphis to gather input on the four co-managed schools.

*Launching the Charter and i3 Application Process.* The charter application for 2012-13 charter conversions began on August 1st and the ASD team in conjunction with leading teacher education organizations has been working to evaluate both the charter and i3 applications. The first round of charters and i3 award recipients will be announced in mid-November.

<u>ASD Exit Criteria</u>

The default is return school to local control in 5 years contingent upon the following:

(1) A majority of parents do not vote to keep school in ASD (i.e. "parent trigger" not activated); and
(2) Commissioner's discretion/evaluation of LEA's ability to ensure ASD-like context for school. This will be evaluated based on the LEA's ability to:
   - <u>Attract and support partners</u>: match schools to models and improvement strategies/partners
   - <u>Coordinate school support</u>: reduce or eliminate unnecessary interference from LEA and state; clear path to promised autonomies for schools.
   - <u>Foster human capital</u>: attract talent from both inside and outside the LEA by crafting incentives and favorable conditions
   - <u>Provide monitoring and oversight over school performance</u>: collect, analyze, and disseminate data (e.g. issuing school report cards, designing progress metrics).
   - <u>Secure resources</u>: Coordinate with other state and LEA offices (e.g., grants management) to be sure turnaround schools receive priority.

While certain ASD schools may improve student achievement and no longer be in the bottom 5 percent (priority school), these schools will remain in the ASD for the minimum of five years. In addition, new schools that fall into the bottom 5 percent will be eligible for the ASD charter conversion or direct-run options.

**LEA Innovation Zones**

Given the difficult nature of turnaround work and our focused commitment on quality in all we pursue, we do not plan to rapidly scale the ASD. In current plans, the ASD will charter and direct-run approximately 35 schools in its third year (2014-15). This represents less than half of the Priority Schools. And while the ASD was established as an exception because we also believe the very lowest-performing schools will not improve with business as usual, we also believe that, whenever possible, LEAs should be the point of intervention with failing schools.

In addition to the ASD, we believe that LEAs can establish innovation zones that have similar flexibilities to the state-run ASD, and that will allow for greater local innovation when conducting turnarounds in the worst schools. LEAs must capitalize on the urgency of persistently failing schools to develop an innovative, service-oriented model of school support.

An LEA Innovation Zone achieves this by

- Streamlining supports from multiple offices rather than creating additional bureaucracy
- Creating a framework for low-performing schools based on opting-in to high-potential reforms rather than a punitive framework
- Ensuring that low-performing schools are prioritized in not only talk but also action
- Protecting school and Lead Partner level authority to deliver results

An LEA Innovation Zones represents a powerful mechanism to turnaround Priority schools because the Innovation Zones (1) create local and sustainable capacity to engage in meaningful turnaround of Priority Schools, and (2) ensure close coordination and collaboration between the LEA and the ASD.

The legislation creating the ASD calls for the Priority School to be given back to local control after five years. Creating an LEA innovation zone creates capacity within the LEA to successfully build upon the turnaround strategies implemented by the ASD and ensure the long-term sustainability of student achievement gains at the campus level once the school is returned to the LEA. Ramping up both the ASD and LEA innovation zone will require close coordination and collaboration between TDOE and the LEA. This coordination will ensure TDOE and LEA capacity are being deployed in the most effective and efficient manner possible.

TDOE will approve and support the creation of LEA-directed innovation zones. TDOE will flow federal and state funding ear-marked for priority schools to the LEA if the LEA has: (1) developed a clear, realistic plan for developing an innovation zone, and (2) demonstrated evidence that the LEA will be able to afford the innovation zone the necessary flexibility to be effective (e.g. new policies adopted by school boards). TDOE will provide organizational support by clearly defining the expectations of roles and responsibilities of an LEA innovation zone, and by allocating state resources to help LEAs create an operating structure in line with these expectations for all stakeholders (outlined below).

We believe that creating incentives for other LEAs across the State to create a similar type of innovation zone is a great example of an additional role TDOE can play to effectively turn around Priority Schools. Below is an explanation of the roles and responsibilities of the various stakeholders in creating the LEA innovation zone.

<u>Requirements of the LEA</u>

- *Structure:* Establish an Innovation zone office
- *Build Management Capacity:* The LEA innovation zone requires sufficient management flexibility to undertake the work successfully. Hire (internally or externally) a leader for the innovation zone office with the authority to hire his/her staff, with at a minimum, one full-time employee per priority school and one full-time data analyst for the office
- *Provide Governing Autonomy:* Allow schools, under governance of the innovation zone office, to have autonomy over financial, programmatic, staffing, and time allocation decisions. The Innovation Zone must be directly linked to and empowered by the superintendent to implement time-critical initiatives quickly.

<u>Requirements of the School Board:</u>

- *Provide Governing Autonomy:* Pass policy, as necessary, to allow schools, under governance of the innovation zone office, to have autonomy over financial, programmatic, staffing, and time

allocation decisions

<u>Requirements of the Innovation Zone office:</u>

- *Foster Human Capital:*
  - Attract talent from both inside and outside of the LEA by crafting incentives and favorable conditions (e.g., allow principals to build their own teams; provide specialized training for principals; develop clear recruitment incentives and selection criteria/processes for turnaround teachers; performance contracts for teachers with hiring and dismissal flexibility)
  - Liaise with other partners working on developing human capital
- *Monitoring and Oversight:* Directly oversee the priority schools absorbed by the Innovation zone in LEA
  - Hold schools accountable for student achievement based on data analysis; establishing and monitoring against goals, benchmarks, and timelines for student achievement
  - Hold LEA support services (e.g. transportation, budget, facilities) that serve priority schools accountable for effective and efficient delivery based on metrics the innovation zone will establish
  - Provide transparency and access to key stakeholders
- *Service-oriented support:* Organize as a comprehensive, service-oriented unit that can serve clusters of priority schools (addressing feeder patterns within LEAs).
  - Communicate with LEA to establish priority in delivery of support services (e.g. contracts, management, technology)
  - Secure direct access to the superintendent
  - Administer SIG and other grants
  - Pursue outside funding opportunities
- *LEA leverage:* The innovation zone should be developed as a LEA platform to afford flexibility, autonomy, and accountability to specific schools that are unlikely to succeed under business-as-usual.
  - Over time, the innovation zone should plan to scale in a similar fashion as the ASD. In order to build a strong foundation, growth will be limited in the first few years to a count of schools that can be managed effectively and comprehensively.
  - We expect that scale-up of an LEA innovation zone would be similar to the scale-up of the ASD: approximately six schools in the first year. An LEA innovation zone must propose and TDOE must approve the number of schools an innovation zone can absorb each year. This decision will be based on past success.
- *Build management capacity:* Hire (internally or externally) a leader for each school with the authority to hire his/her staff
- *Provide Technical Assistance:* Directly or through external partners (as decided and monitored by the Innovation Zone) to assist school strategic planning, stakeholder engagement, and execution of interventions

<u>Requirements of Priority schools absorbed by the Innovation Zone:</u>

- *Operate with Managerial Autonomy:* school leadership will make decisions around financial, programmatic, staff and time allocation
- *Accountability:* school leadership will be held accountable on the managerial decisions that have been made based on the net impact on student achievement

Requirements of TDOE:

- *Provide financial support:* Federal and state funding for a priority school will be channeled directly to the LEA innovation zone for the priority schools that the innovation zone absorbs
- *Provide management support:* Dedicate state resources to LEA innovation zones
- *Accountability:* Monitor progress annually through AMOs and on-site visits by state officials

Consequences of Failure

- If in 2 years, the school's student achievement does not improve, then the school will be absorbed the ASD
- LEA innovation zones that have slower rates of improvement across schools compared to the ASD will lose the right to expand into new schools, until achievement growth in their existing schools improves to ASD levels

**LEA/School-led SIG Turnaround**

Corresponding to SIG turnaround funding and interventions today, LEAs can apply to TDOE for their priority schools that are not absorbed by the ASD or LEA Innovation zones to adopt one of four federal interventions: (1) turnaround model, (2) transformation model, (3) closure, or (4) restart. These school plans must address each of the areas identified in the ESEA Flexibility Guidance for Priority schools.

LEAs must complete the SIG application, specifying the federal model proposed for each school and describing in detail how the robust and dramatic interventions will be implemented. TDOE will evaluate each application based on its comprehensiveness and feasibility; the State intends to only grant funds to realistic, effective plans. LEAs with TDOE approved school plans will receive SIG funding to implement the turnaround.

Consequences of Failure

- If in 2 years, the school's student achievement does not improve, then the school will be absorbed by the ASD or by an LEA innovation zone

**LEA-led school improvement**

To ensure success, the ASD and LEA innovation zones must scale thoughtfully and with measured growth. To ensure SIG turnaround applications are meaningful and truly competitive, school plans that do not meet a high bar for efficacy and feasibility should not be approved. As the ASD and LEA-led innovation zones scale, some schools in the bottom five percent of performance that do not receive SIG funding will require another type of intervention. TDOE will rely on LEAs to manage and closely monitor school improvement in these schools until either the ASD or an effective LEA innovation zone is able to absorb them.

All priority schools that fall into this fourth category will be absorbed either by the ASD or an LEA innovation zone by 2014-15. However, in the event that a school on this list is able to achieve its AMOs for 2 years in a row on its own, thereby showing substantial growth in results, it will be released from "priority" with no more aggressive intervention.

2.D.iv Provide the timeline the SEA will use to ensure that its LEAs that have one or more priority schools implement meaningful interventions aligned with the turnaround

principles in each priority school no later than the 2014–2015 school year and provide a justification for the SEA's choice of timeline.

We have identified a draft list of 85 schools based on 5 percent of 1,687 schools, and we anticipate that our final list determined in the summer of 2012 (which will include 2011-12 data) will have a similar number. We will serve this first cohort of priority schools using a combination of the four interventions outlined above.

Beginning in 2012-13 school year, we anticipate that the ASD will have the capacity to manage approximately 6 schools – 3 schools through direct ASD run operations and 3 schools through charter organizations. We will also work with the LEAs with identified priority schools (there are 3 LEAs identified in the draft lists submitted with this application but there may be more when we re-run the final list next summer 2012) to either establish innovation zones or, in the case of LEAs that already have some version of an innovation zone, make necessary refinements to their current structures to ensure that they will offer similar flexibilities to schools as the ASD. We anticipate that, at a minimum, 3 LEAs will decide to adopt innovation zones that meet the requirements outlined above and that they will be able to each operate 3 schools, in line with what the ASD will also be able to direct run in the first year. Of the remaining approximately 70 schools, we anticipate that the majority will apply for SIG turnaround grants and that through our competitive screening process some portion will gain approval. If we estimate that roughly half will begin SIG turnarounds, then the remaining 35 schools will be managed directly through LEA-led turnarounds.

In 2013-14, we anticipate that the ASD will scale and have capacity for an additional 12 schools (through a combination of direct-run and charter). Similarly, we anticipate that LEA innovation zones will also scale and have capacity for an additional 9 schools collectively. The capacity for 25 new schools to have access to more comprehensive interventions either through the ASD or through their LEA innovation zones will be filled by 25 schools that were being managed directly through the lower-level LEA-led turnaround intervention. The decision around which schools would be handed off from the LEA to the ASD or the LEA-innovation zone would be made based in part through collaborative conversations between the ASD and the LEA.

After the end of the 2013-14 school year and before the start of the 2014-15 school year, all priority schools will be evaluated on academic progress. If in 2 years, any LEA innovation school's student achievement does not improve, then the school will be absorbed by the ASD. If any LEA innovation zone has slower rates of improvement across schools overall compared to the ASD, then the LEA innovation zone will lose the right to expand into new schools until achievement growth in their existing schools improves to ASD levels. If in 2 years, any SIG turnaround school's achievement does not improve sufficiently, then the school will be absorbed by either the ASD or by an LEA innovation zone that is able to expand into new schools. If in 2 years, a school in LEA-led turnaround does not appear to be making enough progress to get off the priority list for the 2nd cohort (to be identified in the fall of 2014 and inducted beginning in the 2015-16 school year), then it will be absorbed by either the ASD or by an LEA innovation zone that is able to expand into new schools.

To demonstrate how progress across the four groups of schools may work, we have an approximate timeline below. Under any scenario, we will have no schools in the LEA-led turnaround category by 2014-15.

**Illustrative: 85 Schools – approximate anticipated timeline**

| | 2012-13 | Change | 2013-14 | Change | 2014-15 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ASD | 6 schools | + 12 | 18 schools | +17 | 35 schools |
| LEA Innovation zones | 9 schools | + 9 | 18 schools | +12<br>- 2 | 28 schools |
| SIG turnarounds | 35 schools | | 35 schools | - 13 | 22 schools |
| LEA-led turnaround | 35 schools | - 21 | 14 schools | - 14 | 0 schools |

Note: an increase in schools in the ASD or LEA Innovation zones corresponds to increased capacity. A decrease in schools in LEA innovation zones corresponds with schools that are absorbed by the ASD; a decrease in schools in SIG turnaround or LEA-led turnaround corresponds with schools that are absorbed by the ASD or effective LEA innovation zones.

2.D.v Provide the criteria the SEA will use to determine when a school that is making significant progress in improving student achievement exits priority status and a justification for the criteria selected.

Schools will exit "priority" status when:

- Three years later, a school is not identified in the next "priority" list that is identified by TDOE; or
- A school passes its achievement AMOs two years in a row

However, priority schools that enter specific interventions will be required to fulfill the entire length of the intervention:

- ASD: five-year minimum requirement (see ASD section above for full exit criteria description)
- LEA Innovation zone: to be determined by each LEA
- SIG turnaround: 36-month intervention

## 2.E Focus Schools

2.E.i Describe the SEA's methodology for identifying a number of low-performing schools equal to at least 10 percent of the State's Title I schools as "focus schools."

We have identified focus schools based on any of the following three pathways, as mandated in this waiver application:

1. High schools with a three-year average graduation rate less than 60 percent that have not otherwise been identified as "Priority" (automatic)
2. Schools with any sub-group(s) with less than 5 percent composite "proficient or advanced" performance on the Math, RLA, and Science portions of the TCAP exam for grades three through eight; or composite "proficient, advanced, or graduated" performance on Algebra and English assessments and graduation rates in high school, and have not been identified as Priority (automatic)
3. Schools with the largest within-school gaps between the highest-achieving subgroup and the lowest achieving subgroup (highest gaps to threshold of up to 10 percent of schools in the state)

1. Graduation rate:
After identifying our priority list, we automatically included any high school with a graduation rate less than 60 percent. In the draft list we submitted with this waiver application, we identified 1 school through this pathway.

2. Sub-group performance below threshold:
We determined a composite threshold of 5 percent, because state intervention is necessary in a school with severely low academic achievement. In the draft list we submitted with this waiver application, we identified 26 schools through this pathway.

3. Gap analysis:
There are many ways we explored defining a "gap" but we ultimately decided that Tennessee's focus school list should reflect schools that have the largest and most pervasive achievement gaps. Furthermore, we decided that there would be two forms of "safe harbor": (1) if a school has reduced its achievement gaps by 6 percent annually (equivalent to the annual gap closure AMO), or (2) if all subgroups are performing at or above the state subgroup median.

To determine "largest" gaps, we accounted for both the degree of a gap between complementary sub-groups (e.g. 40 percent gap between White and Non-White students), and the percent of the school population size in the underperforming group (e.g. Non-White students are the under-performing subgroup and comprise 50 percent of the student body).

To determine "most pervasive" gaps, we looked at the pervasiveness of a gap between the same sub-groups across assessments and high school graduation rates; we considered the gaps between multiple sets of complementary subgroups; and we also used three years of data to capture pervasiveness of gaps over time.

We assessed gaps between the following four sets of complementary sub-groups:

- White vs. Non-White[19]
- Economically Disadvantaged (ED) vs. Non-ED
- English learners (EL) vs. Non-EL
- Students with disabilities (SWD) and Non-SWD

At the high school level for our draft list submitted with this application, we assessed achievement gaps based on an equally weighted composite of:

- Graduation rates
- End-of-course Algebra I (Percent proficient and advanced)
- End-of-course English II (Percent proficient and advanced)

For grades three through eight, we assessed achievement gaps based on an equally weighted composite of the TCAP, including:

- Math (Percent proficient and advanced)
- Reading/Language Arts (Percent proficient and advanced)
- Science (Percent proficient and advanced)

To ensure that small population sizes would not skew the analysis, we established that any sub-group cohort with an N less than 30 would be suppressed.

We identified 142 schools based on the achievement gap pathway, reaching a total of 169 focus schools, which represent 10 percent of all schools in the state.

Please refer to Appendix 8 for a detailed step-by-step explanation of our methodology.

2.E.ii Provide the SEA's list of focus schools in Table 2.

2.E.iii Describe the process and timeline the SEA will use to ensure that its LEAs that have one or more focus schools will identify the specific needs of the SEA's focus schools and their students and provide examples of and justifications for the interventions focus schools will be required to implement to improve the performance of students who are the furthest behind.

**Interventions**

All focus schools will have their names published in a list distributed to the public on the state's website and will have a "focus" designation on the school report card. All LEAs that have focus schools must submit a LEA-wide plan for how the LEA will manage achievement gap closure initiatives at the LEA level and for every identified focus school. In order to ensure these plans will be effective, TDOE's nine field service centers (FSCs) will work with LEAs to identify schools with that have common characteristics to the LEAs' focus schools but are achieving much better results, in order to

[19] "Non-white" is a composite that includes: African American, Hispanic, Native American, Asian, and Hawaiian Pacific Islander. It is important to note that Asian and Hawaiian Pacific Islander students tend to outperform white students across assessments and thus can have the effect of skewing the non-white category. However, because Asian and Hawaiian Pacific Islander students represent a very small percentage of the student body (less than 2 percent aggregated) , we have decided to keep them among the "non-white" category for simplicity in the focus school analysis.

learn from the higher-performing schools. FSCs will seek to identify schools at the same level (e.g., elementary schools with other elementary schools) and similar needs, so that the plans that the LEAs design and implement will have the greatest possible chance of success. Moreover, TDOE and the FSCs will look for initiatives that have proven effective among Reward schools that have successfully made strides in closing achievement gaps in similarly situated sub-groups.

Additionally, all LEAs with focus schools will have the opportunity to apply for a competitive grant put forth by TDOE. In order to be competitive a LEA must develop plans to take on a some of the following initiatives:

- Time on Task
- Extended school day
- Cultural competency education
- Co-teaching opportunities
- Family support/community services
- Root cause analysis
- Feeder patterns within LEA
- Inter-school strategic staffing of school leaders and teachers
- Intra-school strategic staffing of teachers

Grants of approximately $100,000 per school will be offered to LEAs with focus schools on a competitive basis. TDOE will fund these competitive grants from a combination of Title I, Part A, 1003 (a) school improvement funds, Race to the Top funds, and/or state funds to approximately 100 focus schools.[20] Interventions are anticipated to be implemented over a two year period.

For focus schools where the gaps widen or little progress is being made, TDOE officials will meet in-person with the LEA to review their improvement plans and to assist with plan revisions, if needed. Improvement plans must be approved by TDOE.

**Timeline**

Focus schools will be identified once every 3 years, in line with priority identification. The first identification will occur in summer 2012. Competitive grants may be allocated for the maximum grant award period of the funding source.

2.E.iv Provide the criteria the SEA will use to determine when a school that is making significant progress in improving student achievement and narrowing achievement gaps exits focus status and a justification for the criteria selected.

Schools will exit "focus" status when:

- Three years later, a school is not identified in the next "focus" list that is identified by TDOE; or
- A school passes its gap closure AMOs two years in a row

[20] Once ESEA flexibility for Tennessee is approved, the state will propose an amendment to its Race to the Top plan to align some of the dollars allocated on turnaround work to the state's new accountability system. Any dollar figures cited are contingent upon: the continuation of SIG funding, Race to the Top approval, and/or the reallocation of other state funds.

## TABLE 2: REWARD, PRIORITY, AND FOCUS SCHOOLS

Provide the SEA's list of reward, priority, and focus schools using the Table 2 template. Use the key to indicate the criteria used to identify a school as a reward, priority, or focus school.

**TABLE 2: REWARD, PRIORITY, AND FOCUS SCHOOLS**

| LEA Name | School Name | School NCES ID # | REWARD SCHOOL | PRIORITY SCHOOL | FOCUS SCHOOL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *See Attachment 9 for Tennessee's List of Reward, Priority, and Focus Schools* | | | | | |
| TOTAL # of Schools: | | | | | |

**Total # of Title I schools in the State: __1120_____**
**Total # of Title I-participating high schools in the State with graduation rates less than 60%: ___9_____**

| Key | |
|---|---|
| Reward School Criteria:<br>**A.** Highest-performing school<br>**B.** High-progress school<br><br>Priority School Criteria:<br>**C.** Among the lowest five percent of Title I schools in the State based on the proficiency and lack of progress of the "all students" group<br>**D.** Title I-participating or Title I-eligible high school with graduation | Focus School Criteria:<br>**F.** Has the largest within-school gaps between the highest-achieving subgroup(s) and the lowest-achieving subgroup(s) or, at the high school level, has the largest within-school gaps in the graduation rate<br>**G.** Has a subgroup or subgroups with low achievement or, at the high school level, a low graduation rate<br>**H.** A Title I-participating high school with graduation rate less than |

| | |
|---|---|
| rate less than 60% over a number of years<br>**E.** Tier I or Tier II SIG school implementing a school intervention model | 60% over a number of years that is not identified as a priority school |

## 2.F PROVIDE INCENTIVES AND SUPPORTS FOR OTHER TITLE I SCHOOLS

2.F Describe how the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system will provide incentives and supports to ensure continuous improvement in other Title I schools that, based on the SEA's new AMOs and other measures, are not making progress in improving student achievement and narrowing achievement gaps, and an explanation of how these incentives and supports are likely to improve student achievement and school performance, close achievement gaps, and increase the quality of instruction for students.

**Incentives**

We believe that transparency through state reporting and local management through district control will continue to be the primary drivers of action for local schools. However, unlike the accountability system under NCLB where 80 percent of Tennessee schools would be "failing" this year, the differentiated system we are proposing will return meaning to transparent reporting.

All schools and LEAs will continue to receive an annual report card with full transparency on:

- Progress against AMOs
- School status as Reward, Priority, or Focus
- Achievement data by assessment, by sub-group performance
- Growth data by sub-group performance
- Participation and Graduation rates
- School environment
- School profile

To help the public synthesize transparency across multiple types of data, all schools will also receive a letter A-F grade (in addition to the public lists of reward, priority, and focus schools and the public lists for exemplary LEAs and LEAs in need of improvement). Letter grades will have the most impact differentiating schools that are not priority, focus, or reward, and differentiating schools within LEAs that have been designated exemplary or in-need-of-improvement. We believe that making data fully available and providing a clear synthesis of the implications of the data will enable school communities to better understand the state of their schools and the levers for improvement.

Tennessee provides letter grades in our report card today (see Appendix 3). Upon approval of this waiver application, we intend to re-align our grading system with this new differentiated accountability system. The school report card will continue to be managed by TDOE's Office of Accountability.

**Support**

TDOE will maintain a statewide system of support through our 9 regional field service centers (FSCs). FSC staff serve a mission critical role as a conduit between TDOE and LEAs. They provide LEAs with a range of support, including data analysis and training to help LEAs assess root causes of achievement challenges (which will be increasingly important under this new accountability system) as well as support implementing new statewide initiatives aimed at improving performance broadly (including teacher and principal evaluations and common core transitioning).

The most effective way TDOE can drive school improvement broadly, through all principles under this

waiver, is to enhance support to LEAs through the FSCs. We intend to maximize support to LEAs by reducing our reliance on external vendors and building capacity in-house, particularly in field service centers. Increasing the number of regional staff will ensure that LEAs have more individual support; doing so in house will ensure that the support provided is always high quality. TDOE will place a particular focus in building FSC capacity in: technical assistance, data support, and content area specialists (e.g., English Learners, students with disabilities, K-8 Math, etc.).

Because a significant piece of our new accountability proposal relies on district management, we intend to drive most of our support for Title I schools through differentiated support for districts. As described earlier in this section, we intend to provide significant latitude for districts that are both increasing achievement and reducing achievement gaps at ambitious levels. We will provide school improvement planning support for districts that are making progress but not reaching goals. And we will provide significant school planning supports for districts that are moving backwards. Essentially, in districts that do not demonstrate the capacity to increase achievement and reduce gaps, TDOE will use internal staff to engage directly with school planning. In districts that are making progress, we intend to use our FSCs to support the districts in managing their school improvement planning locally.

Increasing FSC capacity will benefit all LEAs and their school improvement planning, but LEAs that have been identified "in need of improvement" (due to missing Achievement AMOs, Gap Closure AMOs, or both) will receive varying degrees of additional attention. FSC staff will be more deeply engaged in supporting LEAs to develop differentiated plans for schools based on their characteristics and challenges. TDOE will ultimately sign off on the school improvement plans for all LEAs "in need of improvement".

## 2.G Build SEA, LEA, and School Capacity to Improve Student Learning

2.G Describe the SEA's process for building SEA, LEA, and school capacity to improve student learning in all schools and, in particular, in low-performing schools and schools with the largest achievement gaps, including through:

i. timely and comprehensive monitoring of, and technical assistance for, LEA implementation of interventions in priority and focus schools;
ii. holding LEAs accountable for improving school and student performance, particularly for turning around their priority schools; and
iii. ensuring sufficient support for implementation of interventions in priority schools, focus schools, and other Title I schools identified under the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system (including through leveraging funds the LEA was previously required to reserve under ESEA section 1116(b)(10), SIG funds, and other Federal funds, as permitted, along with State and local resources).

Explain how this process is likely to succeed in improving SEA, LEA, and school capacity.

We are excited by the opportunity to build significant, sustainable capacity in LEAs, and in doing this,

to substantially enhance LEA support for schools. Throughout this application we have reiterated our philosophy of holding LEAs accountable on behalf of their schools and of working through LEAs to support schools. We believe that the main path to success in the state is by supporting LEAs and building their capacity, rather than through punishment and intervention. In this section, we seek to add credence to this philosophy by outlining the additional resources we will commit to schools through LEAs.

TDOE will allocate a substantial pool of funding toward Priority and Focus schools, beginning with approximately $40 million in School Improvement Grant (SIG) funding in 2012, the majority of which we anticipate flowing through LEAs (see Appendix 9 for an outline of timeline and resources).[21] This funding will enable LEAs to build up LEA staff capacity, to invest in robust data systems, and to develop rigorous and innovative school improvement plans that are not constrained by current budgets. The impact of this funding will have spillover effects for all schools in an LEA. A portion of this funding will also enable TDOE to build up state staff capacity to monitor LEA and school progress, and to support LEAs (particularly in TDOE's regional field service centers) with technical and operational assistance.

Specifically, TDOE will support LEAs responsible for priority and focus schools by creating financial incentives for implementation and providing monitoring and technical assistance resources:

**Support for Implementation**

Priority schools

We will distribute approximately $40 million[22] for priority schools in the next year, and anticipate allocating further resources in the next few years. This funding will be used to: strengthen the ASD, incent LEAs to build LEA innovation zones, and support realistic, innovative SIG plans that are not constrained by current budgets.

In order to ensure that priority interventions are successfully implemented, it is imperative that the foundations for the ASD and the LEA innovation are firmly established and that SIG turnarounds continue to be funded sufficiently. We believe that targeted investment in the ASD and LEA innovation zones will enable them to scale more quickly and ultimately absorb all schools that are not succeeding in other LEA-led turnarounds.

Although interventions will look different depending on whether a school is being managed by the ASD, an LEA innovation zone, or an LEA either through a SIG turnaround process of an LEA-led turnaround, all funded interventions will guided by USED's "turnaround principles":

- *Provide strong leadership*
  - Both the ASD and LEA innovation zones have the mandate to appoint new school leaders and grant them operational and financial flexibility

[21] Once ESEA flexibility for Tennessee is approved, the state will propose an amendment to its Race to the Top plan to align some of the dollars allocated on turnaround work to the state's new accountability system. Any dollar figures cited are contingent upon: the continuation of SIG funding, Race to the Top approval, and/or the reallocation of other state funds.

[22] Once ESEA flexibility for Tennessee is approved, the state will propose an amendment to its Race to the Top plan to align some of the dollars allocated on turnaround work to the state's new accountability system. Any dollar figures cited are contingent upon: the continuation of SIG funding, Race to the Top approval, and/or the reallocation of other state funds.

  - SIG turnaround grantees are required to review the performance of the current principal and to replace the principal as necessary
  - LEAs leading school turnarounds will be encouraged to make leadership changes to avoid the risk of having a school absorbed the ASD in later years
- *Ensure teachers are effective and able to improve instruction*
  - Both the ASD and LEA innovation zone school leaders have the ability to create favorable conditions to maintain and develop current staff and to attract new talent
  - SIG turnaround grantees are required to review the performance of the current staff and to make changes as necessary
  - LEAs leading school turnarounds will be encouraged to make staffing changes to avoid the risk of having a school absorbed the ASD in later years
- *Redesigning the school day, week, or year*
  - Both the ASD and LEA innovation zone school leaders have the authority to redesign the school day as needed
  - SIG turnaround grantees are required to review the design of the class schedule and to make changes as necessary
  - LEAs leading school turnarounds will be encouraged to consider schedule redesign to avoid the risk of having a school absorbed the ASD in later years
- *Strengthen the school's instructional program*
  - Both the ASD and LEA innovation zone school leaders have authority over programmatic decisions
  - SIG turnaround grantees are required to review the school's instructional program and to make changes as necessary
  - LEAs leading school turnarounds will be encouraged to consider instructional changes to avoid the risk of having a school absorbed the ASD in later years
- *Use data to inform instruction and continuous improvement*
  - Both the ASD and LEA innovation zone will have allocated data specialists who will be responsible for analyzing data to develop instructional strategies
  - SIG turnaround grantees are required to demonstrate the use of data in decision-making
  - LEAs leading school turnarounds will receive support from TDOE FSCs to conduct data analysis
- *Establish a safe and supportive school environment*
  - All priority schools will be monitored through FSC field visits on school environment factors
- *Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement*
  - All priority schools will be monitored through FSC field visits on family and community engagement initiatives

<u>Focus schools</u>

We believe that the attention and public accountability for particularly large achievement gaps alone can kick start a school into effective action. To inspire ingenuity and innovation, TDOE will also support a competitive grant process where approximately 100 schools will receive $100,000 to invest specifically in initiatives targeted at closing the achievement gap (anticipating approximately $10 million to be spent on focus schools), pending U.S. Department of Education's approval of a Race to the Top budget amendment. This will allow schools to hire additional support to extend learning time, fund community services that will positively impact students, propose and test innovative

solutions for solving the achievement gap challenges specific to the school, or undertake other targeted initiatives.

**Monitoring and Technical Assistance**

Priority schools

There are 85 priority schools across 3 LEAs. Because of the clustering of priority schools, TDOE can provide concentrated LEA monitoring and technical assistance. Specifically, TDOE will allocate one full-time employee to any LEA with 5 or more priority schools. This will ensure that TDOE will have dedicated staff to not only monitor LEAs and schools based on clear goals and interim benchmarks (as we do today), but to engage in more thorough and time intensive monitoring activities that require staff members to spend more time on site, working collaboratively with LEA staff and schools. Greater TDOE staff time allocated on site will also increase accountability of LEAs and schools as TDOE staff will be able to better understand the challenges and possibilities in a given school and LEA.

Focus schools

There are 169 focus schools across over 60 LEAs. Because of the dispersion of focus schools, it makes sense for TDOE to work with LEAs to determine a system for monitoring focus schools' progress, where clear goals and interim benchmarks would be mutually agreed upon between TDOE and the LEA, and the LEA would be held responsible for monitoring and reporting progress. If progress is insufficient, TDOE will provide additional technical assistance to LEAs through FSC staff with expertise in strategies for improving achievement for specific subgroups of students. LEAs that received funding for focus schools through the competitive grant process will have set a timeline for results in their application. If there is insufficient progress in these focus schools, TDOE has the right to revoke the grant.

TDOE will vet and approve LEA selections for any external providers they choose to support priority or focus interventions. The ASD is already vetting all charter applicants through a rigorous new process from the National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA). To get a sense of the rigor applied through this process, in the first round of this process only 3 charter organizations were advanced out of 8 applicants. Similarly, TDOE intends to create other rigorous review mechanisms to assess any external providers selected by LEAs and funded by SIG or Race to the Top funds. All external providers must be signed off on by TDOE.

More broadly, all LEAs in Tennessee will have the authority to decide if and how they wish to provide public school choice and choice-related transportation to students attending Title I schools. LEAs may also provide extended learning time or targeted remediation services that specifically address the student's individual academic needs. TDOE will continue to provide an approved list of external providers for LEAs that continue to use supplemental education services (SES) funding.

# PRINCIPLE 3: SUPPORTING EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTION AND LEADERSHIP

## 3.A DEVELOP AND ADOPT GUIDELINES FOR LOCAL TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL EVALUATION AND SUPPORT SYSTEMS

Select the option that pertains to the SEA and provide the corresponding description and evidence, as appropriate, for the option selected.

| **Option A** | **Option B** | **Option C** |
|---|---|---|
| ☐ If the SEA has not already developed any guidelines consistent with Principle 3, provide:<br><br>i. the SEA's plan to develop and adopt guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems by the end of the 2011–2012 school year;<br><br>ii. a description of the process the SEA will use to involve teachers and principals in the development of these guidelines; and<br><br>iii. an assurance that the SEA will submit to the Department a copy of the guidelines that it will adopt by the end of the 2011–2012 school year (see Assurance 15). | ☐ If the SEA has already developed and adopted one or more, but not all, guidelines consistent with Principle 3, provide:<br><br>i. a copy of any guidelines the SEA has adopted (Attachment 10) and an explanation of how these guidelines are likely to lead to the development of evaluation and support systems that improve student achievement and the quality of instruction for students;<br><br>ii. evidence of the adoption of the guidelines (Attachment 11);<br><br>iii. the SEA's plan to develop and adopt the remaining guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems by the end of the 2011– | ☒ If the SEA has developed and adopted all of the guidelines consistent with Principle 3, provide:<br><br>i. a copy of the guidelines the SEA has adopted (Attachment 10) and an explanation of how these guidelines are likely to lead to the development of evaluation and support systems that improve student achievement and the quality of instruction for students;<br><br>ii. evidence of the adoption of the guidelines (Attachment 11); and<br><br>iii. a description of the process the SEA used to involve teachers and principals in the development of these guidelines. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | 2012 school year;<br><br>iv. a description of the process used to involve teachers and principals in the development of the adopted guidelines and the process to continue their involvement in developing any remaining guidelines; and<br><br>v. an assurance that the SEA will submit to the Department a copy of the remaining guidelines that it will adopt by the end of the 2011–2012 school year (see Assurance 15). | |

**Using Teacher and Principal Evaluation to Improve Student Achievement and Instruction**

In July 2011, Tennessee became one of the first states in the country to implement a comprehensive, student outcomes-based, state-wide educator evaluation system. Implementing a statewide evaluation system for teachers and principals was a key tenet of Tennessee's First to the Top Act, passed in January 2010 with bipartisan support in the Legislature, from educator unions, community leaders, business leaders and public education advocates. The resulting Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) is a comprehensive evaluation tool designed to improve instructional practices. Given the current state of our student achievement results, it is the Tennessee Department of Education's goal to become the fastest-improving state in the country. Implementing the TEAM system during the 2011-12 school year not only reaffirms the state's commitment to reaching this goal, but accelerates a sense of urgency around improving student outcomes.

**TEAM Teacher Evaluation**

The TEAM program gives educators a roadmap to instructional excellence, a process to guide reflection, and a common language for collaborating to improve instructional practice and examine student outcomes.

Designed to include frequent observation for teachers and principals, the model facilitates constructive conversation between teachers and school leaders about improving practices and student results. Under the TEAM model, 50 percent of the educator's final effectiveness rating is based on observations conducted by trained LEA officials (principals, LEA employees, other administrators, et al.); 35 percent of the rating is based on a student growth measure; and 15 percent

of the rating is based on an achievement measure that is cooperatively agreed upon between the educator and evaluator. Experienced teachers are observed four times annually, and novice teachers are observed six times annually. The TEAM model differentiates educator performance into a one-through-five scale (from "significantly below expectations" to "significantly above expectations"), based on this observational data, student growth data and achievement data. TDOE and LEAs are able to continuously monitor educator effectiveness scores through observational and quantitative data sources, as they are uploaded into a central data system (described in greater detail in the next section).

The use of data from the Tennessee Value Added Assessment System (TVAAS) is a critical component of the TEAM system. Tennessee has the country's oldest value-added student growth model, and has been using TVAAS for nearly 20 years. In that time, Tennessee has captured tens of millions of student assessment records and calculated similar numbers of teacher effect reports that provide TDOE with a veritable vault of achievement and growth data that has informed both the FTTT legislation and the development of the TEAM system. For teachers, 35 percent of their overall evaluation is based on growth data, and 15 percent on achievement data. For teachers in tested subject areas, the 35 percent growth component is individual teacher effect TVAAS data; for teachers in non-tested subject areas, the 35 percent growth component is generally based on available school-wide growth data, with many pilots underway to allow more educators to use individual growth data in the future.

The TEAM model is in marked contrast to the pre-existing system. Previously, student achievement data was not considered, and there was insufficient differentiation of performance. In contrast, TEAM uses student growth data for 35 percent of the overall evaluation, and student achievement data for fully half, and allows for a clear distribution of results across five categories. Under the past system, tenured teachers were evaluated only twice over a 10-year period (in contrast with annual evaluations under TEAM). In contrast, TEAM provides frequent observation and feedback for all teachers. Furthermore, teachers were not treated as professionals with unique strengths and developmental needs, but instead as a monolithic group with no regard for individual differences. TEAM addresses these variations, enabling school leaders to provide tailored feedback that teachers can immediately use to improve their practices. Finally, in addition to providing differentiated, meaningful feedback, another chief objective of TEAM is to identify Tennessee's most outstanding classroom leaders, through the full model of both quantitative and qualitative measures. This will enable school and LEA leaders, for the first time, to tap into the state's greatest educational resource – our most outstanding teachers. We are learning what makes them successful, and how we can share, replicate and reward their best practices.

The First to the Top statute states that teacher and principal evaluations "shall be a factor in employment decisions, including, but not necessarily limited to, promotion, retention, termination, compensation and the attainment of tenure status."[23] All personnel decisions will continue to be made by LEAs. The state will not mandate that LEAs make any employment decisions based on educators' final TEAM effectiveness ratings, but instead hopes to give LEAs meaningful data in order to inform their personnel decisions. Tennessee also passed tenure reform legislation that extends the teacher tenure probationary period from three to five years, and requires teachers to perform "above

[23] Tenn. Code Ann. § 49-1-302(d)(2).

expectations" (level 4 of 5) "or "significantly above expectations" (level 5 of 5) for two consecutive years before receiving tenure.[24] Similarly, tenured teachers who perform "below expectations" (level 2 of 5) or "significantly below expectations" (level 1 of 5) for two consecutive years may be dismissed by their LEAs.

**TEAM Principal Evaluation**

The implementation of the TEAM system for principals is another critical element of improving student outcomes across the state. The First to the Top Act requires annual evaluations for all principals and administrators. Tennessee is implementing comprehensive principal evaluation state-wide in the 2011-12 school year. Implementing a rigorous principal evaluation system during the current school year underscores Tennessee's commitment to ensuring that every school is lead by strong instructional leaders, who will profoundly impact their students' achievement.

Principal and Assistant Principal evaluations are based half on qualitative and quantitative data. On the qualitative side, 35 percent of a principal's effectiveness rating is based on their performance on the Tennessee Instructional Leadership Standards (TILS) framework and 15 percent is based on an assessment of the quality of the teacher evaluations that the principal conducts. On the quantitative side, 35 percent of a principal's scores are based on school-wide growth data, and 15 percent on an achievement measure agreed upon by the administrator and their LEA evaluator. As with teachers, principals are scored on a 5 point scale, ranging from "significantly above expectations" (level 5 of 5) to "significantly below expectations" (level 1 of 5).

The TEAM principal evaluation is slightly different for Phase 1 principals (principals who are new to their LEA, school and/or level and those scoring "below expectations" or "significantly below expectations" on their most recent evaluation) and Phase 2 principals who are veteran administrators who scored "at expectations" or better on their most recent evaluation. See Appendix 10 for more details on both processes. In the TEAM model, principals are given opportunities to self reflect, use formative assessments, and are required to have observations and conferences, conduct staff surveys (which the LEA can select) and hold summative conferences with their LEA evaluator.

## 3.B Ensure LEAs Implement Teacher and Principal Evaluation and Support Systems

3.B Provide the SEA's process for ensuring that each LEA develops, adopts, pilots, and implements, with the involvement of teachers and principals, including mechanisms to review, revise, and improve, high-quality teacher and principal evaluation and support systems consistent with the SEA's adopted guidelines.

**Involving Educators in the Development of TEAM**

In passing the First to the Top legislation into law in January 2010, and in developing TEAM, Tennessee brought together educators in to provide input and guidance related to the legislation, policy and implementation. Grounded in the reality that the state lags behind much of the rest of the country in student achievement, and has a profound "achievement gap" across income and race,

[24] Tenn. Code Ann. § 49-5-501, 503-4.

educators from across the state mobilized around the widespread belief that a new evaluation system could provide a key lever for changing practice and improving student outcomes.

As such, state officials consulted and collaborated with educators to develop the TEAM model. The Tennessee Evaluation Advisory Committee (TEAC), a 15-member panel that included public school teachers and principals, developed and recommended to the State Board of Education guidelines and criteria for the annual evaluation of teachers and principals see (Appendix 11).

Over the course of several months, the Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) also convened twelve development teams of teachers and content specialists in the non-tested grades and subject areas to make recommendations around alternative growth measures (see Appendix 12) for the new teacher evaluation system. Their recommendations were reviewed by a group of technical experts, and development teams reviewed and, where necessary, revised the recommendations based on feedback. Teachers' union representatives were involved in these meetings as well to assure that points of view from their constituents were represented.

Based on discussions of the TEAC, department officials then worked with The Tennessee Consortium on Research Evaluation and Development (TN CRED) to conduct field testing of four observational models of teacher evaluation with schools and LEAs throughout the state in the 2010-11 school year to learn more about the various appraisal instruments (see Appendix 13). The field test included 84 LEAs and more than 8,000 teachers. TN CRED conducted a rigorous review of the piloting of the each of the four models being considered for the state's observational model. TN CRED also conducted a series of focus groups with principals who took part in a field test of the principal qualitative instrument and changes were made based on participants' feedback. According to field test data, educators and evaluators reported that the TAP model provided useful feedback opportunities, encouraged reflection on strategies to improve instruction, and required less paperwork of the educators.

After months of thoughtful consideration of research and national models, analysis and dialogue with educators across the state, and in accordance with state law (which requires 50 percent of an educator's evaluation be based on qualitative observational data and 50 percent on student performance data), TDOE elected to adapt the TAP® rubric (see Appendix 14) as the qualitative instrument for teacher evaluation, and the Tennessee Instructional Leadership Standards (TILS) framework (see Appendix 15) as the qualitative instrument for principal evaluation in TEAM, the state-wide evaluation model.

The state has also invited all LEAs to submit their own models for the qualitative portion of the evaluation (see Appendix 16 that details alternate model development and alternate model implementation planning process). Following a year-long pilot and analysis phase, three alternate models were approved for the 2011-12 school year, and are currently being used in 10 of the state's 136 LEAs. The component percentages (50 percent qualitative, 35 percent student growth, 15 percent student achievement) are codified in state statute, ensuring that no matter which qualitative model an LEA elects to implement, there will be comparability across LEAs. Additionally, based on this year's results, we anticipate that additional LEAs will submit alternate models for approval by the state board. These models must follow state rules for the qualitative and quantitative proportional scoring, and districts using alternate models must still meet the state's recommended range of distribution of results.

**TDOE technical assistance and support**

In implementing the TEAM model in 2011-12, TDOE is providing direct, intensive training on the new evaluation system. Over the summer of 2010, TDOE partnered with the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET) to train more than 5,000 evaluators, through an intensive process including an assessment to ensure a measure of consistency across evaluator ratings. TDOE also dispatched scores of implementation coaches, recruited full-time regional consultants to provide on-the-ground support for implementation of the system state wide, and trained nine field service centers to further assist LEAs in implementing the TEAM model.

TDOE has developed several avenues of ongoing communication to ensure that educators and evaluators have the resources necessary to implement the TEAM model. Channels for input and feedback include: training session surveys, webinars, conference calls, meetings and the clearly established communication on-line vehicles - team.questions@tn.gov and team.feedback@tn.gov - among others to inform and enhance the TEAM model. The team-tn.gov web-site, launched in August, provides a readily accessible and current channel of communication on implementing the model, and provides a host of up-to-date resources for educators and leaders. To date, TDOE has had several thousand interactions with teachers in assisting them with implementing the TEAM system. TDOE staff has held scores of trainings, Q&A sessions, calls, webinars, weekly communications, produced and disseminated scores of support and guidance documents, and have spoken to thousands of educators in assisting them in implementing this model (see Appendix 17 for an example of weekly email communication with updates and resources). This robust effort to support the implementation of the TEAM program is one of the central components of TDOE's efforts to ensure the model's success in improving student outcomes.

**TDOE monitoring and review**

Because TEAM is a statewide system, most of its components are mandated by statute, State Board of Education policy, or TDOE guidelines. The only discretionary component is the 15 percent of teacher and principal evaluations comprised of an achievement measure to be selected from a TDOE-approved list by joint decision of the teacher/principal being evaluated and his or her evaluator. See Appendix 18 for TDOE-approved list of measures.

TDOE has developed a robust data system (see Appendix 19 for more information) that allows evaluators to enter observation scores and comments, allows educators to track their observation reports, calculates summative ratings, and allows LEA leaders and TDOE real-time access to data that will help determine where additional implementation support is needed. The data system already has several thousand records of observational data entered. On November 4, 2011, the State Board of Education adopted a policy change, stating that each year, TDOE will publish an anticipated range of distribution of evaluation results (from level 5, "significantly above expectations," to level 1, "significantly below expectations") for the coming school year, subject to variation based on differences in student achievement growth in individual schools and LEAs. The Department of Education will monitor observation scores throughout the year and enforce consistent application of standards across LEAs. Upon the conclusion of the school year and relevant data collection, the department will publish evaluation results by LEA. LEAs that fall outside the acceptable range of results, subject to student achievement scores, will not be approved to use alternate models for the following school year, and will be subject to additional training and monitoring by the department.

**Next steps on TEAM implementation**

The State of Tennessee, through its First to the Top Act has committed to rigorously evaluating educators, and TDOE will continue to work to improve the TEAM model. Among the most significant areas of continued work and progress are ongoing pilots of non-tested grades and subjects, in which TDOE and educators are collaborating to determine the best possible measures to use for the growth measures of non-tested subjects. TDOE also expects to learn a great deal from the ongoing implementation of three alternate observation models for the qualitative component of teacher evaluations, and potentially more in the future, as we continue to refine the TEAM model overall to most dramatically increase student achievement.

| Date | Group | Topic |
|---|---|---|
| October 19, 2011 | Superintendents' Study Council Executive Committee<br><br>The purposes of the Superintendents' Study Council are to:<br>•Provide an opportunity for the continuous study of problems of the profession;<br>•Jointly evaluate, with the State Department of Education, ongoing instructional programs and recommend changes designed to improve those programs<br><br>The Superintendent Study Council consists of all superintendents grouped by the 9 field service regions. Each of those groups has a representive on the executive committee that convenes regularly. | The 9 Superintendents' Study Council representatives were provided an overview of our approach to seeking felixbility from certain provisions in NCLB. Members were afforded the opportunity to pose questions and were encouraged to continue to provide feedback to TDOE, in advance of the all district webinar scheduled the following week. |
| October 21, 2011 | One-on-one meetings with 5 superintendents representing rural and urban districts | Commissioner Huffman had one-on-one conversations with a number of school directors, providing them with an overview of the approach to ESEA flexibility. These intimate conversations afforded Commissioner Huffman an opportunity to receive specific feedback about Tennessee's approach. These school directors were encouraged to continue to provide feedback to TDOE. |
| October 27, 2011 | LEA leaders and their teams representing all 136 LEAs in Tennessee | School systems were provided with an overview of our waiver request. Participants in the teleconference were provided the opportunity during the meeting to pose questions and were also encouraged to continue to provide feedback to TDOE. |

| Date | Group | Topic |
|---|---|---|
| November 2, 2011 | House Education Committee<br><br>*Description:* 13 members of the House Education Committee of the Tennessee General Assembly | Legislators were provided with an overview of our waiver request. Commissioner Huffman provided legislators the opportunity during the meeting to pose questions and they were also encouraged to continue to provide feedback to TDOE. |
| November 4, 2011 | State Board of Education<br><br>*Description:* 11 member governing and policy making body for TN elementary and secondary education. | State Board members were provided with an overview of our waiver request during their monthly workshop. Commissioner Huffman provided Board members and State Board staff the opportunity to pose questions and also encouraged them to continue to provide feedback to TDOE. |
| November 8, 2011 | Tennessee Education Association<br><br>*Description:* Tennessee's largest professional organization representing over 52,000 elementary and secondary teachers, school administrators, education support professionals, higher education faculty, and students preparing to become teachers. | Union members were provided with an overview of our waiver request. Meeting participants were provided the opportunity during the meeting to pose questions and were also encouraged to continue to provide feedback to TDOE. |
| November 8, 2011 | Special Education Stakeholders<br><br>*Description:* District Special EducationCoordinators and representatives from Tenneessee Support and Training for Exceptional Parents, the Disability Law and Advocacy Center of Tennessee, and Higher Education Institutions including the University of Memphis and Austin Peay State University | TDOE engaged with stakeholders in the education of students with disabilities by providing them a draft of the ESEA Flexibility Request and a summary power point outlining the implementation of the four principles in the waiver. Stakeholders provided input and were encouraged to continue providing feedback to the TDOE. |

| Date | Group | Topic |
|---|---|---|
| November 8, 2011 | ESL Task Force<br><br>*Description:* State-wide committee including teachers, administrators, and superintendents | TDOE engaged with stakeholders in the education of English Learners by providing them a draft of the ESEA Flexibility Request and a summary power point outlining the implementation of the four principles in the waiver. Stakeholders provided input and were encouraged to continue providing feedback to the TDOE. |
| November 9, 2011 | Tennessee School Board Association<br><br>*Description:* The organization and representative agency of the members of schools boards of Tennessee. The TSBA offers programs, meetings and services designed to help school boards and their members to better serve the children in their school system. | TDOE engaged with representatives from the TN School Board Association by providing them a draft of the ESEA Flexibility Request and a summary power point outlining the implementation of the four principles in the waiver. Stakeholders provided input and were encouraged to continue providing feedback to the TDOE. |
| November 9, 2011 | Committee of Practitioners<br><br>*Description:* A committee of twenty-one members that advises the state in carrying out its responsiblities under Title I. The committee is comprised of a wide variety of members including teachers, TN Educators Association, parents, and school administrators | A draft of the ESEA Flexibility Request and a summary powerpoint was given to the committee outlining the implementation of the four principles in the waiver. Members provided input during the meeting and were also invited to continue to provide feedback to the designated recipient. |

| Date | Group | Topic |
|---|---|---|
| November 9, 2011 | Town Hall Community Forum<br><br>*Description:* Presented in partnership with Stand for Children, a statewide advocacy group striving to make education a top political priority; TN SCORE, a statewide organization advancing innovative reform; United Ways of Tennessee, dedicated to improving quality of life; and Urban Leagues of Tennessee, civil rights organizations raising the standard of living in historically underserved urban communities | Commissioner Huffman presented an overview of the four principles of the waiver, outlined next steps, and answered questions from attendees via the web and over the phone. Participants provided input and were encouraged to continue providing feedback to the TDOE.<br><br>The audience was comprised of 426 participants consisting of Parents, Educators, Community Members, Education Advocacy Organizations, and Civil Rights Organizations. |
| November 10, 2011 | Tennessee Business Roundtable<br><br>*Description:* Business organization of CEO's of major corporations in the state | TDOE met with TN Business Roundtable's Executive Director, Ellen Thornton, and provided an overview of the waiver application. Thornton provided input on behalf of the Business Roundtable and offered support. |
| November 14, 2011 | Tennessee Media Outreach<br><br>*Description:* Media outlets from around Tennessee. | Commissioner Huffman presented an overview of the four principles of the waiver, outlined next steps, and answered questions from media participants. |

| Grades/ subjects | Activities | 2011-2012 School Year | Summer 12 | 2012-2013 School Year | Summer 13 | 2013-2014 School Year | Summer 14 | 2014-2015 School Year |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **K-2** | Professional development (PD) | Summer PD: awareness & implementation | Enhanced PD on content/instructional practice | | | | Enhanced PD and review on standards, PARCC assessments | |
| | CCSS standards | Implemented (opt-in) | | Full implementation | | | | |
| | Assessment | Various assessments[1]; Develop comprehensive assessment plan | | Work with vendors to determine approved CCSS-aligned assessments | | Give districts option of administering approved CCSS-aligned assessments | | PARCC K-2 diagnostic tools[2] |
| **3-8 Math** | PD | | PD: awareness; preparation for implementation (50% of standards) | | PD: preparation for implementation (remaining 50% of standards) | | Enhanced PD and review on standards, PARCC assessments | |
| | CCSS standards | | | Partial implementation (50% of standards) | | Full Implementation | | |
| | Assessment | TCAP Phase 1: pilot CCSS-aligned field test items in spring; Develop comprehensive assessment plan | | Phase 2: TCAP with CCSS-aligned field test items* | | TCAP with CCSS-aligned items^; PARCC pilot | | PARCC |

| Grades/ subjects | Activities | 2011-2012 School Year | Summer 12 | 2012-2013 School Year | Summer 13 | 2013-2014 School Year | Summer 14 | 2014-2015 School Year |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **9-12 math** | PD | | | | PD: awareness and preparation for implementation | | Enhanced PD and review on standards, PARCC assessments | |
| | CCSS standards | | | | | Full implementation | | |
| | Assessment | TCAP; Develop comprehensive assessment plan | | TCAP with CCSS-aligned field test items | | TCAP with CCSS-aligned items^; PARCC pilot | | PARCC |
| **3-12 ELA** | PD | | Training on CCSS-adapted writing test | | PD: awareness and preparation for implementation | | Enhanced PD and review on standards, PARCC assessments | |
| | CCSS standards | | | | | Full implementation | | |
| | Assessment | TCAP; Develop comprehensive assessment plan | | TCAP with CCSS-aligned field test items; CCSS-adapted writing test | | TCAP with CCSS-aligned items^; PARCC pilot | | PARCC |
| **6-12 Literacy for social studies, math, and science** | PD | | | | PD: awareness and preparation for implementation | | | |
| | CCSS Standards | | | | | Full implementation | | |
| | Assessment | | | | | | | |
| **K-12 ALL** | Teacher prep/evaluation /licensing | | THEC develops curriculum | Training of HE teacher pre-service pilot (spring) | | Teacher pre-service CCSS training implemented | | All new teachers and principals trained on CCSS |
| **K-12 ALL** | ELP/SWD accommodations | | | Develop implementation plan | | Enact implementation plan | | |

[1]The TDOE is working with LEAs who are experimenting with various early grades assessments, including the SAT-10, to use for TEAM quantitative scores for K-2 teachers
[2]PARCC states are exploring the option of creating summative assessments for K-2
*Overpopulate items that already align with CCSS
^New item types covering CCSS standards

TDOE Report Card

Report Card Explained | Report Card Terms | Benchmarks & Documents | NAEP data
Data Explanation | Print Version | Grade Scale | Value-Added

Reported by School, LEA, and State level today

TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Governor: Mr. Bill Haslam
**2010**

**STATE WIDE**

Commissioner: Kevin Huffman

Comprehensive and Transparent Reporting

**Report Card**

Report Card for 2010

State System School

Profile | NCLB (AYP) | **Achievement** | Value-Added | Attendance and Graduation | Discipline | Teacher | Special Education | Career Technical Education

Academic Achievement Grades Additional Academic Achievement Data

## Academic Achievement Grades

This page displays the 2009 re-start of all comparison reporting for achievement data for Tennessee's annual comprehensive educational report card.

Only 2009 converted data are reported and no trend data are available.

Scores and grades may only be compared for 2008-09 and 2009-10. (See Note.)

**Grades 3-8: TCAP Criterion Referenced Academic Achievement** View Chart ?

| (3 year average) | 2009 | | 2010 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CRT | Score | Grade | Score | Grade | Trend |
| Math | 50 | B | 49 | C | - |
| Reading/Language | 50 | B | 49 | C | - |
| Social Studies | 50 | B | 51 | B | NC |

A – F grading scale in use today

School Report Card will be updated to align with new accountability system, upon waiver approval

# Tennessee's New Accountability System

## Public Accountability

### REPORT CARDS

- **School, LEA, and TDOE levels**
- **Full transparency** of:
  - Progress against AMOs
  - School status as Reward, Priority, or Focus
  - Achievement data by assessment, by sub-group performance
  - Growth data by sub-group performance
  - Participation and Graduation rates
  - School environment
  - School profile

⇨ ***Reported annually***

## State Accountability: 2 Systems

### ① Absolute Accountability: AMOs

**(1) Achievement* :**
% Proficient/Advanced targets in:
- 3rd grade Math
- 3rd grade RLA
- 7th grade Math
- 7th grade RLA
- 3-8 grades Math
- 3-8 grades RLA
- HS: Algebra I
- HS: English II
- HS: Graduation rate

⇨ ***"Achieve" / "Miss" assessed annually***

**(2) Gap Closure*:**
6% annual reduction in gaps for:
- 3-8 grades Math
- 3-8 grades RLA
- HS: Algebra I
- HS: English II

⇨ ***"Achieve" / "Miss" assessed annually***

### ② Relative Accountability: Priority, Focus, Reward

**(1) Priority:** Bottom 5% of all schools in proficiency

⇨ ***Identified every 3-years***

**(2) Focus:** 10% of Schools with largest achievement gaps; graduation rates <60%; sub-group performance below threshold

⇨ ***Identified every 3-years***


**(3) Reward:** Top 5% of all schools in Proficiency and Top 5% of all schools in Progress

⇨ ***Identified Annually***


* Algebra II and English III data will be included when available

# Criteria for "Achieving"/"Missing" AMO Categories

## Achievement Measures




## Gap closure Measures




*SAFE HARBOR: If a District has a "green" TVAAS score on a measure (i.e. demonstrating a positive threshold of growth), then this will stand as goal achievement for that measure

PARTICIPATION RATE: A 95% participation rate in the required TCAP accountability tests for all students and for each student subgroup; If an LEA does not meet this participation rate, the LEA will automatically fail both its achievement and gap closure measures

# AMO Interventions

**ACHIEVE Achievement Measures**
**ACHIEVE Gap Closure Measures**

- LEA commended to an exemplary LEA list
- LEA allowed to maintain plans at the district level without approval from the state
- LEA granted increased latitude in funding flexibility (where possible)

**MISS Achievement Measures** | **ACHIEVE Gap Closure Measures**

***If achievement declined in half or more targets; OR declined in either 3-8 math, 3-8 RLA, or the majority of HS targets*:***

- LEA will be placed on public list of LEAs in need of improvement
- LEA must meet with TDOE to support the creation of an aggressive plan for corrective action

***In all other cases:***

- LEA must submit a detailed analysis of the results along with plans for the coming year to achieve goals, subject to TDOE approval

**ACHIEVE Achievement Measures** | **MISS Gap Closure Measures**

***If gaps widened because the same subgroup had achievement declines in a majority of its gap target areas, or because subgroups declined in achievement in half or more targets* :***

- LEA placed on public list of LEAs in need of improvement
- LEA must meet with TDOE to support the creation of an aggressive plan for corrective action

***In all other cases:***

- LEA must submit a detailed analysis of the results along with plans for the coming year to achieve goals, subject to TDOE approval

**MISS Achievement Measures**
**MISS Gap Closure Measures**

- LEA placed on public list of LEAs in need of improvement
- LEA must meet with TDOE officials in-person to support the creation of an aggressive plan for corrective action

*SAFE HARBOR: If a District has a "green" TVAAS score on a measure (i.e. demonstrating a positive threshold of growth), then this will stand as goal achievement for that measure

PARTICIPATION RATE: A 95% participation rate in the required TCAP accountability tests for all students and for each student subgroup; If an LEA does not meet this participation rate, the LEA will automatically fail both its achievement and gap closure measures

# State-level Annual Measurable Objectives

**I. Achievement AMOs**

| | 2010-2011 Actual | 2011-12 Target | 2012-13 Target | 2013-14 Target | 2014-15 Target | 2015-16 Target | 2016-17 Target | 2017-18 Target | 2018-19 Target | Percent annual growth (2010-11 to 2014-15) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3rd grade Math | 51.4% | 54.6% | 57.7% | 60.9% | **64.0%** | 67.2% | 70.3% | 73.5% | 76.6% | *3.2%* |
| 3rd grade Reading | 43.9% | 47.9% | 52.0% | 56.0% | **60.0%** | 64.0% | 68.1% | 72.1% | 76.1% | *4.0%* |
| 7th grade Math | 35.9% | 39.7% | 43.5% | 47.2% | **51.0%** | 54.8% | 58.6% | 62.3% | 66.1% | *3.8%* |
| 7th grade Reading | 45.3% | 48.2% | 51.2% | 54.1% | **57.0%** | 59.9% | 62.9% | 65.8% | 68.7% | *2.9%* |
| 3-8 aggregate math | 41.0% | 44.5% | 48.0% | 51.5% | **55.0%** | 58.5% | 62.0% | 65.5% | 69.0% | *3.5%* |
| 3-8 aggregate reading | 48.5% | 51.6% | 54.8% | 57.9% | **61.0%** | 64.1% | 67.3% | 70.4% | 73.5% | *3.1%* |
| End-of-Course: Algebra I | 51.7% | 54.7% | 57.6% | 60.6% | **63.5%** | 66.5% | 69.4% | 72.4% | 75.3% | *3.0%* |
| End-of-Course: English II | 57.5% | 60.1% | 62.8% | 65.4% | **68.0%** | 70.6% | 73.3% | 75.9% | 78.5% | *2.6%* |
| Graduation rates | 85.3% | 86.5% | 87.7% | 88.8% | **90.0%** | 90.0% | 90.0% | 90.0% | 90.0% | *1.2%* |

**II. Gap Closure AMOs: Close Achievement Gap between Highest Performing and Lowest Performing, Corresponding Sub-groups by 6% Annually.**

This implies target achievement gap sizes for the following achievement measures

**3-8 Aggregate Math**

| | 2010-2011 Actual | 2011-12 Target | 2012-13 Target | 2013-14 Target | 2014-15 Target | 2015-16 Target | 2016-17 Target | 2017-18 Target | 2018-19 Target | Annual gap reduction in percentage points | Annual gap reduction as a percent of 2010-11 gap size |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| White vs. Non-White | 20.1% | 18.8% | 17.6% | 16.3% | **15.1%** | 13.8% | 12.6% | 11.3% | 10.0% | **1.3%** | 6.2% |
| Non-ED vs. ED | 26.5% | 24.8% | 23.1% | 21.5% | **19.8%** | 18.2% | 16.5% | 14.9% | 13.2% | **1.7%** | 6.2% |
| Non EL vs. EL | 24.9% | 23.3% | 21.8% | 20.2% | **18.7%** | 17.1% | 15.6% | 14.0% | 12.5% | **1.6%** | 6.3% |
| Non-SWD vs. SWD | 10.9% | 10.2% | 9.5% | 8.8% | **8.1%** | 7.5% | 6.8% | 6.1% | 5.4% | **0.7%** | 6.2% |

**3-8 Aggregate Reading**

| | 2010-2011 Actual | 2011-12 Target | 2012-13 Target | 2013-14 Target | 2014-15 Target | 2015-16 Target | 2016-17 Target | 2017-18 Target | 2018-19 Target | Annual gap reduction in percentage points | Annual gap reduction as a percent of 2010-11 gap size |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| White vs. Non-White | 24.3% | 22.8% | 21.3% | 19.8% | **18.2%** | 16.7% | 15.2% | 13.7% | 12.2% | **1.5%** | 6.2% |
| Non-ED vs. ED | 30.5% | 28.6% | 26.7% | 24.8% | **22.9%** | 21.0% | 19.1% | 17.2% | 15.3% | **1.9%** | 6.3% |
| Non EL vs. EL | 39.0% | 36.6% | 34.1% | 31.7% | **29.3%** | 26.8% | 24.4% | 21.9% | 19.5% | **2.4%** | 6.3% |
| Non-SWD vs. SWD | 9.3% | 8.8% | 8.2% | 7.6% | **7.0%** | 6.4% | 5.8% | 5.3% | 4.7% | **0.6%** | 6.3% |

**HS: Algebra I**

| | 2010-2011 Actual | 2011-12 Target | 2012-13 Target | 2013-14 Target | 2014-15 Target | 2015-16 Target | 2016-17 Target | 2017-18 Target | 2018-19 Target | Annual gap reduction in percentage points | Annual gap reduction as a percent of 2010-11 gap size |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| White vs. Non-White | 18.7% | 17.6% | 16.4% | 15.2% | **14.1%** | 12.9% | 11.7% | 10.5% | 9.4% | **1.2%** | 6.2% |
| Non-ED vs. ED | 28.1% | 26.4% | 24.6% | 22.9% | **21.1%** | 19.3% | 17.6% | 15.8% | 14.1% | **1.8%** | 6.3% |
| Non EL vs. EL | 30.9% | 29.0% | 27.1% | 25.1% | **23.2%** | 21.3% | 19.3% | 17.4% | 15.5% | **1.9%** | 6.3% |
| Non-SWD vs. SWD | 9.3% | 8.8% | 8.2% | 7.6% | **7.0%** | 6.4% | 5.8% | 5.3% | 4.7% | **0.6%** | 6.3% |

**HS: English II**

| | 2010-2011 Actual | 2011-12 Target | 2012-13 Target | 2013-14 Target | 2014-15 Target | 2015-16 Target | 2016-17 Target | 2017-18 Target | 2018-19 Target | Annual gap reduction in percentage points | Annual gap reduction as a percent of 2010-11 gap size |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| White vs. Non-White | 26.6% | 24.9% | 23.3% | 21.6% | **20.0%** | 18.3% | 16.6% | 15.0% | 13.3% | **1.7%** | 6.3% |
| Non-ED vs. ED | 31.6% | 29.6% | 27.6% | 25.6% | **23.7%** | 21.7% | 19.7% | 17.8% | 15.8% | **2.0%** | 6.3% |
| Non EL vs. EL | 50.6% | 47.5% | 44.3% | 41.2% | **38.0%** | 34.8% | 31.7% | 28.5% | 25.3% | **3.2%** | 6.2% |
| Non-SWD vs. SWD | 47.4% | 44.5% | 41.5% | 38.5% | **35.6%** | 32.6% | 29.6% | 26.7% | 23.7% | **3.0%** | 6.2% |

# State-level Annual Measurable Objectives

This implies the following proficiency targets by subgroup:

**3-8 Aggregate Math**

| | 2010-2011 Actual | 2011-12 Target | 2012-13 Target | 2013-14 Target | 2014-15 Target | 2015-16 Target | 2016-17 Target | 2017-18 Target | 2018-19 Target | *Percent annual growth (2010-11 to 2018-19)* | *Percent annual growth (2010-11 to 2014-15)* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **ALL Students** | 41.0% | 44.7% | 48.4% | 52.1% | 55.8% | 59.5% | 63.2% | 66.8% | 70.5% | *3.7%* | *3.7%* |
| White | 47.5% | 50.8% | 54.0% | 57.3% | 60.6% | 63.9% | 67.2% | 70.5% | 73.7% | *3.3%* | *3.3%* |
| Non-White | 27.4% | 31.9% | 36.5% | 41.0% | 45.5% | 50.1% | 54.6% | 59.2% | 63.7% | *4.5%* | *4.5%* |
| African American | 23.1% | 27.9% | 32.7% | 37.6% | 42.4% | 47.2% | 52.0% | 56.8% | 61.6% | *4.8%* | *4.8%* |
| Asian | 66.2% | 68.3% | 70.4% | 72.5% | 74.6% | 76.8% | 78.9% | 81.0% | 83.1% | *2.1%* | *2.1%* |
| Native American | 40.5% | 44.2% | 48.0% | 51.7% | 55.4% | 59.1% | 62.8% | 66.5% | 70.3% | *3.7%* | *3.7%* |
| Hispanic | 32.3% | 36.5% | 40.7% | 45.0% | 49.2% | 53.4% | 57.7% | 61.9% | 66.1% | *4.2%* | *4.2%* |
| Hawaiian Pacific Islander | 49.3% | 52.5% | 55.7% | 58.8% | 62.0% | 65.2% | 68.3% | 71.5% | 74.7% | *3.2%* | *3.2%* |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 29.8% | 34.2% | 38.6% | 43.0% | 47.4% | 51.8% | 56.2% | 60.5% | 64.9% | *4.4%* | *4.4%* |
| English Language Learners | 16.7% | 21.9% | 27.1% | 32.3% | 37.5% | 42.7% | 47.9% | 53.2% | 58.4% | *5.2%* | *5.2%* |
| Students with disabilities | 31.5% | 35.8% | 40.1% | 44.3% | 48.6% | 52.9% | 57.2% | 61.5% | 65.8% | *4.3%* | *4.3%* |

**3-8 Aggregate Reading**

| | 2010-2011 Actual | 2011-12 Target | 2012-13 Target | 2013-14 Target | 2014-15 Target | 2015-16 Target | 2016-17 Target | 2017-18 Target | 2018-19 Target | *Percent annual growth (2010-11 to 2018-19)* | *Percent annual growth (2010-11 to 2014-15)* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **ALL Students** | 48.5% | 51.7% | 55.0% | 58.2% | 61.4% | 64.6% | 67.8% | 71.0% | 74.3% | *3.2%* | *3.2%* |
| White | 56.3% | 59.0% | 61.7% | 64.5% | 67.2% | 69.9% | 72.7% | 75.4% | 78.1% | *2.7%* | *2.7%* |
| Non-White | 31.9% | 36.2% | 40.4% | 44.7% | 49.0% | 53.2% | 57.5% | 61.7% | 66.0% | *4.3%* | *4.3%* |
| African American | 28.4% | 32.9% | 37.4% | 41.9% | 46.3% | 50.8% | 55.3% | 59.8% | 64.2% | *4.5%* | *4.5%* |
| Asian | 65.7% | 67.9% | 70.0% | 72.2% | 74.3% | 76.4% | 78.6% | 80.7% | 82.9% | *2.1%* | *2.1%* |
| Native American | 45.5% | 48.9% | 52.3% | 55.7% | 59.1% | 62.5% | 65.9% | 69.4% | 72.8% | *3.4%* | *3.4%* |
| Hispanic | 35.5% | 39.5% | 43.6% | 47.6% | 51.6% | 55.7% | 59.7% | 63.7% | 67.7% | *4.0%* | *4.0%* |
| Hawaiian Pacific Islander | 57.5% | 60.1% | 62.8% | 65.4% | 68.1% | 70.8% | 73.4% | 76.1% | 78.7% | *2.7%* | *2.7%* |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 35.6% | 39.6% | 43.6% | 47.7% | 51.7% | 55.7% | 59.7% | 63.8% | 67.8% | *4.0%* | *4.0%* |
| English Language Learners | 10.4% | 16.0% | 21.6% | 27.2% | 32.8% | 38.4% | 44.0% | 49.6% | 55.2% | *5.6%* | *5.6%* |
| Students with disabilities | 40.3% | 44.0% | 47.8% | 51.5% | 55.2% | 59.0% | 62.7% | 66.4% | 70.2% | *3.7%* | *3.7%* |

**HS: Algebra I**

| | 2010-2011 Actual | 2011-12 Target | 2012-13 Target | 2013-14 Target | 2014-15 Target | 2015-16 Target | 2016-17 Target | 2017-18 Target | 2018-19 Target | *Percent annual growth (2010-11 to 2018-19)* | *Percent annual growth (2010-11 to 2014-15)* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **ALL Students** | 51.8% | 54.8% | 57.8% | 60.8% | 63.8% | 66.8% | 69.8% | 72.9% | 75.9% | *3.0%* | *3.0%* |
| White | 57.6% | 60.3% | 62.9% | 65.6% | 68.2% | 70.9% | 73.5% | 76.2% | 78.8% | *2.6%* | *2.6%* |
| Non-White | 38.9% | 42.7% | 46.5% | 50.4% | 54.2% | 58.0% | 61.8% | 65.6% | 69.4% | *3.8%* | *3.8%* |
| African American | 34.6% | 38.7% | 42.8% | 46.9% | 50.9% | 55.0% | 59.1% | 63.2% | 67.3% | *4.1%* | *4.1%* |
| Asian | 75.4% | 77.0% | 78.5% | 80.0% | 81.6% | 83.1% | 84.6% | 86.2% | 87.7% | *1.5%* | *1.5%* |
| Native American | 49.1% | 52.3% | 55.5% | 58.7% | 61.8% | 65.0% | 68.2% | 71.4% | 74.6% | *3.2%* | *3.2%* |
| Hispanic | 46.2% | 49.6% | 52.9% | 56.3% | 59.7% | 63.0% | 66.4% | 69.7% | 73.1% | *3.4%* | *3.4%* |
| Hawaiian Pacific Islander | 56.5% | 59.2% | 62.0% | 64.7% | 67.4% | 70.1% | 72.8% | 75.5% | 78.3% | *2.7%* | *2.7%* |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 38.5% | 42.4% | 46.2% | 50.0% | 53.9% | 57.7% | 61.6% | 65.4% | 69.3% | *3.8%* | *3.8%* |
| English Language Learners | 21.3% | 26.2% | 31.1% | 36.0% | 41.0% | 45.9% | 50.8% | 55.7% | 60.6% | *4.9%* | *4.9%* |
| Students with disabilities | 13.4% | 18.8% | 24.2% | 29.7% | 35.1% | 40.5% | 45.9% | 51.3% | 56.7% | *5.4%* | *5.4%* |

Appendix 5

# State-level Annual Measurable Objectives

**HS: English II**

| | 2010-2011 Actual | 2011-12 Target | 2012-13 Target | 2013-14 Target | 2014-15 Target | 2015-16 Target | 2016-17 Target | 2017-18 Target | 2018-19 Target | *Percent annual growth (2010-11 to 2018-19)* | *Percent annual growth (2010-11 to 2014-15)* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **ALL Students** | 57.5% | 60.1% | 62.8% | 65.4% | 68.1% | 70.8% | 73.4% | 76.1% | 78.7% | *2.7%* | *2.7%* |
| White | 65.9% | 68.0% | 70.2% | 72.3% | 74.4% | 76.6% | 78.7% | 80.8% | 83.0% | *2.1%* | *2.1%* |
| Non-White | 39.3% | 43.1% | 46.9% | 50.7% | 54.5% | 58.3% | 62.1% | 65.9% | 69.7% | *3.8%* | *3.8%* |
| African American | 35.0% | 39.0% | 43.1% | 47.2% | 51.2% | 55.3% | 59.3% | 63.4% | 67.5% | *4.1%* | *4.1%* |
| Asian | 71.5% | 73.3% | 75.1% | 76.8% | 78.6% | 80.4% | 82.2% | 84.0% | 85.7% | *1.8%* | *1.8%* |
| Native American | 48.3% | 51.6% | 54.8% | 58.0% | 61.2% | 64.5% | 67.7% | 70.9% | 74.2% | *3.2%* | *3.2%* |
| Hispanic | 71.5% | 73.3% | 75.1% | 76.8% | 78.6% | 80.4% | 82.2% | 84.0% | 85.7% | *1.8%* | *1.8%* |
| Hawaiian Pacific Islander | 66.7% | 68.8% | 70.8% | 72.9% | 75.0% | 77.1% | 79.2% | 81.3% | 83.3% | *2.1%* | *2.1%* |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 41.7% | 45.3% | 49.0% | 52.6% | 56.3% | 59.9% | 63.5% | 67.2% | 70.8% | *3.6%* | *3.6%* |
| English Language Learners | 7.3% | 13.1% | 18.9% | 24.7% | 30.5% | 36.3% | 42.0% | 47.8% | 53.6% | *5.8%* | *5.8%* |
| Students with disabilities | 14.6% | 19.9% | 25.3% | 30.6% | 35.9% | 41.3% | 46.6% | 52.0% | 57.3% | *5.3%* | *5.3%* |

# REWARD SCHOOLS: METHODOLOGY FOR IDENTIFYING HIGHEST-PERFORMING AND HIGHEST PROGRESS SCHOOLS

Overview:

- Reward schools are 10% of schools[1], comprised of:
  - 5% highest-performing schools in the State
  - 5% highest-progress schools in the State
- TDOE has developed, in collaboration with external technical advisors, the following methodologies:
  - To identify "highest-performance" (matched with priority methodology):
    - Calculate a composite proficiency rate ("success rate") for all students in a school, in order to have one comparable number across sub-groups
    - Rank schools based on "success rate"
  - To identify "highest-progress"
    - Rank schools based on the TVAAS growth composite index
  - Exempt any school with achievement gaps that are larger than the state median in any sub-group area and where achievement gaps have widened between 2009-10 and 2010-11 school years
- Note: Elementary/Middle Schools and High Schools were assessed separately using different measures; Schools that span both levels were assessed in both categories

Data inputs

- 2009-10 and 2010-11 data sets, except where noted otherwise[2]
- **Elementary/Middle Measures:**
  - TCAP Math, Science, RLA data
    - Total # of students tested (3-8 aggregate)
    - # of students tested who scored "proficient" or "advanced"
    - TVAAS Composite Index Scores including data for up to three years based on TCAP Math, Science, RLA, Social Studies, and Algebra I (if taken at the Middle school level)
- **High School Measures:**
  - End-of-course exams: Algebra I, Biology I, English I, English II
    - Total # of students tested
    - # of students tested who scored "proficient" or "advanced"
  - Graduation rate
    - Total # of students in graduation cohort [3]

---

[1] USED has not mandated a certain percentage of "reward" schools, however Tennessee has determined a target of 10%, which corresponds with the percentage required for focus schools, of which 5% are "highest performing schools," which corresponds with the percentage required for priority schools

[2] Tennessee TCAP cut scores were recalibrated in 2009-10, which means 2008-9 data is not comparable. However, going forward, we intend to include 3-years of data, beginning with our final list run in summer of 2012.

- # of students who graduate in four years with a regular high school diploma
- TVAAS Composite Index Scores including data for up to three years based on Algebra I, Biology I, U.S. History, English I and English II

Calculation: "Highest-Performance" Methodology

1. Calculate a 2-year "success rate" for all students, by school, based on the number of students who scored "proficient" or "advanced" on any exam and the number who graduated in high school, out of the total number of students who took any of the corresponding exams and the number in the graduation cohort in high school

**Elementary/Middle Schools Example:**

$$\text{[School X] Blended 2009-10 and 2010-11 2-year "success rate"} = \frac{\begin{array}{c}\text{\# P/A on RLA 2011 +}\\ \text{\# P/A on Math 2011 +}\\ \text{\# P/A on Science 2011 +}\\ \text{\# P/A on RLA 2010 +}\\ \text{\# P/A on Math 2010 +}\\ \text{\# P/A on Science 2010}\end{array}}{\begin{array}{c}\text{\# Exam Cohort RLA 2011 +}\\ \text{\# Exam Cohort Math 2011 +}\\ \text{\# Exam Cohort Science 2011 +}\\ \text{\# Exam Cohort RLA 2010 +}\\ \text{\# Exam Cohort Math 2010 +}\\ \text{\# Exam Cohort Science 2010}\end{array}}$$

**High School Example:**

$$\text{[School Y] Blended} = \frac{\begin{array}{c}\text{\# P/A on Algebra I 2011 +}\\ \text{\# P/A on Biology I 2011 +}\\ \text{\# P/A on English I 2011 +}\\ \text{\# P/A on English II 2011 +}\\ \text{\# 2011 graduates +}\\ \text{\# P/A on Algebra I 2010 +}\\ \text{\# P/Aon Biology I 2010 +}\\ \text{\# P/Aon English I 2010 +}\\ \text{\# P/A on English II 2010 +}\\ \text{\# 2010 graduates}\end{array}}{}$$

[3] From the beginning of 9th grade, students who are entering that grade for the first time form a cohort that is subsequently "adjusted" by adding any students who transfer into the cohort later during the 9th grade and the next three years and subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during that same period (As defined in 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(i)-(iv))

**2009-10 and 2010-11 2-year "success rate"** =

**# Exam Cohort Algebra I 2011 +**
**# Exam Cohort Biology I 2011 +**
**# Exam Cohort English I 2011 +**
**# Exam Cohort English II 2011 +**
**# 2011 Graduation Cohort +**
**# Exam Cohort Algebra I 2010 +**
**# Exam Cohort Biology I 2010 +**
**# Exam Cohort English I 2010 +**
**# Exam Cohort English II 2010 +**
**# 2010 Graduation Cohort**

2. Rank schools based on blended 2-year success rates across measures to identify the top 5% of schools with the highest aggregate rates of achievement:

**EXAMPLE: Rank Two-Year Blended Success Rates by School (Lowest Rank = Highest-Performing School)**

| | Two-year Blended Success Rate (2009/10-2010/11) | Rank | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **SCHOOL A** | 5% | 6 | --> *"Priority school" (same methodology)* |
| **SCHOOL B** | 10% | 5 | |
| **SCHOOL C** | 12% | 4 | |
| **SCHOOL X** | 24.0% | 3 | |
| **SCHOOL Y** | 27% | 2 | |
| **SCHOOL Z** | 40% | 1 | --> "Reward school" |

Calculation: "Highest-Progress" Methodology

**1.** Rank TVAAS Composite Index scores (provided by SAS Institute)

Calculation: Exemption based on Significant Gaps that are widening[4]

1. Refer to Focus list calculations
2. Identify schools with any achievement gap greater than the State median achievement gap for that subgroup
3. For identified schools in step #2, identify whether any gaps are widening (i.e. whether achievement gaps are larger in 2010-11 than in 2009-10)
4. If a school has any achievement gap larger than the state median achievement gap for that subgroup and any achievement gaps are widening, then the school is excluded from being a Reward school

[4] This is mandated by the waiver application. The USED states: "A school may not be classified as a 'highest-performing' school if there are significant achievement gaps across subgroups that are not closing in the school" and "A school may not be classified as a 'high-progress school' if there are significant achievement gaps across subgroups that are not closing in the school." (US Department of Education, *ESEA Flexibility*, September 23, 2011)

# PRIORITY SCHOOLS: METHODOLOGY FOR IDENTIFYING BOTTOM 5% SCHOOLS ON PROFICIENCY

Overview:

- Priority schools[1] are the 5% lowest-performing schools in the state
- TDOE has developed, in collaboration with external technical advisors, the following methodology to identify "lowest-performance" (same as highest-performance reward methodology):
    - Calculate a composite proficiency rate ("success rate") for all students in a school, in order to have one comparable number across sub-groups
    - Rank schools based on "success rate"
- Note: Elementary/Middle Schools and High Schools were assessed separately using different measures; Schools that span both levels were assessed in both categories

Data inputs

- 2009-10 and 2010-11 data sets[2]
- **Elementary/Middle Measures:**
    - TCAP Math, Science, RLA data
        - Total # of students tested (3-8 aggregate)
        - # of students tested who scored "proficient" or "advanced"
- **High School Measures:**
    - End-of-course exams: Algebra I, Biology I, English I, English II[3]
        - Total # of students tested
        - # of students tested who scored "proficient" or "advanced"
    - Graduation rate
        - Total # of students in graduation cohort [4]
        - # of students who graduate in four years with a regular high school diploma

---

[1] The USED states: "A 'priority school' is a school that, based on the most recent data available, has been identified as among the lowest-performing schools in the State…based on the achievement of the 'all students' group in terms of proficiency on the statewide assessments that are part of the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system, combined, and has demonstrated a lack of progress on those assessments over a number of years in the 'all students' group." (US Department of Education, *ESEA Flexibility*, September 23, 2011)

[2] Tennessee TCAP cut scores were recalibrated in 2009-10, which means 2008-9 data is not comparable. However, going forward, we intend to include 3-years of data, beginning with our final list run in summer of 2012.

[3] Data for Algebra II and English III will be included when available

[4] From the beginning of 9th grade, students who are entering that grade for the first time form a cohort that is subsequently "adjusted" by adding any students who transfer into the cohort later during the 9th grade and the next three years and subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during that same period (As defined in 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(i)-(iv))

Calculation

1. Calculate a 2-year "success rate" for all students, by school, based on the number of students who scored "proficient" or "advanced" on any exam and the number who graduated in high school, out of the total number of students who took any of the corresponding exams and the number in the graduation cohort in high school

**Elementary/Middle Schools Example:**

**[School X]**

**Blended 2009-10 and 2010-11 2-year "success rate"** =

$$\frac{\text{\# P/A on RLA 2011 + \# P/A on Math 2011 + \# P/A on Science 2011 + \# P/A on RLA 2010 + \# P/A on Math 2010 + \# P/A on Science 2010}}{\text{\# Exam Cohort RLA 2011 + \# Exam Cohort Math 2011 + \# Exam Cohort Science 2011 + \# Exam Cohort RLA 2010 + \# Exam Cohort Math 2010 + \# Exam Cohort Science 2010}}$$

**High School Example:**

**[School Y]**

**Blended 2009-10 and 2010-11 2-year "success rate"** =

$$\frac{\text{\# P/A on Algebra I 2011 + \# P/A on Biology I 2011 + \# P/A on English I 2011 + \# P/A on English II 2011 + \# 2011 graduates + \# P/A on Algebra I 2010 + \# P/Aon Biology I 2010 + \# P/Aon English I 2010 + \# P/A on English II 2010 + \# 2010 graduates}}{\text{\# Exam Cohort Algebra I 2011 + \# Exam Cohort Biology I 2011 + \# Exam Cohort English I 2011 + \# Exam Cohort English II 2011 + \# 2011 Graduation Cohort + \# Exam Cohort Algebra I 2010 + \# Exam Cohort Biology I 2010 + \# Exam Cohort English I 2010 + \# Exam Cohort English II 2010 +}}$$

| | # 2010 Graduation Cohort |
|---|---|
| | |

2. Rank schools based on blended 2-year success rates across measures to identify the bottom 5% of schools with the lowest aggregate rates of achievement:

**EXAMPLE: Rank Two-Year Blended Success Rates by School**
**(Highest Rank = Lowest-Performing School)**

| | Two-year Blended Success Rate (2009/10-2010/11) | Rank | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **SCHOOL A** | 5% | 6 | --> "Priority school" |
| **SCHOOL B** | 10% | 5 | |
| **SCHOOL C** | 12% | 4 | |
| **SCHOOL X** | 24.0% | 3 | |
| **SCHOOL Y** | 27% | 2 | |
| **SCHOOL Z** | 95% | 1 | --> *"Reward school" (same methodology)* |

# FOCUS SCHOOLS: METHODOLOGY FOR IDENTIFYING SCHOOLS WITH THE LARGEST GAPS

Overview:

- Focus Schools[1] are the 10% of schools that are:
    1. High schools with a three-year average graduation rate less than 60% that have not otherwise been identified as "Priority"
    2. Schools with sub-groups that have less than **5%** composite performance on the TCAP Math, RLA, and Science for grades three through eight, or composite performance on Algebra , English, and graduation rates in high school[2]
    3. Schools with the largest within-school gaps between sub-groups
- Identifying pathway #3: schools with the largest gaps, requires a new comprehensive method for conducting gap analyses
- TDOE has developed, in collaboration with external technical advisors, the following methodology:
    1. Calculate a composite proficiency rate for each sub-group in a school, in order to have one comparable number across sub-groups
    2. Calculate the "gap" between up to four corresponding sub-group sets within a school (1. White vs. Non-White; 2.Economically Disadvantaged vs. Non-ED; 3. English Learners vs. Non-EL; 4. Students with Disabilities vs. Non-SWD), in order to capture the depth of each gap
    3. Weight the size of each gap by the percentage of students in the school who are negatively impacted by the gap (i.e who are in the underperforming sub-group), in order to capture the breadth of the gap
    4. Once the depth and breadth has been captured into a single weighted average gap for each of up to four sub-group sets in a school, average the weighted gaps to arrive at a "gap index" number that can be used as a point of comparison across schools
    5. Rank schools based on their "gap index" numbers
- There are two "safe harbors" that can exempt a school from "focus" identification:
    1. Every sub-group in a school is performing at or above the State proficiency/graduation levels for all students
    2. Every corresponding sub-group set (e.g. White vs. Non-White) has reduced its gap by at least 6% in the last year (equivalent to gap closure AMO)
- Note: Elementary/Middle Schools and High Schools were assessed separately using different measures; Schools that span both levels were assessed in both categories

---

[1] The USED states: "A 'focus school' is …a school that has the largest within-school gaps between the highest-achieving subgroup or subgroups and the lowest-achieving subgroup or subgroups or, at the high school level, has the largest within-school gaps in graduation rates; or a school that has a subgroup or subgroups with low achievement or, at the high school level, low graduation rates. An SEA must also identify as a focus school a Title I high school with a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years that is not identified as a priority school." (US Department of Education, *ESEA Flexibility*, September 23, 2011)

[2] Note: the threshold calculation is based on "success rates" (step #1 of gap analysis calculation) that are less than 5% for any subgroup

Pathway #3: Gap Analysis Explanation

*Data Inputs:*

- 2009-10 and 2010-11 data sets[3]
- **Elementary/Middle Measures:**
    - TCAP Math, Science, RLA data
        - Total # of students tested (3-8 aggregate)
        - # of students tested who scored "proficient" or "advanced"
- **High School Measures:**
    - End-of-course exams: Algebra I and English II
        - Total # of students tested
        - # of students tested who scored "proficient" or "advanced"
    - Graduation rate
        - Total # of students in graduation cohort [4]
        - # of students who graduate in four years with a regular high school diploma
- All data disaggregated by sub-groups:
    - White
    - Non-White (composite of African American, Hispanic, Asian, Native American, Hawaiian/Pacific Islander)
    - Economically Disadvantaged
    - Non – Economically Disadvantaged
    - Students with Disabilities
    - Non – Students with Disabilities
    - English Language Learners
    - Non – English Language Learners

*Calculation:*

1. Calculate a 2-year "success rate" for each sub-group, by school, based on the number of students who scored "proficient" or "advanced" on any exam and the number who graduated in high school, out of the total number of students who took any of the corresponding exams and the number in the graduation cohort in high school

**Elementary/Middle Schools Example:**

---

[3] Tennessee TCAP cut scores were recalibrated in 2009-10, which means 2008-9 data is not comparable. However, going forward, we intend to include 3-years of data, beginning with our final list run in summer of 2012.

[4] From the beginning of 9th grade, students who are entering that grade for the first time form a cohort that is subsequently "adjusted" by adding any students who transfer into the cohort later during the 9th grade and the next three years and subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during that same period (As defined in 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(i)-(iv))

$$\text{[School X] Blended 2009-10 and 2010-11 2-year [SUBGROUP] "success rate"} = \frac{\text{\# P/A [Subgroup] on RLA 2011 + \# P/A [Subgroup] on Math 2011 + \# P/A [Subgroup] on Science 2011 + \# P/A [Subgroup] on RLA 2010 + \# P/A [Subgroup] on Math 2010 + \# P/A [Subgroup] on Science 2010}}{\text{\# Exam [Subgroup] Cohort RLA 2011 + \# Exam [Subgroup] Cohort Math 2011 + \# Exam [Subgroup] Cohort Science 2011 + \# Exam [Subgroup] Cohort RLA 2010 + \# Exam [Subgroup] Cohort Math 2010 + \# Exam [Subgroup] Cohort Science 2010}}$$

**High School Example:**

$$\text{[School Y] Blended 2009-10 and 2010-11 2-year [SUBGROUP] "success rate"} = \frac{\text{\# P/A [Subgroup] on Algebra I 2011 + \# P/A [Subgroup] on English II 2011 + \# 2011 graduates [Subgroup] + \# P/A [Subgroup] on Algebra I 2010 + \# P/A [Subgroup] on English II 2010 + \# 2010 graduates [Subgroup]}}{\text{\# Exam [Subgroup] Cohort Algebra I 2011 + \# Exam [Subgroup] Cohort English II 2011 + \# 2011 Graduation [Subgroup] Cohort + \# Exam [Subgroup] Cohort Algebra I 2010 + \# Exam [Subgroup] Cohort English II 2010 + \# 2010 Graduation [Subgroup] Cohort}}$$

2. Calculate the size of the achievement gap between corresponding subgroups by school:

**EXAMPLE [SCHOOL X]:**
**Achievement Gaps based on 2-year blended success rates**

| White | Non-White | Gap size |
|---|---|---|
| 60% | 40% | 60%-40% = 20% |

| ED | Non-ED | Gap size |
|---|---|---|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 50% | 25% | 50%-25% = 25% |

| EL | Non-EL | Gap size |
|---|---|---|
| 40% | 30% | 40%-30% = 10% |

| SWD | Non-SWD | Gap size |
|---|---|---|
| 45% | 30% | 45%-30% = 15% |

3. Weight the size of each achievement gap based on the percent of the under-performing population size, by school:

**EXAMPLE [SCHOOL X]:**
**Achievement Gaps weighted by % Underperforming Cohort Size**

| White vs. Non-White gap | % Non-White of Tested Cohort | Weighted Gap |
|---|---|---|
| 20% | 50% | 20% × 50% = 10% |

| ED vs. Non-ED | % ED of Tested Cohort | Weighted Gap |
|---|---|---|
| 25% | 70% | 25% × 70% = 17.5% |

| ELL vs. Non-ELL | % EL of Tested Cohort | Weighted Gap |
|---|---|---|
| 10% | 20% | 10% × 20% = 2% |

| SWD vs. Non-SWD | % SWD of Tested Cohort | Weighted Gap |
|---|---|---|
| 15% | 30% | 15% × 30% = 4.5% |

4. Average the weighted gaps by school to arrive at an average weighted gap that accounts for both magnitude of gap size and magnitude of students impacted by gap, across all sub-groups and all within-school gaps:

**EXAMPLE: Average Weighted Achievement Gaps**

| | Whited vs. Non-White Weighted Gap | ED vs. Non-ED Weighted Gap | ELL vs. Non-ELL Weighted Gap | SWD vs. Non-SWD Weighted Gap | "Gap Index" (Average of Weighted Gaps where 1% = 1 point) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **SCHOOL X** | 10.0% | 17.5% | 2.0% | 4.5% | =[10% + 17.5% + 2% + 4.5%] ÷ 4 = 8.5 |
| **SCHOOL Y** | 15% | 1% | | | =[15% + 1%] ÷ 2 = 8.0 |
| **SCHOOL Z** | 15% | | 3% | 5% | =[15% + 3% + 5%] ÷ 3 = 7.7 |

5. Rank the average weighted achievement gaps across schools to identify the schools with the largest, pervasive achievement gaps

**EXAMPLE: Rank Average Weighted Gaps Across Schools (Highest Rank = Largest Cross-School Achievement Gap)**

| | Average Weighted Gaps | Rank | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **SCHOOL A** | 20 | 6 | --> "Focus school" |
| **SCHOOL B** | 15 | 5 | |
| **SCHOOL C** | 10 | 4 | |
| **SCHOOL X** | 8.5 | 3 | |
| **SCHOOL Y** | 8.0 | 2 | |
| **SCHOOL Z** | 7.7 | 1 | |

** Safe Harbors:*

Schools that meet the following criteria will receive "safe harbor" and will not be identified as "focus schools" if:

1) Every sub-group in a school is performing at or above the State proficiency/graduation levels for all students
2) Every corresponding sub-group set (e.g. White vs. Non-White) has reduced its gap by at least 6% (equivalent to gap closure AMO)

**<u>Exemption #1</u>: If "success rates" for <u>every sub-group</u> for 2010-11 (or the last year of the three year data set) data is greater than the State average 2011 success rate for all students**

- 2010-11 High School State Average Success Rate = **63.4%**
- 200-11 Elementary/Middle School State Average Success Rate = **48.3%**

**Elementary/Middle Schools 2010-11 Success Rate Calculation:**

$$\text{[School X]}\ \text{2010-11}\ \text{[SUBGROUP]}\ \text{“Success Rate”} = \frac{\#\text{ P/A [Subgroup] on RLA 2011} + \#\text{ P/A [Subgroup] on Math 2011} + \#\text{ P/A [Subgroup] on Science 2011}}{\#\text{ Exam [Subgroup] Cohort RLA 2011} + \#\text{ Exam [Subgroup] Cohort Math 2011} + \#\text{ Exam [Subgroup] Cohort Science 2011}}$$

**High Schools 2010-11 Success Rate Calculation:**

$$\text{[School Y]}\ \text{2010-11}\ \text{[SUBGROUP]}\ \text{“Success Rate”} = \frac{\#\text{ P/A [Subgroup] on Algebra I 2011} + \#\text{ P/A [Subgroup] on English II 2011} + \#\text{ 2011 graduates [Subgroup]} +}{\#\text{ Exam [Subgroup] Cohort Algebra I 2011} + \#\text{ Exam [Subgroup] Cohort English II 2011} + \#\text{ 2011 Graduation [Subgroup] Cohort} +}$$

* The above calculations must be done for all sub-groups in a school, and all sub-groups must clear the respective State average success rate for the school level to be granted SAFE HARBOR

**<u>Exemption # 2:</u> If the change in gap size has reduced by at least 6% (equivalent to gap closure AMO) from 2010 to 2011 (or between the last two years of the data set)**

1. Calculate annual success rates by sub-groups:

**2009-10 Success Rates**

| White | Non-White | Gap size |
|---|---|---|
| 55% | 30% | 55%-30% = 25% |

**2010-11 Success Rates**

| White | Non-White | Gap size |
|---|---|---|
| 70% | 60% | 70%-60% = 10% |

2. Calculate percent reduction in gap size from 2009-10 to 2010-11

| | 2009-10 Gap | 2010-11 Gap | Point change in success rate | Percent reduction |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| White vs. Non-White | 25% | 10% | 25% - 10% = 15% | 15% ÷ 25% = 60% |

* The above calculations must be done for all corresponding sub-group sets in a school, and all achievement gaps in a school must achieve equal to or greater than a 6% gap reduction between the last two years of the data set to be granted SAFE HARBOR

## ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM: Resources and timeline for interventions

| Identification Timeline | Priority Schools | Focus Schools | Reward Schools |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Schools identified November 14, 2011 through the ESEA Flexibility Waiver application** | Approximately $40-45M grant competition to begin in December 2011 with awards by March 2012 (School Improvement Grant Cohort 2 funds) | Possible competition using School Improvement Grant Cohort 2 funds | All Reward Schools eligible for resources based upon identification at end of 2011-12 |
| **Schools identified at end of 2011-12** | School Improvement Grant Cohort 3 funds and First to the Top Renewal Schools Funds to be allocated conditional upon approval of Race to the Top amendment by USED | Approximately $5M (State funds and First to the Top Renewal Schools Funds conditional upon approval of Race to the Top amendment by USED) | Approximately $2M (First to the Top Focus Schools Funds conditional upon approval of Race to the Top amendment by USED) |
| **Schools identified at end of 2012-13** | Not applicable | Approximately $5M (State funds and First to the Top Renewal Schools Funds conditional upon approval of Race to the Top amendment by USED) | Approximately $2M (First to the Top Focus Schools Funds conditional upon approval of Race to the Top amendment by USED) |
| **Schools identified at end of 2013-14 and in future years** | Achievement School District will utilize available local, state and federal funds allocated to schools on a per pupil basis for approximately 35 schools by 2014-15<br><br>LEA Innovation Zones will utilize available local, state and federal funds allocated to schools on a per pupil basis for approximately 30 schools<br><br>Any future federal school improvement funds will be allocated to ASD and LEA Innovation Zones | State funds and any future federal school improvement funds | Any future federal school improvement funds<br><br>State or private funds |

# Principal Evaluation Process (Phase 1)*

**Self Reflection**

- Principals and Assistant Principals rate themselves using the *TILS Self Reflection/Appraisal Instrument* (**Optional**)

**Formative Assessment**

- A formal coaching or mentoring process will be provided through district and/or state structures. Goal setting should be the focus (**Required beginning in 2012-2013**)

**Observations and Conferences**

- Evaluator conducts Observation #1 (scheduled) prior to the midpoint of the academic year
- Conference to review Observation #1
- Evaluator conducts Observation #2 (unannounced) during the second half of the academic year
- Conference to review Observation #2

**Survey**

- District selects a survey or combination of surveys of all or select staff that will be summarized and reviewed during the Summative Conference

**Summative Conference**

- Evaluator assesses the quality of teacher evaluations and the survey data
- Evaluator holds a summative conference with the principal or assistant principal to discuss the results of the observations and additional data
- Evaluator completes and submits the *TN Principal and Assistant Principal Evaluation Summative Report*

**The Phase 1 Process is used to evaluate administrators new to their district, school, and/or level and those scoring Below Expectations or Significantly Below Expectations on their most recent evaluation.*

*The Phase 2 Process is used to evaluate veteran administrators who scored At Expectations or above on their most recent evaluation.*

# Principal Evaluation Timeline – Phase 1 Administrator

*The Phase 1 Process will be used to evaluate administrators new to their district, school, and/or level and those scoring Below Expectations or Significantly Below Expectations on their most recent evaluation*

| Timeline | Component | Evaluator Steps | Administrator Steps |
|---|---|---|---|
| **August** | Self-Reflection | None | 1. Principals and assistant principals may rate themselves in all areas of TILS using the *TILS Self Reflection / Appraisal Instrument* **(Optional)**<br>2. Principals and assistant principals may also identify 3 strengths and 3 areas of growth from the TILS **(Optional)** |
| **Late August – September** | Formative Assessment | 1. Facilitate a formal coaching/mentoring process provided through district and/or state structures<br>2. Goal setting is the focus<br>3. Goals may be aligned with self-reflection, school data, and/or areas for growth<br>**(Required beginning in 2012-2013)** | 1. Participate in the formal coaching/mentoring process provided through district and/or state structures<br>• Goal setting is the focus<br>• Goals may be aligned with self-reflection, school data, and/or areas for growth<br>**(Required beginning in 2012-2013)** |
| **During the First Half of the Academic Year** | Observation #1 (Announced) | 1. Schedule Observation #1 and notify principal or assistant principal<br>2. Conduct Observation #1 using the *Tennessee Principal and Assistant Principal Evaluation* form for guidance<br>3. Schedule a post-conference and provide feedback from Observation #1 | 1. Schedule Observation #1 with the evaluator<br>2. Attend post-conference to receive feedback from Observation #1 from the evaluator<br>3. Implement feedback |
| **During the Second Half of the Academic Year** | Observation #2 (Unannounced) | 1. Conduct Observation #2 using the *Tennessee Principal and Assistant Principal Evaluation* form for guidance<br>2. Schedule a post-conference and provide feedback from Observation #2 | 1. Attend post-conference to receive feedback from Observation #2 from the evaluator<br>2. Implement feedback |
| **Flexible/Ongoing** *(Completed Prior to the Summative Conference)* | Survey Component | 1. Collect data from a survey or combination of surveys of all or select staff selected by the district<br>2. Summarize the survey data for review during the summative conference | 1. Help to implement any surveys selected by the district with fidelity |
| **Flexible/Ongoing** *(Completed Prior to the Summative Conference)* | Teacher Evaluation Component | 1. Review the quality of implementation of the teacher evaluation system<br>2. Review the quality of feedback given to teachers as the result of classroom observations<br>3. Review whether teacher observation ratings appropriately differentiate between teachers' effectiveness | 1. Implement the teacher evaluation system with a high degree of fidelity<br>2. Provide high quality feedback to teachers as the result of classroom observations<br>3. Provide the evaluator with requested data or documents needed to assess the quality of teacher evaluations |
| **May - June** | Summative Conference | 1. Schedule Summative Conference<br>2. Review the results from the observations, survey data, and quality of teacher evaluations prior to the conference<br>3. Conduct the Summative Conference<br>• Review the sources of data that informed the evaluation<br>• Discuss ratings on the *Tennessee Principal and Assistant Principal Evaluation* form | 1. Provide any data needed by the evaluator prior to the Summative Conference<br>2. Attend the Summative Conference |

# Principal Evaluation Process (Phase 2)*

**Self Reflection**

- Principals and Assistant Principals rate themselves using the *TILS Self Reflection/Appraisal Instrument* and/or identify 3 strengths and 3 areas of growth from TILS (**Optional**)

**Formative Assessment**

- Options for Phase 2 principals may be principal initiated, district iniated, or suggested by supervisors (**Required beginning in 2012-2013**)

**Observations and Conferences**

- Evaluator conducts Observation #1 (scheduled) prior to the midpoint of the academic year
- Conference to review Observation #1
- Evaluator conducts Observation #2 (unannounced) during the second half of the academic year
- Conference to review Observation #2

**Survey**

- District selects a survey or combination of surveys of all or select staff that will be summarized and reviewed during the Summative Conference

**Summative Conference**

- Conference is led by the principal or assistant principal and includes discussion of the SIP and student achievment data
- Conference results in the collaborative completion of the *TN Principal and Assistant Principal Evaluation Summative Report*

**The Phase 1 Process is used to evaluate administrators new to their district, school, and/or level and those scoring Below Expectations or Significantly Below Expectations on their most recent evaluation.*

*The Phase 2 Process is used to evaluate veteran administrators who scored At Expectations or above on their most recent evaluation.*

# Principal Evaluation Timeline – Phase 2 Administrator

*The Phase 2 Process will be used to evaluate veteran administrators who scored At Expectations or above on their most recent evaluation*

| Timeline | Component | Evaluator Steps | Administrator Steps |
|---|---|---|---|
| **August** | Self-Reflection | None | 1. Principals and assistant principals may rate themselves in all areas of TILS using the *TILS Self Reflection / Appraisal Instrument* **(Optional)**<br>2. Principals and assistant principals may also identify 3 strengths and 3 areas of growth from the TILS **(Optional)** |
| **August – September** | Formative Assessment | 1. Facilitate options for formative assessment that may be district initiated, supervisor suggested, or principal initiated **(Required beginning in 2012-2013)** | 1. Participate in selected district initiated, supervisor suggested or principals initiated formative assessment **(Required beginning in 2012-2013)** |
| **During the First Half of the Academic Year** | Observation #1 (Announced) | 1. Schedule Observation #1 and notify principal or assistant principal<br>2. Conduct Observation #1 using the *Tennessee Principal and Assistant Principal Evaluation* form for guidance<br>3. Schedule a post-conference and provide feedback from Observation #1 | 1. Schedule Observation #1 with the evaluator<br>2. Attend post-conference to receive feedback from Observation #1 from the evaluator<br>3. Implement feedback |
| **During the Second Half of the Academic Year** | Observation #2 (Unannounced) | 1. Conduct Observation #2 using the *Tennessee Principal and Assistant Principal Evaluation* form for guidance<br>2. Schedule a post-conference and provide feedback from Observation #2 | 1. Attend post-conference to receive feedback from Observation #2 from the evaluator<br>2. Implement feedback |
| **Flexible/Ongoing** *(Completed Prior to the Summative Conference)* | Survey Component | 1. Collect data from a survey or combination of surveys of all or select staff selected by the district<br>2. Summarize the survey data for review during the summative conference | 1. Help to implement any surveys selected by the district with fidelity |
| **Flexible/Ongoing** *(Completed Prior to the Summative Conference)* | Teacher Evaluation Component | 1. Review the quality of implementation of the teacher evaluation system<br>2. Review the quality of feedback given to teachers as the result of classroom observations<br>3. Review whether teacher observation ratings appropriately differentiate between teachers' effectiveness | 1. Implement the teacher evaluation system with a high degree of fidelity<br>2. Provide high quality feedback to teachers as the result of classroom observations<br>3. Provide the evaluator with requested data or documents needed to assess the quality of teacher evaluations |
| **May - June** | Summative Conference | 1. Schedule Summative Conference<br>2. Participate in the principal-led Summative Conference<br>a. Discuss School Improvement Plan (including survey data and goals)<br>b. Analyze student achievement data<br>c. Complete the *Tennessee Principal and Assistant Principal Evaluation Form*<br>3. Record the final ratings | 1. Review the School Improvement Plan and student achievement data prior to the Summative Conference<br>2. Lead the Summative Conference<br>a. Discuss School Improvement Plan (including survey data and goals)<br>b. Analyze student achievement data |

# Final Report of the Teacher Evaluation Advisory Committee

*Prepared by the TN Department of Education for Senate Finance Ways and Means Sunset Hearing*
*May 10, 2011*

## TEAC Context and Statutory Responsibility

Established under Tennessee's *First to the Top Act* in January 2010, the 15-member Teacher Evaluation Advisory Committee (TEAC) is charged with developing and recommending broad parameters for the components to be included in the state's new educator evaluation system.

## TEAC Statutory Responsibilities and Timeline

Statutory charge outlined in *TN code Annotated, Section 49-1-302(d)(1) and (2)* includes:

- *"The committee shall develop and recommend to the board, guidelines and criteria for the annual evaluation of all teachers and principals employed by LEAs, including a local-level evaluation grievance procedure"*
  - Teacher and Principal Evaluation guidelines and criteria (see p.2 for highlights)
    - Approved by SBOE on first reading on 10.29.10
    - Final TEAC review and approval on 4.6.11
    - Approved on final reading by SBOE on 4.15.11
  - Teacher and Principal Evaluation local-level grievance procedures (see p.2 for highlights)
    - Approved by SBOE on first reading on 1.28.11
    - Final TEAC review and approval on 4.6.11
    - Approved on final reading by SBOE on 4.15.11
- *"Fifteen percent (15%) shall be based on other measures of student achievement selected from a list of such measures developed by the TEAC and adopted by the board."*
  - Teacher and Principal Evaluation 15% student achievement options (see p. 2)
    - TEAC unanimously approved list of options for each educator group on 1.27.11
    - Final TEAC review and approval on 4.6.11
    - Approved on final reading by SBOE on 4.15.11
- *"(iii) Notwithstanding subdivisions (i) and (ii) above, if a particular teacher's or principal's growth data, as described in subdivision (1) above, reflects attainment of a specific achievement level, to be recommended by the TEAC and adopted by the board, then such student growth data may, at the choice of the individual being evaluated, comprise fifty percent (50%) of their evaluation."*
    - Approved by SBOE on first reading on 10.29.10
    - Final TEAC review and approval on 4.6.11
    - Approved on final reading by SBOE on 4.15.11

## TEAC Non-Statutory Areas to Consider

Members of the Committee raised a number of issues for the Tennessee Department of Education (DOE) and the State Board of Education (SBOE) to consider that help support and fully implement the state's new evaluation system. These issues, though integral to the fidelity of implementation of the new system, are not part of the TEAC statutory requirements. As such, the committee prepared a memo outlining these remaining considerations, which has been submitted to the Commissioner of

Education, State Board and Governor since the final TEAC meeting on 4.6.11. These considerations include: evaluator training, data delivery, oversight, and future evaluation of central office staff.

**Highlights of the TEAC recommended and SBOE approved policy for the new evaluation system include:**

*"The committee shall develop and recommend to the board, guidelines and criteria for the annual evaluation of all teachers and principals employed by LEAs, including a local-level evaluation grievance procedure"*

- Evaluations will differentiate teachers and principals into five effectiveness groups: significantly below expectations, below expectations, meets expectations, above expectations, and significantly above expectations;
- The Department of Education will work to develop growth measures for those educators without TVAAS data; in lieu of approved growth measures, school-wide value-added data will be used for those educators' 35 percent growth component while other measures are developed;
- Local-level evaluation grievance procedures provide a means for evaluated teachers and principals to challenge only the accuracy of the data used in the evaluation and the adherence to the evaluation policies adopted by the State Board of Education; disputes are to be resolved at the lowest possible level.

*"Fifteen percent (15%) shall be based on other measures of student achievement selected from a list of such measures developed by the TEAC and adopted by the board."*

- For the 15 percent menus of options, educators can, in collaboration with their supervisors, choose from their educator category's menu of options; options include state assessments, TVAAS, ACT/SAT suites, national or state off-the-shelf assessments approved by the Department of Education, AP/IB/NIC suites, graduation rate/CTE concentrator graduation rate, postsecondary matriculation/persistence/placement, completion/success in advanced coursework, 9$^{th}$ grade promotion to the 10$^{th}$ grade.

*"(iii) Notwithstanding subdivisions (i) and (ii) above, if a particular teacher's or principal's growth data, as described in subdivision (1) above, reflects attainment of a specific achievement level, to be recommended by the TEAC and adopted by the board, then such student growth data may, at the choice of the individual being evaluated, comprise fifty percent (50%) of their evaluation."*

- Educators whose growth score is in the top three quintiles will be able to use this score for the entire 50% student achievement component.

Other criteria for the evaluations:

- 50 percent of the evaluation will be based on qualitative data in four domains, Planning, Environment, Professionalism, and Instruction, drawn from:
  - Multiple and frequent observations (four annually for professionally licensed staff, six annually for apprentice staff)
  - Written and in-person feedback within a week of observation
- Principals and assistant principals who spend at least 50 percent of their time on administrative duties will be evaluated according to a qualitative appraisal instrument based on the Tennessee Instructional Leadership Standards (TILS).

# Tennessee's Plan to Measure Student Growth in Untested Subjects and Grades

Educator evaluation in Tennessee is changing from an infrequent, compliance-driven process that does not differentiate teachers' needs or skills to an annual process that includes solid data, is linked to meaningful supports and decisions, and helps educators improve their practice. Beginning in July 2011, all educators will be evaluated under new guidelines recommended by the Teacher Evaluation Advisory Committee (TEAC), approved by the State Board of Education, and administered by the Department of Education. The new system is designed to link professional development, promotion, compensation, tenure, and renewal decisions with specific, identifiable educator needs. The system will provide a fair, transparent, and data-driven process that uses student growth as one of multiple measures for gauging teacher and principal effectiveness.

Teachers who teach grades or subjects that are not tested through TVAAS, as well as educators who are not in the classroom like library media specialists, counselors and social workers – roughly 55 percent of the state's educators – do not have their own teacher effect scores.[1] Under the new state statute, student learning growth for all educators, including those without teacher effect scores, must be counted as 35 percent of the evaluation.

**Criteria for Measuring Student Growth in Untested Subjects and Grades**

Certain criteria are important to consider when identifying measures to determine teacher impact on student learning. Tennessee statute requires that the measures used in untested subjects and grades are "comparable" to TVAAS. In addition, the measures must be of high quality. This means that the state intends the measures to be, to the maximum extent possible, *valid* (meaning they provide an accurate representation of the subject area being assessed), *reliable* (meaning the results are fair and will yield similar results if the tests are repeated multiple times), easily understood and *transparent* for educators and students, adaptable to identify learning growth from two points in time or against comparable students, *practical* and *fiscally responsible*.

**A Proposed Process for Identifying Student Growth Goals and Measures**

For all educators of subjects or grades where an individual teacher effect measure is not currently available, three steps will need to be taken to incorporate student learning growth in the evaluation:

1. Determine what assessment instruments will be used to assess growth for that teacher's students, and how assessment instruments will be used;
2. Determine what is an appropriate level of growth to maintain progress in a subject area toward state standards of learning; and
3. Calculate and report the growth achieved in a timely manner.

**Managing and Informing the Process**

**Tennessee's Guiding Principles for Measuring Student Growth**

1. Educators in untested subjects and grades, state officials and district officials all will be involved in identifying measures.
2. Measures used in untested subjects and grades should produce results that are comparable to TVAAS. To the maximum extent possible, the measures should be valid, reliable, transparent, able to discern student growth, practical and fiscally responsible.
3. The state will determine clear processes to select measures, approve measures, and develop baseline and expected one-year gains for all measures.
4. Tennessee will collaborate with other states and districts on this work.

[1] New state end-of-course tests are rolling out beginning in 2009; for some subjects, two or more years of data will not be available until fall 2012.

The overall process will include a detailed summary of existing research in the area of untested subjects and grades, ample opportunities for discussions among educators in untested subjects and grades, identification of potential measures by educators, a process for narrowing the options that involves psychometric expertise, and a vetting process once options have been identified. The state will manage this complex effort and will provide communication around the process, activities and results.

***Development Teams of Practitioners***

Because of the unprecedented nature of this work, the process that the state adopts to develop the measures may be as important as which measures are selected. A clear process that is transparent and articulated to all stakeholders will yield more support for the measures that are selected. There are literally hundreds of subjects that are not tested through statewide measures. Tennessee proposes to convene Development Teams comprised of educators and subject matter experts, organized in 12 categories (see box at right) to help guide this work.

***Potential Groupings of Educators***

1. Pre-kindergarten – Grade 3
2. Performing/fine arts (e.g., art, music, dance, theatre, photography)
3. Computer Technology
4. Educators with caseloads (social workers, counselors, psychologists, speech and language specialists)
5. Library Media Specialists
6. Physical Education/Health Education/Wellness
7. Career/Technical Education
8. World Languages
9. English Language Learner Specialists
10. Special Education Specialists
11. High School Courses in English, Math, Science and Social Studies without State Tests
12. Academic Interventionists

***Vetting Growth Measures: The Teacher Evaluation Technical Advisory Group***

To ensure maximum quality and fairness, the Department of Education will also convene a Teacher Evaluation Technical Advisory Group to develop a standardized process and criteria for identifying measures to guide the work of the Development Teams and determine processes for calculating a year's worth of growth. Additionally, the Teacher Evaluation Technical Advisory Group will oversee the process for determining one year's worth of growth for each measure.

***Determining the Final List of Approved Measures: Tennessee Department of Education***

All recommendations from the Teacher Evaluation Technical Advisory Group will go to the Department of Education, which will approve all measures, regardless of which entity (educators, districts, state, testing consortium, or commercial test publisher) identifies or develops the measures. The outcome of the Department process will be the identification of at least one growth measure for all subjects and grades. The Department will be responsible for laying out a plan for districts to follow based on the growth measure chosen (implementing a pre- and post-test, acquiring the tests, training, etc.).

**Conclusion**

The goal of the growth measures work is to ensure high quality, fair and transparent measures for all types of educators. Tennessee has few precedents for this work. The state, along with a handful of states and districts, is forging new ground on developing growth measures in untested subjects and grades. As part of the plan, Tennessee will incorporate lessons learned through networks and regular communication with other states and districts engaged in this work.

Tennessee understands that this work is very difficult and that the state will need to refine both the process and measures over time. To this end, the state intends to be flexible, and to make necessary adjustments throughout the development process and in subsequent years. This approach allows for that flexibility while engaging educators in a thoughtful, intentional way.

VANDERBILT PEABODY COLLEGE

TENNESSEE CONSORTIUM ON RESEARCH, EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT

College of Education & Human Development

# Early Evidence from Tennessee's Teacher Evaluation Field Test

Presentation prepared for the Teacher Evaluation Advisory Committee

April 6, 2011

For more details contact the Tennessee Consortium on Research, Evaluation, and Development
(1-615-322-5538; or PMB 0044, 230 Appleton Place, Nashville, TN 37203-5721)

VANDERBILT PEABODY COLLEGE | TENNESSEE CONSORTIUM on Research, Evaluation & Development | College of Education & Human Development

# Summary: Framing the Field Test

- Ensuring a great teacher is at the front of the room is a critical step we can take to help students succeed and provide excellent academic opportunity to all.
- Past research has shown that educator evaluation systems rarely shed light on the strengths and needs of educators, or facilitate a process for analysis and continuous improvement.
- Educators and teachers in Tennessee exercised considerable initiative and leadership to make the field test successful, while also taking time to offer feedback that will help inform ways to improve program.

VANDERBILT PEABODY COLLEGE | TENNESSEE CONSORTIUM ON RESEARCH, EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT | College of Education & Human Development

# Outline

- Purpose of the study
- Participants
- Data collection
- Preliminary findings
- Next steps

VANDERBILT PEABODY COLLEGE | TENNESSEE CONSORTIUM on Research, Evaluation & Development | College of Education & Human Development

# Purpose

- Study the development and operation of the TN teacher evaluation field test with the intent to inform:
  - Implementation
  - Resources and Capacity
  - Perceptions and Opinions

*Student outcomes relative to the evaluation process will be examined, but only in the longer term, and not as part of the field test.*

VANDERBILT PEABODY COLLEGE | TENNESSEE CONSORTIUM on Research, Evaluation & Development | College of Education & Human Development

# Participants by Model

| | TN Framework | TAP Rubric | AIMS TIGER | COACH |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Districts** | 31 | 31 | 21 | 1 |
| **Schools** | 60 | 45 | 47 | 78 |
| **Personnel** | 2373 | 1822 | 1619 | 2596 |

VANDERBILT PEABODY COLLEGE | TENNESSEE CONSORTIUM on Research, Evaluation & Development | College of Education & Human Development

# Data Collection

- Observed observer/evaluator trainings.
- Fielded survey on program implementation and teacher and evaluator perceptions and attitudes toward program.
- Will conduct principal focus groups to gather feedback regarding the principal evaluation field test in May 2011.
- Will continue data collection and evaluation activities.

VANDERBILT PEABODY COLLEGE | TENNESSEE CONSORTIUM on Research, Evaluation & Development | College of Education & Human Development

# Survey Response Rates

| | TN Framework | TAP Rubric | AIMS TIGER | COACH |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Invitations** | 2373 | 1822 | 1619 | 2596 |
| **Responses** | 1272 | 1048 | 928 | 1412 |
| **Resp. Rate** | 54% | 58% | 57% | 54% |
| **Schools** | 60 | 45 | 47 | 78 |

VANDERBILT PEABODY COLLEGE | TENNESSEE CONSORTIUM on Research, Evaluation & Development | College of Education & Human Development

# Years of Experience

| | | TN Framework | TAP Rubric | AIMS TIGER | COACH |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Evaluator | ***Total Exp.*** | 14.1 | 13.2 | 14.2 | 13.6 |
| | ***Present District*** | 11.1 | 10.2 | 10.8 | 10.2 |
| | ***Present School*** | 7.9 | 7.5 | 9.2 | 6.7 |
| | ***Total Exp. (admin. /coach)*** | 9.3 | 6.8 | 8.1 | 9.7 |
| | ***Total Exp. (teaching)*** | 15.2 | 13.2 | 13.9 | 12.0 |
| | ***Present District*** | 13.5 | 12.7 | 11.1 | 10.6 |

VANDERBILT PEABODY COLLEGE | TENNESSEE CONSORTIUM on Research, Evaluation & Development | College of Education & Human Development

# Teachers By Schooling Level and Subject

| | | TN Framework | TAP Rubric | AIMS TIGER | COACH |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Level | Elementary | 49% | 37% | 65% | 47% |
| | Middle | 22% | 19% | 17% | 22% |
| | High | 25% | 39% | 12% | 26 % |
| | Other | 5% | 6% | 6% | 5% |
| Subject | ELA/Read. | 51% | 45% | 63% | 46% |
| | Math | 45% | 40% | 57% | 43% |
| | Perform. Arts | 7% | 6% | 5% | 6% |
| | Phys. Educ. | 4% | 4% | 5% | 4% |
| | Spec. Educ. | 13% | 11% | 9% | 13% |

VANDERBILT PEABODY COLLEGE

TENNESSEE CONSORTIUM ON RESEARCH, EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT

College of Education & Human Development

# Preliminary Findings

# Implementation

VANDERBILT PEABODY COLLEGE | TENNESSEE CONSORTIUM on Research, Evaluation & Development | College of Education & Human Development

# Position of Classroom Observer

| | TN Framework | TAP Rubric | AIMS TIGER | COACH |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Principal** | 81% | 71% | 77% | 92% |
| **Asst. Principal** | 58% | 58% | 49% | 79% |
| **Dept. Head** | 8% | 12% | 15% | 4% |
| **Math/Lit. Coach** | 12% | 13% | 10% | 9% |
| **Other Teacher** | 6% | 7% | 12% | 3% |
| **Non-School** | 12% | 16% | 9% | 10% |
| **Other** | 11% | 9% | 9% | 4% |

***How would you describe the professional status of your classroom observer(s)?***

*Note: As reported by teachers. More than one answer per respondent possible.*

VANDERBILT PEABODY COLLEGE | TENNESSEE CONSORTIUM on Research, Evaluation & Development | College of Education & Human Development

# Number of Evaluations Completed

| | | TN Framework | TAP Rubric | AIMS TIGER | COACH |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Observations | 1 to 3 | 53% | 67% | 71% | 11% |
| | 4 to 5 | 6% | 6% | 11% | 29% |
| | 6 + | 3% | 1% | 3% | 57% |
| | None | 37% | 26% | 15% | 2% |
| Implemented… | | Sept. 2010 | Jan. 2011 | Nov. 2010 | Sept. 2010 |

***During this school year how many times has someone formally observed you teaching?***

*Note: As reported by teachers. Respondents answering "None" were not administered questions about their experience with observations.*

VANDERBILT PEABODY COLLEGE | TENNESSEE CONSORTIUM on Research, Evaluation & Development | College of Education & Human Development

# Average Length of Observation

| Length of Obs. (min.) | TN Framework | TAP Rubric | AIMS TIGER | COACH |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| < 10 | 7% | 3% | 5% | 22% |
| 10 to 15 | 14% | 6% | 20% | 48% |
| 15 to 20 | 13% | 11% | 26% | 18% |
| 20 to 30 | 15% | 18% | 29% | 7% |
| 30 to 40 | 21% | 24% | 13% | 2% |
| 40 + | 27% | 36% | 6% | 2% |
| Other | 3% | 1% | 1% | 1% |

***How many minutes did the individual(s) conducting the observations stay in your classroom during your most recent observation?***

VANDERBILT PEABODY COLLEGE | TENNESSEE CONSORTIUM on Research, Evaluation & Development | College of Education & Human Development

# Days Between Observation and Verbal Feedback

| | | TN Framework | TAP Rubric | AIMS TIGER | COACH |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teacher | *<3* | 67% | 61% | 68% | 90% |
| | *3 to 10* | 24% | 33% | 27% | 9% |
| | *11 to 20* | 4% | 3% | 4% | 1% |
| | *20 +* | 4% | 3% | 2% | 0% |
| Evaluator | *<3* | 77% | 82% | 65% | 100% |
| | *3 to 10* | 20% | 16% | 33% | 0% |
| | *11 to 20* | 1% | 0% | 2% | 0% |
| | *20 +* | 1% | 2% | 0% | 0% |

***How much time passed before you received verbal feedback regarding your observation***

VANDERBILT PEABODY COLLEGE | TENNESSEE CONSORTIUM on Research, Evaluation & Development | College of Education & Human Development


# Days Between Observation and Written Feedback

| | | TN Framework | TAP Rubric | AIMS TIGER | COACH |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teacher | *<3* | 64% | 57% | 59% | 82% |
| | *3 to 10* | 27% | 37% | 34% | 16% |
| | *11 to 20* | 6% | 4% | 5% | 1% |
| | *20 +* | 3% | 2% | 2% | 1% |
| Evaluator | *<3* | 66% | 84% | 66% | 79% |
| | *3 to 10* | 31% | 14% | 33% | 21% |
| | *11 to 20* | 2% | 0% | 2% | 0% |
| | *20 +* | 2% | 2% | 0% | 0% |

***How much time passed before you received written feedback regarding your observation***

VANDERBILT PEABODY COLLEGE | TENNESSEE CONSORTIUM ON RESEARCH, EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT | College of Education & Human Development

# Percentage of respondents who *agreed or strongly agreed* with the statement, *Tennessee's plans for teacher evaluation have been clearly communicated to me.*



VANDERBILT PEABODY COLLEGE

TENNESSEE CONSORTIUM ON RESEARCH, EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT

College of Education & Human Development


# Preliminary Findings

## *Resources and Capacity*


VANDERBILT PEABODY COLLEGE | TENNESSEE CONSORTIUM on Research, Evaluation & Development | College of Education & Human Development

# Percentage of respondents who stated that the model for teacher evaluation had *increased* or *significantly increased* their *workload* relative to the following areas:

## Interacting with Other Teachers to Improve Instruction





## Completing Observation and Evaluation Task



VANDERBILT PEABODY COLLEGE | TENNESSEE CONSORTIUM on Research, Evaluation & Development | College of Education & Human Development

# Percentage of respondents who stated that the model for teacher evaluation had *increased* or *significantly increased* their *workload* relative to the following areas:

## Developing Lesson Plans




## Completing Paperwork



VANDERBILT PEABODY COLLEGE

TENNESSEE CONSORTIUM ON RESEARCH, EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT

College of Education & Human Development

# Preliminary Findings


# Perceptions and Opinions

VANDERBILT PEABODY COLLEGE

TENNESSEE CONSORTIUM on Research, Evaluation & Development

College of Education & Human Development

**Percentage of respondents who *agreed or strongly agreed* with the statement, *Teacher evaluation systems used at this school contribute to greater collegiality and professionalism among teachers.***



VANDERBILT PEABODY COLLEGE | TENNESSEE CONSORTIUM on Research, Evaluation & Development | College of Education & Human Development

# Purpose of Most Recent Observation

| | TN Framework | TAP Rubric | AIMS TIGER | COACH |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *… give you feedback to help you improve your teaching.* | 85% | 89% | 84% | 84% |
| *… make a judgment about your performance.* | 74% | 75% | 70% | 66% |

**Extent to which teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, *Thinking of your most recent observation was it designed to…***

VANDERBILT PEABODY COLLEGE | TENNESSEE CONSORTIUM on Research, Evaluation & Development | College of Education & Human Development

# Top Benefits Realized with Observation System (Teachers)

| | TN Framework | TAP Rubric | AIMS TIGER | COACH |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Provides useful feedback | Provides useful feedback | Provides useful feedback | Provides useful feedback |
| 2 | Encourages reflection | Encourages strategies to improve instruction | Encourages reflection | Observation process requires less time and paperwork. |
| 3 | Encourages strategies to improve instruction | Less paperwork | Encourages strategies to improve instruction | Accurate measure of teacher effectiveness |

*Note: 39% of eligible respondents from TN Framework sample offered feedback, 42% from TAP Rubric sample; 47% from the AIMS TIGER sample; and 57% from COACH sample. Appendix A contains information on open-ended response format and coding strategy.*

VANDERBILT PEABODY COLLEGE | TENNESSEE CONSORTIUM on Research, Evaluation & Development | College of Education & Human Development

# Top Benefits Realized with Observation System (Evaluators)

| | TN Framework | TAP Rubric | AIMS TIGER | COACH |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Ability to provide feedback to teachers | Ability to provide feedback to teachers | Ability to provide feedback to teachers | More time in classrooms |
| 2 | Fosters professional interactions | Quality of the rubric | Quality of the rubric | Accurate picture of teacher effectiveness |
| 3 | Accurate picture of teacher effectiveness | Fosters professional interactions | Fosters professional interactions | Fosters professional interactions |

*Note: 64% of eligible respondents from TN Framework sample offered feedback, 71% from TAP Rubric sample; 69% from the AIMS TIGER sample; and 73% from COACH sample. Appendix A contains information on open-ended response format and coding strategy.*

VANDERBILT PEABODY COLLEGE | TENNESSEE CONSORTIUM on Research, Evaluation & Development | College of Education & Human Development

# Top Challenges Realized with Observation System (Teachers)

| | TN Framework | TAP Rubric | AIMS TIGER | COACH |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Time demands | Time demands | Time demands | Fairly evaluating teachers in the allotted time |
| 2 | Subjectivity/ unclear expectations | Demands on administrators | Subjectivity/ unclear expectations | Unannounced observations are disruptive or happen at inopportune times. |
| 3 | Getting useful/ timely feedback | Negative impact on teacher morale/ stress level | Difficulty evaluating select job classifications | Demands on administrators |

*Note: 37% of eligible respondents from TN Framework sample offered feedback, 40% from TAP Rubric sample; 58% from the AIMS TIGER sample; and 43% from COACH sample. Appendix A contains information on open-ended response format and coding strategy.*

VANDERBILT PEABODY COLLEGE | TENNESSEE CONSORTIUM on Research, Evaluation & Development | College of Education & Human Development

# Top Challenges Realized with Observation System (Evaluators)

| | TN Framework | TAP Rubric | AIMS TIGER | COACH |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Time demands | Time demands | Time demands | Time demands |
| 2 | Lack of flexibility | Communicating with teachers | Learning Curve/ Late implementation | Communicating with teachers |
| 3 | Subjectivity | Learning Curve/ Late implementation | Communicating with teachers | Observing all indicators in the allotted time. |

*Note: 62% of eligible respondents from TN Framework sample offered feedback, 78% from TAP Rubric sample; 77% from the AIMS TIGER sample; and 69% from COACH sample. Appendix A contains information on open-ended response format and coding strategy.*

VANDERBILT PEABODY COLLEGE | TENNESSEE CONSORTIUM on Research, Evaluation & Development | College of Education & Human Development

# Recommendations

- Continue to monitor implementation of teacher evaluation programs, and begin to examine effect on intermediate and long-term outcomes.
- Ensure observers/evaluators are adequately trained and their effectiveness periodically assessed.
- Ensure that information and expectations regarding evaluation are adequately communicated to both teachers and evaluators/ observers.
- Explore efficiencies afforded by technology, including logging observer ratings, collecting completed records, so on.
- Take advantage of data from observations to identify opportunities for targeted professional growth.

**Educator Rubric**

# Instruction

| | Significantly Above Expectations (5) | At Expectations (3) | Significantly Below Expectations (1) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Standards and Objectives** ☐ | • All learning objectives and state content standards are explicitly communicated.<br>• Sub-objectives are aligned and logically sequenced to the lesson's major objective.<br>• Learning objectives are: (a) consistently connected to what students have previously learned, (b) know from life experiences, and (c) integrated with other disciplines.<br>• Expectations for student performance are clear, demanding, and high.<br>• State standards are displayed and referenced throughout the lesson.<br>• There is evidence that most students demonstrate mastery of the objective. | • Most learning objectives and state content standards are communicated.<br>• Sub-objectives are mostly aligned to the lesson's major objective.<br>• Learning objectives are connected to what students have previously learned.<br>• Expectations for student performance are clear.<br>• State standards are displayed.<br>• There is evidence that most students demonstrate mastery of the objective. | • Few learning objectives and state content standards are communicated.<br>• Sub-objectives are inconsistently aligned to the lesson's major objective.<br>• Learning objectives are rarely connected to what students have previously learned.<br>• Expectations for student performance are vague.<br>• State standards are displayed.<br>• There is evidence that few students demonstrate mastery of the objective. |
| **Motivating Students** ☐ | • The teacher consistently organizes the content so that it is personally meaningful and relevant to students.<br>• The teacher consistently develops learning experiences where inquiry, curiosity, and exploration are valued.<br>• The teacher regularly reinforces and rewards effort. | • The teacher sometimes organizes the content so that it is personally meaningful and relevant to students.<br>• The teacher sometimes develops learning experiences where inquiry, curiosity, and exploration are valued.<br>• The teacher sometimes reinforces and rewards effort. | • The teacher rarely organizes the content so that it is personally meaningful and relevant to students.<br>• The teacher rarely develops learning experiences where inquiry, curiosity, and exploration are valued.<br>• The teacher rarely reinforces and rewards effort. |
| **Presenting Instructional Content** ☐ | Presentation of content always includes:<br>• visuals that establish the purpose of the lesson, preview the organization of the lesson, and include internal summaries of the lesson;<br>• examples, illustrations, analogies, and labels for new concepts and ideas;<br>• modeling by the teacher to demonstrate his or her performance expectations;<br>• concise communication;<br>• logical sequencing and segmenting;<br>• all essential information;<br>• no irrelevant, confusing, or non-essential information. | Presentation of content most of the time includes:<br>• visuals that establish the purpose of the lesson, preview the organization of the lesson, and include internal summaries of the lesson;<br>• examples, illustrations, analogies, and labels for new concepts and ideas;<br>• modeling by the teacher to demonstrate his or her performance expectations;<br>• concise communication;<br>• logical sequencing and segmenting;<br>• all essential information.;<br>• no irrelevant, confusing, or non-essential information. | Presentation of content rarely includes:<br>• visuals that establish the purpose of the lesson, preview the organization of the lesson, and include internal summaries of the lesson;<br>• examples, illustrations, analogies, and labels for new concepts and ideas;<br>• modeling by the teacher to demonstrate his or her performance expectations;<br>• concise communication;<br>• logical sequencing and segmenting;<br>• all essential information;<br>• no irrelevant, confusing, or non-essential information. |
| **Lesson Structure and Pacing** ☐ | • The lesson starts promptly.<br>• The lesson's structure is coherent, with a beginning, middle, end, and time for reflection.<br>• Pacing is brisk and provides many opportunities for individual students who progress at different learning rates.<br>• Routines for distributing materials are seamless.<br>• No instructional time is lost during transitions. | • The lesson starts promptly.<br>• The lesson's structure is coherent, with a beginning, middle, and end.<br>• Pacing is appropriate and sometimes provides opportunities for students who progress at different learning rates.<br>• Routines for distributing materials are efficient.<br>• Little instructional time is lost during transitions. | • The lesson does not start promptly.<br>• The lesson has a structure, but may be missing closure or introductory elements.<br>• Pacing is appropriate for less than half of the students and rarely provides opportunities for students who progress at different learning rates.<br>• Routines for distributing materials are inefficient.<br>• Considerable time is lost during transitions. |

**Educator Rubric**

# Instruction *(continued)*

| | Significantly Above Expectations (5) | At Expectations (3) | Significantly Below Expectations (1) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Activities and Materials** | Activities and materials include all of the following:<br>• support the lesson objectives;<br>• are challenging;<br>• sustain students' attention;<br>• elicit a variety of thinking;<br>• provide time for reflection;<br>• are relevant to students' lives;<br>• provide opportunities for student-to-student interaction;<br>• induce student curiosity and suspense;<br>• provide students with choices;<br>• incorporate multimedia and technology; and<br>• incorporate resources beyond the school curriculum texts (e.g., teacher-made materials, manipulatives, resources from museums, cultural centers, etc).<br>• In addition, sometimes activities are game-like, involve simulations, require creating products, and demand self-direction and self-monitoring. | Activities and materials include most of the following:<br>• support the lesson objectives;<br>• are challenging;<br>• sustain students' attention;<br>• elicit a variety of thinking;<br>• provide time for reflection;<br>• are relevant to students' lives;<br>• provide opportunities for student to student interaction;<br>• induce student curiosity and suspense;<br>• provide students with choices;<br>• incorporate multimedia and technology; and<br>• incorporate resources beyond the school curriculum texts (e.g., teacher made materials, manipulatives, resources from museums, cultural centers, etc). | Activities and materials include few of the following:<br>• support the lesson objectives;<br>• are challenging;<br>• sustain students' attention;<br>• elicit a variety of thinking;<br>• provide time for reflection;<br>• are relevant to students' lives;<br>• provide opportunities for student to student interaction;<br>• induce student curiosity and suspense;<br>• provide students with choices;<br>• incorporate multimedia and technology; and<br>• incorporate resources beyond the school curriculum texts (e.g., teacher made materials, manipulatives, resources from museums, etc). |
| **Questioning** | Teacher questions are varied and high quality, providing a balanced mix of question types:<br>○ knowledge and comprehension;<br>○ application and analysis; and<br>○ creation and evaluation.<br>• Questions are consistently purposeful and coherent.<br>• A high frequency of questions is asked.<br>• Questions are consistently sequenced with attention to the instructional goals.<br>• Questions regularly require active responses (e.g., whole class signaling, choral responses, written and shared responses, or group and individual answers).<br>• Wait time (3-5 seconds) is consistently provided.<br>• The teacher calls on volunteers and nonvolunteers, and a balance of students based on ability and sex.<br>• Students generate questions that lead to further inquiry and self-directed learning. | Teacher questions are varied and high quality providing for some, but not all, question types:<br>○ knowledge and comprehension;<br>○ application and analysis; and<br>○ creation and evaluation.<br>• Questions are usually purposeful and coherent.<br>• A moderate frequency of questions asked.<br>• Questions are sometimes sequenced with attention to the instructional goals.<br>• Questions sometimes require active responses (e.g., whole class signaling, choral responses, or group and individual answers).<br>• Wait time is sometimes provided.<br>• The teacher calls on volunteers and nonvolunteers, and a balance of students based on ability and sex. | Teacher questions are inconsistent in quality and include few question types:<br>○ knowledge and comprehension;<br>○ application and analysis; and<br>○ creation and evaluation.<br>• Questions are random and lack coherence.<br>• A low frequency of questions is asked.<br>• Questions are rarely sequenced with attention to the instructional goals.<br>• Questions rarely require active responses (e.g., whole class signaling, choral responses, or group and individual answers).<br>• Wait time is inconsistently provided.<br>• The teacher mostly calls on volunteers and high-ability students. |

**Educator Rubric**

# Instruction *(continued)*

| | Significantly Above Expectations (5) | At Expectations (3) | Significantly Below Expectations (1) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Academic Feedback** | • Oral and written feedback is consistently academically focused, frequent, and high quality.<br>• Feedback is frequently given during guided practice and homework review.<br>• The teacher circulates to prompt student thinking, assess each student's progress, and provide individual feedback.<br>• Feedback from students is regularly used to monitor and adjust instruction.<br>• Teacher engages students in giving specific and high-quality feedback to one another. | • Oral and written feedback is mostly academically focused, frequent, and mostly high quality.<br>• Feedback is sometimes given during guided practice and homework review.<br>• The teacher circulates during instructional activities to support engagement, and monitor student work.<br>• Feedback from students is sometimes used to monitor and adjust instruction. | • The quality and timeliness of feedback is inconsistent.<br>• Feedback is rarely given during guided practice and homework review.<br>• The teacher circulates during instructional activities, but monitors mostly behavior.<br>• Feedback from students is rarely used to monitor or adjust instruction. |
| **Grouping Students** | • The instructional grouping arrangements (either whole class, small groups, pairs, individual; heterogeneous or homogenous ability) consistently maximize student understanding and learning efficiency.<br>• All students in groups know their roles, responsibilities, and group work expectations.<br>• All students participating in groups are held accountable for group work and individual work.<br>• Instructional group composition is varied (e.g., race, gender, ability, and age) to best accomplish the goals of the lesson.<br>• Instructional groups facilitate opportunities for students to set goals, reflect on, and evaluate their learning. | • The instructional grouping arrangements (either whole class, small groups, pairs, individual; heterogeneous or homogenous ability) adequately enhance student understanding and learning efficiency.<br>• Most students in groups know their roles, responsibilities, and group work expectations.<br>• Most students participating in groups are held accountable for group work and individual work.<br>• Instructional group composition is varied (e.g., race, gender, ability, and age) to most of the time, accomplish the goals of the lesson. | • The instructional grouping arrangements (either whole class, small groups, pairs, individual; heterogeneous or homogenous ability) inhibit student understanding and learning efficiency.<br>• Few students in groups know their roles, responsibilities, and group work expectations.<br>• Few students participating in groups are held accountable for group work and individual work.<br>• Instructional group composition remains unchanged irrespective of the learning and instructional goals of a lesson. |
| **Teacher Content Knowledge** | • Teacher displays extensive content knowledge of all the subjects she or he teaches.<br>• Teacher regularly implements a variety of subject-specific instructional strategies to enhance student content knowledge.<br>• The teacher regularly highlights key concepts and ideas and uses them as bases to connect other powerful ideas.<br>• Limited content is taught in sufficient depth to allow for the development of understanding. | • Teacher displays accurate content knowledge of all the subjects he or she teaches.<br>• Teacher sometimes implements subject-specific instructional strategies to enhance student content knowledge.<br>• The teacher sometimes highlights key concepts and ideas and uses them as bases to connect other powerful ideas. | • Teacher displays under-developed content knowledge in several subject areas.<br>• Teacher rarely implements subject-specific instructional strategies to enhance student content knowledge.<br>• Teacher does not understand key concepts and ideas in the discipline and therefore presents content in an unconnected way. |
| **Teacher Knowledge of Students** | • Teacher practices display understanding of each student's anticipated learning difficulties.<br>• Teacher practices regularly incorporate student interests and cultural heritage.<br>• Teacher regularly provides differentiated instructional methods and content to ensure children have the opportunity to master what is being taught. | • Teacher practices display understanding of some student anticipated learning difficulties.<br>• Teacher practices sometimes incorporate student interests and cultural heritage.<br>• Teacher sometimes provides differentiated instructional methods and content to ensure children have the opportunity to master what is being taught. | • Teacher practices demonstrate minimal knowledge of students anticipated learning difficulties.<br>• Teacher practices rarely incorporate student interests or cultural heritage.<br>• Teacher practices demonstrate little differentiation of instructional methods or content. |

## Educator Rubric

| | Significantly Above Expectations (5) | At Expectations (3) | Significantly Below Expectations (1) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Thinking** | The teacher thoroughly teaches two or more types of thinking:<br>• analytical thinking, where students analyze, compare and contrast, and evaluate and explain information;<br>• practical thinking, where students use, apply, and implement what they learn in real-life scenarios;<br>• creative thinking, where students create, design, imagine, and suppose; and<br>• research-based thinking, where students explore and review a variety of ideas, models, and solutions to problems.<br>The teacher provides opportunities where students:<br>• generate a variety of ideas and alternatives;<br>• analyze problems from multiple perspectives and viewpoints; and<br>• monitor their thinking to insure that they understand what they are learning, are attending to critical information, and are aware of the learning strategies that they are using and why. | The teacher thoroughly teaches one type of thinking:<br>• analytical thinking, where students analyze, compare and contrast, and evaluate and explain information;<br>• practical thinking, where students use, apply, and implement what they learn in real-life scenarios;<br>• creative thinking, where students create, design, imagine, and suppose; and<br>• research-based thinking, where students explore and review a variety of ideas, models, and solutions to problems.<br>The teacher provides opportunities where students:<br>• generate a variety of ideas and alternatives; and<br>• analyze problems from multiple perspectives and viewpoints. | The teacher implements no learning experiences that thoroughly teach any type of thinking.<br><br>The teacher provides no opportunities where students:<br>• generate a variety of ideas and alternatives; or<br>• analyze problems from multiple perspectives and viewpoints. |
| **Problem Solving** | The teacher implements activities that teach and reinforce three or more of the following problem-solving types:<br>• Abstraction<br>• Categorization<br>• Drawing Conclusions/Justifying Solutions<br>• Predicting Outcomes<br>• Observing and Experimenting<br>• Improving Solutions<br>• Identifying Relevant/Irrelevant Information<br>• Generating Ideas<br>• Creating and Designing | The teacher implements activities that teach two of the following problem-solving types:<br>• Abstraction<br>• Categorization<br>• Drawing Conclusions/Justifying Solution<br>• Predicting Outcomes<br>• Observing and Experimenting<br>• Improving Solutions<br>• Identifying Relevant/Irrelevant Information<br>• Generating Ideas<br>• Creating and Designing | The teacher implements no activities that teach the following problem-solving types:<br>• Abstraction<br>• Categorization<br>• Drawing Conclusions/Justifying Solution<br>• Predicting Outcomes<br>• Observing and Experimenting<br>• Improving Solutions<br>• Identifying Relevant/Irrelevant Information<br>• Generating Ideas<br>• Creating and Designing |

**Educator Rubric**

# Planning

| | Significantly Above Expectations (5) | At Expectations (3) | Significantly Below Expectations (1) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Instructional Plans** | Instructional plans include:<br>• measurable and explicit goals aligned to state content standards;<br>• activities, materials, and assessments that:<br>○ are aligned to state standards.<br>○ are sequenced from basic to complex.<br>○ build on prior student knowledge, are relevant to students' lives, and integrate other disciplines.<br>○ provide appropriate time for student work, student reflection, and lesson and unit closure;<br>• evidence that plan is appropriate for the age, knowledge, and interests of all learners; and<br>• evidence that the plan provides regular opportunities to accommodate individual student needs. | Instructional plans include:<br>• goals aligned to state content standards;<br>• activities, materials, and assessments that:<br>○ are aligned to state standards.<br>○ are sequenced from basic to complex.<br>○ build on prior student knowledge.<br>○ provide appropriate time for student work, and lesson and unit closure;<br>• evidence that plan is appropriate for the age, knowledge, and interests of most learners; and<br>• evidence that the plan provides some opportunities to accommodate individual student needs. | Instructional plans include:<br>• few goals aligned to state content standards;<br>• activities, materials, and assessments that:<br>○ are rarely aligned to state standards.<br>○ are rarely logically sequenced.<br>○ rarely build on prior student knowledge<br>○ inconsistently provide time for student work, and lesson and unit closure;<br>• little evidence that the plan is appropriate for the age, knowledge, or interests of the learners; and<br>• little evidence that the plan provides some opportunities to accommodate individual student needs. |
| **Student Work** | Assignments require students to:<br>• organize, interpret, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information rather than reproduce it;<br>• draw conclusions, make generalizations, and produce arguments that are supported through extended writing; and<br>• connect what they are learning to experiences, observations, feelings, or situations significant in their daily lives both inside and outside of school.<br>• | Assignments require students to:<br>• interpret information rather than reproduce it;<br>• draw conclusions and support them through writing; and<br>• connect what they are learning to prior learning and some life experiences. | Assignments require students to:<br>• mostly reproduce information;<br>• rarely draw conclusions and support them through writing; and<br>• rarely connect what they are learning to prior learning or life experiences. |
| **Assessment** | Assessment Plans:<br>• are aligned with state content standards;<br>• have clear measurement criteria;<br>• measure student performance in more than three ways (e.g., in the form of a project, experiment, presentation, essay, short answer, or multiple choice test;<br>• require extended written tasks;<br>• are portfolio-based with clear illustrations of student progress toward state content standards; and<br>• include descriptions of how assessment results will be used to inform future instruction. | Assessment Plans:<br>• are aligned with state content standards;<br>• have measurement criteria;<br>• measure student performance in more than two ways (e.g., in the form of a project, experiment, presentation, essay, short answer, or multiple choice test);<br>• require written tasks; and<br>• include performance checks throughout the school year. | Assessment Plans:<br>• are rarely aligned with state content standards;<br>• have ambiguous measurement criteria;<br>• measure student performance in less than two ways (e.g., in the form of a project, experiment, presentation, essay, short answer, or multiple choice test); and<br>• include performance checks, although the purpose of these checks is not clear. |

**Educator Rubric**

# Environment

| | Significantly Above Expectations (5) | At Expectations (3) | Significantly Below Expectations (1) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Expectations** | • Teacher sets high and demanding academic expectations for every student.<br>• Teacher encourages students to learn from mistakes.<br>• Teacher creates learning opportunities where all students can experience success.<br>• Students take initiative and follow through with their own work.<br>• Teacher optimizes instructional time, teaches more material, and demands better performance from every student. | • Teacher sets high and demanding academic expectations for every student.<br>• Teacher encourages students to learn from mistakes.<br>• Teacher creates learning opportunities where most students can experience success.<br>• Students complete their work according to teacher expectations. | • Teacher expectations are not sufficiently high for every student.<br>• Teacher creates an environment where mistakes and failure are not viewed as learning experiences.<br>• Students demonstrate little or no pride in the quality of their work. |
| **Managing Student Behavior** | • Students are consistently well-behaved and on task.<br>• Teacher and students establish clear rules for learning and behavior.<br>• The teacher uses several techniques, such as social approval, contingent activities, and consequences, to maintain appropriate student behavior.<br>• The teacher overlooks inconsequential behavior.<br>• The teacher deals with students who have caused disruptions rather than the entire class.<br>• The teacher attends to disruptions quickly and firmly. | • Students are mostly well-behaved and on task, some minor learning disruptions may occur.<br>• Teacher establishes rules for learning and behavior.<br>• The teacher uses some techniques, such as social approval, contingent activities, and consequences, to maintain appropriate student behavior.<br>• The teacher overlooks some inconsequential behavior, but other times addresses it, stopping the lesson.<br>• The teacher deals with students who have caused disruptions, yet sometimes he or she addresses the entire class. | • Students are not well-behaved and are often off task.<br>• Teacher establishes few rules for learning and behavior.<br>• The teacher uses few techniques to maintain appropriate student behavior.<br>• The teacher cannot distinguish between inconsequential behavior and inappropriate behavior.<br>• Disruptions frequently interrupt instruction. |
| **Environment** | The classroom:<br>• welcomes all members and guests.<br>• is organized and understandable to all students.<br>• supplies, equipment, and resources are easily and readily accessible.<br>• displays student work that frequently changes.<br>• is arranged to promote individual and group learning. | The classroom:<br>• welcomes most members and guests.<br>• is organized and understandable to most students.<br>• supplies, equipment, and resources are accessible.<br>• displays student work.<br>• is arranged to promote individual and group learning.<br>• | The classroom:<br>• is somewhat cold and uninviting.<br>• is not well organized and understandable to students.<br>• supplies, equipment, and resources are difficult to access.<br>• does not display student work.<br>• is not arranged to promote group learning. |
| **Respectful Culture** | • Teacher-student interactions demonstrate caring and respect for one another.<br>• Students exhibit caring and respect for one another.<br>• Teacher seeks out and is receptive to the interests and opinions of all students.<br>• Positive relationships and interdependence characterize the classroom. | • Teacher-student interactions are generally friendly, but may reflect occasional inconsistencies, favoritism, or disregard for students' cultures.<br>• Students exhibit respect for the teacher, and are generally polite to each other.<br>• Teacher is sometimes receptive to the interests and opinions of students. | • Teacher-student interactions are sometimes authoritarian, negative, or inappropriate.<br>• Students exhibit disrespect for the teacher.<br>• Student interaction is characterized by conflict, sarcasm, or put-downs.<br>• Teacher is not receptive to interests and opinions of students. |

## ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION OBSERVATION FORM

**Updated 10/17/2011**

**Ratings Descriptors:**

**1 – Significantly Below Expectations – limited implementation and unsatisfactory knowledge**
**2 – Below Expectations – partial implementation and basic knowledge**
**3 – At Expectation – consistent implementation**
**4 – Above Expectation – consistent implementation with successful adaptation to school context**
**5 – Significantly Above Expectations – exemplary implementation with innovation that leads to dramatic gains in student outcomes**

School Administrator:

Evaluator:

Date of Observation 1 _____ Date of Observation 2 _____

School: Year:

Appendix 13 Early Evidence fro

| Tennessee Instructional Leadership Standards (TILS) and Indicators | 1 Significantly Below Expectation | 2 Below Expectation | 3 At Expectation | 4 Above Expectation | 5 Significantly Above Expectation | Notes | Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Standard A – Continuous School Improvement** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Notes** | **Score** |
| **1.** Leads the process of developing the school's vision, mission and goals. | | | | | | | |
| **2.** Creates and sustains an organizational culture that supports the school's vision, mission and goals. | | | | | | | |
| **3.** Effectively implements clear strategies focused on student achievement and learning. | | | | | | | |
| **4.** Develops, implements and reviews data informed school-wide improvement plans. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | **Total Points for Standard A:** A36 | |
| **Standard B – Culture for Teaching and Learning** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | | |
| 1. Creates a safe and effective learning environment for all students. | | | | | | | |
| 2. Creates and maintains a school culture of high academic expectations for all students. | | | | | | | |
| 3. Develops and sustains a secure and disciplined learning environment for all students. | | | | | | | |
| 4. Develops and sustains a school culture that maximizes instructional time. | | | | | | | |

## ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION OBSERVATION FORM

**Updated 10/17/2011**

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5. Creates a shared responsibility among teachers, staff, students and parents for student learning. | | | | | | | |
| 6. Demonstrates ability to implement changes in school operations when necessary. | | | | | | | |
| 7. Encourages the school community to build professional relationships that result in productive learning environment. | | | | | | | |
| 8 Establishes and cultivates strong relationships between parents/guardians and the school community. | | | | | | | |
| 9. Establishes clear lines of communication with teachers, staff, parents, students, and community members | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | **Total Points for Standard B:** | |
| **Standard C – Instr. Leadership/Assessment** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | | |
| 1. Supports teachers to analyze student achievement data to drive instruction. | | | | | | | |
| 2. Ensures student access to a rigorous curriculum and the support necessary for all students to meet high expectations. | | | | | | | |
| 3. Works to embed numeracy and literacy across the curriculum in all subject areas. | | | | | | | |
| 4. Oversees the implementation of research-based best practices in classroom instruction. | | | | | | | |
| 5. Regularly communicates student progress to appropriate stakeholders. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | **Total Points for Standard C:** | |
| **Standard D – Professional Growth** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | | |
| 1. Recruits, hires and makes other personnel decisions in alignment with the school's mission and goals. | | | | | | | |
| 2. Models continuous personal professional development. | | | | | | | |
| 3. Provides leadership opportunities for the professional learning community and mentors aspiring leaders. | | | | | | | |
| 4. Works in collaboration with the school community to implement high-quality professional development that is tailored to the school's needs and is focused on increasing student achievement. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | **Total Points for Standard D:** | |

## ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION OBSERVATION FORM

**Updated 10/17/2011**

| Standard E – Management of the School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Establishes a set of standard operating procedures and routines that are understood and followed by all staff. | | | | | | | |
| 2. Constantly focuses on increasing achievement. | | | | | | | |
| 3. Prepares and monitors an annual operational school budget that aligns with the school's improvement plan. | | | | | | | |
| 4. Identifies potential problems and proactively addresses problems. | | | | | | | |
| 5. Works to involve the community in support of the school's mission and goals. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | **Total Points for Standard E:** | |
| **Standard F – Ethics** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | | |
| 1. Performs all professional responsibilities with integrity and fairness. | | | | | | | |
| 2. Makes decisions within an ethical context and respecting the dignity of all. | | | | | | | |
| 3. Considers legal, moral and ethical implications when making decisions. | | | | | | | |
| 4. Acts in accordance with federal and state constitutional provisions, statutory standards and regulatory applications. | | | | | | | |
| 5. Recognizes and addresses cultural, learning and personal differences as a basis for academic decision-making. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | **Total Points for Standard F:** | |
| **Standard G – Diversity** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | | |
| 1. Creates an inclusive environment for decision-making. | | | | | | | |
| 2. Continuously strives to recruit, hire and retain a diverse staff. | | | | | | | |
| 3. Interacts effectively with diverse individuals and groups. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | **Total Points for Standard G:** | |

## ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION OBSERVATION FORM

**Updated 10/17/2011**

| Quality of Teacher Evaluation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Performs the teacher evaluation with a high degree of fidelity to the approved Tennessee evaluation model. | | | | | | | |
| 2. Provides accurate, high-quality feedback on teacher practices and classroom outcomes. | | | | | | | |
| 3. Observation ratings appropriately differentiate between teachers' effectiveness | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | **Total points for Quality of Teacher Evaluation** | |

**Evidence Base for Observations/Evaluation**

- Observations (required)
- Surveys (required)
- Student achievement data (required)
- Student/parent/teacher feedback
- Portfolios
- Walkthroughs
- School Improvement Plan

**Goals for School Leader (Box expands to accommodate text.)**

**Signatures below indicate that the school leader and supervisor have discussed the information contained in this document.**

**Principal or Assistant Principal Signature** _____ **Date**_____

**Supervisor Signature**_____ **Date**_____

# Tennessee Department of Education
# Application for Approval of Alternate Qualitative Evaluation Instrument/Process Developer Form
# Due May 2, 2011

Directions: Provide the information requested below. This application form is a Word document, so where narrative is required, please insert it directly into the document. **Attach a copy of the rubric and the observation recording forms to this application for submission.** A hard copy of the application with required original signatures should be submitted to:

Tim Gaddis, TN Department of Education
710 James Robertson Parkway
Andrew Johnson Tower, 5th Floor
Nashville, TN 37243

**Developer Information**

**Name of Organization or District: _____**

**Primary Contact Person: _____**

**Address: _____**

**Phone: _____** **E-mail Address: _____**

**Department Use Only**

**Received: Date_____**

**Reviewed by: _____ _____ _____**

## Assurances

**I/we hereby assure that this alternate model meets all guidelines and criteria set forth by the Tennessee State Board of Education on April 15, 2011, including the following:**

(1) The primary purpose of annual teacher and principal evaluations is to identify and support instruction that will lead to high levels of student achievement.
(2) Evaluations will be used to inform human capital decisions, including, but not limited to individual and group professional development plans, hiring, assignment and promotion, tenure and dismissal, and compensation.
(3) Annual evaluations will differentiate teacher and principal performance into five effectiveness groups according to the individual educator's evaluation results. The five effectiveness groups are: significantly above expectations, above expectations, at expectations, below expectations, significantly below expectations.
(4) The qualitative appraisal instrument must contain the following domains: Planning, Environment, Professionalism, Instruction.
(5) All approved models shall include, but are not limited to a review of prior evaluations, personal conferences to discuss strengths, weaknesses, and remediation, and classroom observation visits.
(6) All educators, other than apprentice teachers and administrators, will have a minimum of four observations, with at least two observations in each semester, for a minimum of at least 60 minutes each school year. Apprentice teachers will have at least six observations, with three in each semester, for a minimum total of at least 90 minutes each school year.
(7) Evaluators will provide written feedback within one week of each observation visit to the educator and schedule an in-person debrief with the educator within one week of each observation visit.

**Authorized Signature for Model Developer** **Date**

**I/we hereby assure that the model developer will cooperate with TN CRED in the ongoing study of the effectiveness of the model through the 2013-14 academic year.**

**Authorized Signature for Model Developer** **Date**

**In the space below, describe the research base that informed the development of this model.**

(Use as much space as necessary)

**In the space below, describe the pilot of the instrument, including but not limited to the description and number of participants, timeframe of the pilot, the training process, and documented outcomes.**

(Use as much space as necessary)

**TEAM Updates**

District leaders,

We are continuing the weekly updates and sharing additional guidance in an effort to support the implementation of TEAM. Please let me know if you have any questions or requests for additional information.

Sincerely,
Emily Barton
emily.barton@tn.gov

**I. New Guidance and Resources:**

A. **State Board of Education Observation Policy Change:** Last week, the State Board of Education adopted a policy change to allow two observations to be completed during one classroom visit. The attached document "A" provides guidance on what the change means for implementation. A FAQ section is also included at the end of the document.

B. **Observation Data Reports:** On November 9, 2011, TDOE will distribute reports with data from the TEAM Data System to directors via email. Directors whose districts have entered observation data in the data system will receive a one page report summarizing the data across their district and an additional spreadsheet with school by school data. Both the district report and the spreadsheet with school by school data will include the number of observations completed and entered in the data system, the distribution of scores across the district, and average scores for all indicators on the TEAM rubric. Additional guidance about these reports will be included in the email. We will provide the same reports with updated data on November 22 and December 6. The ability to produce reports directly from the TEAM Data System is projected to be available in mid-December.

**II. Frequently Asked Questions this Week:**

**General**

A. **Currently, observers cannot enter two observation scores in the data system on the same day. Will this change?** Given the recent policy change, we are working with our vendor, My Learning Plan, to have this changed so that multiple observation scores can be entered on the same day. There will be some delay as it takes time to change programming, but hope to have this feature by November 20th. We will communicate through this e-mail when it has changed.

B. **Will there be guidance for the Professionalism rubric?** The Professionalism rubric should be completed near the end of the school year and be based on the full year's activities. Additional guidance will be released on this rubric in January.

**Administrator Evaluation**

A. **Do evaluators score each indicator on the Administrator Observation Form twice?** No. Over two observations, an evaluator completes the Administrator Observation Form, the TILS-based rubric, once. Evidence to score a particular indicator may be gathered and scored at either the

first or second observation, at the discretion of the evaluator. Only one score should be recorded for each indicator for the year.

B. **Should the Summative Rating Form be completed after each observation?** No. The Administrator Evaluation Summative Rating Form should be completed once at the end of the year and is used to combine all components of an administrator's evaluation into a final effectiveness rating.

## III. Resources from Other Districts that Might be Helpful to You:

A. **Scoring Calculations Guide:** We attached a score calculations guide that we have heard from several districts has been useful when having conversations with teachers about how their scores are calculated (see attachment B). Please let us know if you have resources that have been particularly helpful to you or if you know of tools being used in other districts we should share with all directors.

Dear District and School Leaders,

The following document provides guidance on implementing the TEAM Evaluation system in light of the recent state board policy change permitting the completion of two observations in one classroom visit. Please note, the board policy change does not *require* districts to complete two observations in one classroom visit, but provides districts added flexibility if they wish to do so.

The permissible combination of observations means evaluators can look at two different domains (e.g. planning and instruction) during one classroom visit. While the suggested length below states "Lesson + 15 Min," evaluators may adjust the time spent observing at their discretion, based on the time needed to observe multiple domains. Only one pre-conference (if announced) and post conference are required for the combined observations.

**Professional License**:

For professionally licensed teachers, the following is the **suggested** cycle for this year.

1. If you have **not completed any** observations this year:

| | Suggested Sequence | Type | Length | Rubric | Pre-Conference | Post-Conference Type |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **First Semester** | First | Announced | Lesson + 15 Min | Instruction Rubric and Planning Rubric | Yes | Formal |
| **Second Semester** | Second | Unannounced | Lesson + 15 Min | Instruction Rubric and Environment Rubric | No | Formal |

2. If you have completed either the **planning or instruction** observations:

| | Suggested Sequence | Type | Length | Rubric | Pre-Conference | Post-Conference Type |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **First Semester** | First | Announced | 15 Min | Planning Rubric | Yes | Informal |
| | Second | Announced | Lesson | Instruction Rubric | Yes | Formal |
| **Second Semester** | Third | Unannounced | Lesson + 15 Min | Instruction Rubric and Environment Rubric | No | Formal |

**Apprentice License**:

For apprentice teachers, the following is the **suggested** cycle for this year. If you have **not completed any** observations, either of the two options below could be used. Since Board policy requires half of observations to be completed in each semester, at least 4 classroom visits are required of apprentice teachers.

1. If you have only completed the **planning** observation:

| | Suggested Sequence | Type | Length | Rubric | Pre-Conference | Post-Conference Type |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **First Semester** | First | Announced | 15 Min | Planning Rubric | Yes | Informal |
| | Second | Unannounced | Lesson + 15 Min | Instruction Rubric and Environment Rubric | No | Formal |
| **Second Semester** | Third* | Unannounced | Lesson | Instruction Rubric | No | Formal |
| | Fourth* | Announced | Lesson | Instruction Rubric and Planning Rubric + Environment Rubric | Yes | Formal |

*The order of the third and fourth observations can be switched

2. If you have already completed your **planning and instruction** observation:

| | Suggested Sequence | Type | Length | Rubric | Pre-Conference | Post-Conference Type |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **First Semester** | First | Announced | 15 Min | Planning Rubric | Yes | Informal |
| | Second | Unannounced | Lesson | Instruction Rubric | No | Formal |
| | Third | Unannounced | Lesson + 15 Min | Environment Rubric | No | Formal |
| **Second Semester** | Fourth* | Unannounced | Lesson | Instruction Rubric | No | Formal |
| | Fifth* | Announced | Lesson | Instruction Rubric and Planning Rubric + Environment Rubric | Yes | Formal |

*The order of the fourth and fifth observations can be switched

**FAQs**:

**Has the definition of an observation changed?** The definition of what constitutes an observation has not changed. When observations are combined (for example, when planning and instruction observations are completed in succession), it is still considered to be two observations. However, the State Board policy change now allows those two observations to be completed in one classroom visit.

**How much time needs to be spent in the classroom for the combined observations?** While the suggested length states "Lesson + 15 Min," evaluators may adjust the time spent observing at their discretion, based on the time needed to observe multiple domains. The only time requirements are that professional teachers are observed for a minimum of 60 minutes throughout the year and apprentice teachers 90 minutes.

**How do I know how and when to hold a pre- and post- conference?** The tables above outline this in detail. All announced observations include a pre-conference, while unannounced observations do not. For post-conferences, any observation or observations that include the instruction domain will require a formal post-conference. Any observations that are 15 minutes will only require an informal post-conference.

**How many refinement and reinforcement indicators should be completed for combined observations?** Since these are still considered to be two observations, a refinement and reinforcement indicator must be included for each of the domains observed. This means that if you have evaluating planning and instruction together, you have to include a refinement and reinforcement for planning and one of each for instruction for a total of 2 refinement and 2 reinforcement indicators.

**How will this affect entry into the data system?** While this combines two observations into one classroom visit, you will still have to enter the two observations separately in the data system. Please note that this policy change will need to be reflected in our data system. Currently, you can only submit one observation score per day. The goal is to have this change reflected in the data system by the last week of November.

**The School Services Personnel and Library Media Specialists Rubrics have different domains. Does this policy change still apply?** Yes. Evaluators using these rubrics may combine observations for the equivalent of the planning, instruction, and environment domains. For example, instead of being evaluated on "instruction," school services personnel are evaluated on "delivery of services." An observation on "delivery of services" may be combined with an observation on "planning of services."

**Have any of the former policy requirements been removed?** No. The changes just give added flexibility to how observations can be conducted. Half of a teacher's observations must still be completed during the first semester and half must still be completed in the second semester. Likewise, the ratio of unannounced to announced observations remains half and half.

**Are the charts above the only possible cycles available?** The observation cycles above are only suggestions. There are other ways to combine observations, depending upon which observations have already been completed. The only requirement is that the observations still fall within State Board policy.

## Score Calculations

The three evaluation components are used to compute an overall teacher effectiveness rating as shown below.

Overall Score Calculation

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Overall Observation Score*: | ____ | x | 50 | = | _____ |
| Growth Score: | ____ | x | 35 | = | _____ |
| Achievement Measure Score: | ____ | x | 15 | = | _____ |
| Total Score | | | 100% | Sum Lines 1-3 | _____ |

*Scores on the Professionalism Domain are included in the Overall Observation Score. This overall score is rounded to the hundredths place.

The total score is then converted to an overall effectiveness rating using the following table.

| Score Range | Overall Effectiveness Rating |
|---|---|
| <200 | 1 |
| 200-274.99 | 2 |
| 275-349.99 | 3 |
| 350-424.99 | 4 |
| 425-500 | 5 |

Example Calculations

The examples below illustrate how various combinations of component scores would yield an overall effectiveness rating for a teacher:

| | (Observation Score, Growth Score, Achievement Measure Score) | Total Score | Overall Effectiveness Rating |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Teacher A** | 2.22, 2, 2 | 211 | 2 |
| **Teacher B** | 3.50, 2, 3 | 290 | 3 |
| **Teacher C** | 3.82, 4, 4 | 391 | 4 |
| **Teacher D** | 4.07, 5, 4 | 438.5 | 5 |

***NOTE:** As the overview document on non-tested grades and subjects, explains, in year one, teachers will use an individual or school-level TVAAS score for the 35% growth component. In future years, we expect that districts will have approved alternative growth options from which to choose for many non-tested educator groups.

## Calculating Teacher Effectiveness Ratings

A teacher's overall effectiveness rating will be calculated using the three component scores as shown above. Evaluators will enter observation scores into the web-based TEAM data system as observations are completed throughout the year. TVAAS scores will be uploaded into the system as soon as possible after testing occurs. Evaluators will enter achievement measure scores when the data is available. Ultimately a final effectiveness score will be calculated in the web-based system to produce scores in the above ranges. Principals and teachers will then verify these final ratings.

For example, assume Teacher D in the table on the previous page is a professionally licensed teacher evaluated according to the TEAM rubric. As a result, their observation score is the average of the following 41 indicators*:

- 3 Planning indicators
- 4 Environment indicators
- 12 Instruction indicators from an announced observation
- 12 Instruction indicators from an unannounced observation
- 10 Professionalism indicators

If the sum of the 1-5 scores for all of these indicators was 167, the teacher's observation average (167/41) would be 4.07 when rounded to the nearest hundredth.

If this teacher's growth score was 5 and their achievement measure score was 4, their total score would be calculated as follows:

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Overall Observation Score: | 4.07 | x | 50 | = | | 203.5 |
| Growth Score: | 5 | x | 35 | = | | 175 |
| Achievement Measure Score: | 4 | x | 15 | = | | 60 |
| Total Score | | | 100% | Sum Lines 1-3 | | 438.5 |

This total score is then converted to an overall effectiveness rating using the table on the previous page. Teacher D's overall effectiveness rating would be 5.

***NOTE:** Apprentice teachers evaluated according to the TEAM rubric will be scored on 60 indicators. In addition to the indicators listed above, they will be scored one additional time on the instruction, planning, and environment indicators. As a result, their overall observation score will be calculated by summing the 1-5 scores on these 60 indicators, dividing by 60, and rounding this average to the nearest hundredth.

## Teacher Effectiveness Descriptors

**Significantly Above Expectations (425-500):** A teacher at this level exemplifies the instructional skills, knowledge, and responsibilities described in the rubric, and implements them without fail. He/she is adept at using data to set and reach ambitious teaching and learning goals. He/she makes a significant impact on student achievement and should be considered a model of exemplary teaching.

**Above Expectations (350-424.99):** A teacher at this level comprehends the instructional skills, knowledge, and responsibilities described in the rubric and implements them consistently. He/she is skilled at using data to set and reach appropriate teaching and learning goals and makes a strong impact on student achievement.

**At Expectations (275-349.99):** A teacher at this level understands and implements most of the instructional skills, knowledge, and responsibilities described in the rubric. He/she uses data to set and reach teaching and learning goals and makes the expected impact on student achievement.

**Below Expectations (200-274.99):** A teacher at this level demonstrates some knowledge of the instructional skills, knowledge, and responsibilities described in the rubric, but implements them inconsistently. He/she may struggle to use data to set and reach appropriate teaching and learning goals. His/her impact on student achievement is less than expected.

**Significantly Below Expectations (Under 200):** A teacher at this level has limited knowledge of the instructional skills, knowledge, and responsibilities described in the rubric, and struggles to implement them. He/she makes little attempt to use data to set and reach appropriate teaching and learning goals, and has little to no impact on student achievement.

## Score Distribution

Statistical modeling using historical TVAAS data and historical data from implementation of comparable observation rubrics suggests that TEAM is likely to produce a full range of ratings:

**Projected Range of Distribution**

| Score/ Rating | Predicted Distribution |
|---|---|
| **1** | 3-5% |
| **2** | 15-25% |
| **3** | 40-50% |
| **4** | 15-25% |
| **5** | 5-10% |

As this breakdown illustrates, we anticipate teacher performance in year one will yield observation scores and overall effectiveness ratings that span the complete spectrum of scores. These predicted distributions are based on the best available information, but actual year-one scores for each of the components may be different from the data used in the projections - and should be different depending on the student achievement and growth in different schools and districts. As a result, while these projections provide a good estimate of the distribution of scores that TEAM could produce, actual distributions during the first year of implementation may vary.

## 15% Approved Achievement Measures: Expanded Options

This document expands on the Approved Measures Matrix by the State Board of Education. The expanded types and options will be available for selection in the TEAM Data System. The options listed for "off the shelf" assessments are the most commonly used assessments statewide; this is not meant to be an exhaustive list of all options within each approved measure. Other "off the shelf" measures may be selected as long as they are used statewide or nationally. The agreed-upon measure should be a measure aligned as closely as possible to the educator's primary responsibility.

| Approved Measure | Types | Options | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **State Assessments** | TCAP | • Math<br>• Reading<br>• Science<br>• Writing (5, 8, 11)<br>• Social Studies<br>*All TCAP tests could have ALT-MAAS, ALT-Portfolio, ELDA, and ELSA qualifications | |
| | End of Course Exams | • English I<br>• English II<br>• English III<br>• Algebra I<br>• Algebra II<br>• U.S. History<br>• Biology I<br>*All End of Course Exams could have an Alternative Performance Based Measurement | |
| **School-wide TVAAS** | • TVAAS all<br>• TVAAS literacy and numeracy<br>• TVAAS literacy<br>• TVAAS numeracy | | |
| **ACT/SAT Suite of Assessments** | ACT | • EXPLORE<br>• PLAN<br>• ACT | |
| | SAT | • SAT<br>• PSAT | |
| **"Off the Shelf" Assessments** | Commonly used throughout the state and/or nationally | • AIMS Web<br>• Children's Progress Academic Assessment<br>• Istation<br>• DIBELS<br>• Discovery Ed/ThinkLink<br>• DRA<br>• MAP | • ELDA<br>• CTE Competency<br>• Attainment<br>• Linguafolio<br>• STAMP<br>• NOELLA<br>• National Latin Exam |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | • STAR Early Literacy<br>• STAR Reading<br>• STAR Math<br>• SAT 10<br>• Terranova<br>• Fountas-Pinell<br>• GOLD Assessment<br>• Kindergarten Readiness<br>• Scholastic Suite of Assessments | • National Greek Exam<br>• Michigan Model<br>• Learning.com<br>• Voyager<br>• Limelight<br>• Classworks<br>• OTHER** |
| **AP/IB/NIC Suites of Assessments** | Advanced Placement | | |
| | International Baccalaureate | | |
| | National Industry Certification (CTE) | | |
| **Graduate Rate/CTE Concentrator Graduation Rate** | School Graduation Rate | | |
| | CTE Concentrator Graduation Rate | | |
| **Postsecondary matriculation/persistence/placement** | Postsecondary Matriculation | | |
| | Postsecondary Persistence | | |
| | Postsecondary Placement | | |
| **Completion/Success in Advanced coursework, including dual credit and dual enrollment** | Dual Credit | | |
| | Dual Enrollment | | |
| **9th grade promotion to the 10th grade/9th grade retention rate** | 9th grade promotion rate to 10th grade | | |
| | 9th grade retention rate | | |

**Note: Other "off-the-shelf" assessments may be used. This list includes "off-the-shelf" assessment options used most commonly statewide and is not meant to be an all encompassing list.

# TEAM Data System

The TEAM data system is a simple, online program that can be accessed from any computer with secure web-access. It is the responsibility of the evaluator to input the information from the TEAM Observation Form and the Educator Professionalism Rating Report. The system will track and share these observation scores, help users to pace their observations, and calculate the teacher's overall Effectiveness Rating. Below is more detail on the timing, steps, and supplemental resources of this system.

## Development and timing:

The TEAM data system is currently under development and will be rolled out in stages for the 2011-12 School Year.

- TDOE contracted with My Learning Plan, an organization with years of experience developing similar systems in LEAs across the country, including LEAs in Tennessee.
- The first phase, launching in early Fall 2011, will be an electronic form for observers to submit observation data.*
- TDOE will have more details on the first phase, including previews of the forms and trainings, by the end of August.
- The second phase of the system, including reports on observation progress and access for teachers to view their ratings, will be launched in Spring 2012.
- As pieces of the system are rolled out during School Year 2011-12, TDOE will solicit feedback and use it to make improvements to this system on a rolling basis.

## How evaluators will use the data system:

Evaluators are only asked to submit the information from the TEAM Observation Form and the Educator Professionalism Rating Report into the online TEAM data system while keeping signed paper copies of each document in the teacher's personnel file.

1. Conduct the observation and Post-Conference.
2. Fill out an electronic TEAM Observation Form within one week of the actual observation.
    - All you need is your computer and internet access to use the online system.
    - The online TEAM Observation Form is similar to the paper form, and it will capture the same observer information, including the Indicator ratings, Area of Reinforcement, Area for Refinement, and any Optional Reflection.
    - The online system will not require input of the teacher self-score or reflection - that will remain on the paper version only.
    - If you conduct your first observations before the online system is up and running, we ask you to input the results from the paper form as soon as the system is ready.
3. Keep a signed copy of the paper TEAM Observation Form in the teacher's personnel file.
    - The ratings on the paper form must match the ratings entered into the online system.
4. At the end of the year, log-in to the data system to fill in the Educator Professionalism Rating Report fields for the teacher, which will give you an overall qualitative rating.
5. Keep a signed copy of the paper Educator Professionalism Rating Report in the teacher's personnel file.

## What the completed data system will do for schools:

Once fully developed, the TEAM data system can support schools in tracking their observations, allow teachers to see their ratings, and help the State monitor the progress of the new evaluation system implementation. When completed, the system will:

- Provide reports that Principals and Director of Schools can use to see how many observations have been completed so far and their associated ratings.
- Allow teachers to access their completed TEAM Observation Forms, overall observation score, and final Effectiveness Rating, all of which they can use to inform their instruction going forward.
- Allow Principals to access teacher effectiveness data that can guide professional development at their schools.
- Allow LEAs and TDOE to monitor observation results in real time and offer targeted support to schools as they implement the new evaluation system.
- Calculate the final summative score from the observation data that evaluators submit. TDOE and LEAs will upload the 15% achievement and 35% growth scores into the system.

## Who can see the information:

TDOE is committed to protecting the confidentiality of all observation information and will restrict access to school, LEA, and State leaders.

- Designated TDOE staff will have access to view all data in the system.
- Each LEA's Director of Schools can view all observation data in the LEA. They cannot see results for any other LEA.
- Principals can see the observation forms for all teachers in their school. They cannot see observation results for teachers in any other school or LEA.
- Additional observers at the school, such as Assistant Principals or Instructional Coaches who are doing observations, can only see the observation forms they create. They cannot see any other observation results for teachers.
- Teachers can see their own observation data.

*Observation data for Library Media Specialists and Alternative School Educators can be entered beginning in December. Maintain all paper records until then; additional information and guidance to follow.

STATE OF TENNESSEE
**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**
6th FLOOR, ANDREW JOHNSON TOWER
710 JAMES ROBERTSON PARKWAY
NASHVILLE, TN 37243-0375

**BILL HASLAM**
GOVERNOR

**KEVIN HUFFMAN**
COMMISSIONER

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: District directors

FROM: Kevin Huffman

DATE: Oct. 25, 2011

SUBJECT: ESEA Flexibility Waiver Application

---

Directors,

The purpose of this memo is to provide an overview of the process of the ESEA Flexibility Waiver Application, due on November 14.

I will be hosting a webinar this Thursday, October 27, with all directors to provide additional context on the waiver and to solicit your early feedback. I sincerely hope you will be able to join the call.

**Background**
In July, the Tennessee Department of Education submitted a letter to the U.S. Department of Education requesting a waiver of provisions of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

On September 23, U.S. Education Secretary Arne Duncan formally offered every state education department the opportunity to waive a broad set of requirements under NCLB.

While there is significant overlap in our initial waiver letter and the principles of the new waiver application, the waiver application requires greater specificity and some new requirements, discussed below.

**Principles of the Waiver**
The U.S. Department of Education has designed the waiver application around four principles with corresponding requirements:

1. ***College- and Career- Ready Expectations:*** An SEA must demonstrate that is has college- and career- ready expectations (such as the adoption of Common Core standards) for all students, and must provide a plan that outlines how it will transition to these new expectations.

2. ***Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support:*** An SEA must establish a dual-faceted accountability system that: (1) Sets new Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) at the

state, district, and school levels to replace No Child Left Behind's Adequate Yearly Progress AMOs; and (2) Identifies "Priority schools" — the bottom 5 percent of schools in proficiency; "Focus schools" — the 10 percent of schools with the largest achievement gaps, and "Reward schools" — the 5 percent of the highest performing and/or highest progress schools.

3. ***Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership:*** an SEA must develop teacher and principal evaluation and support systems that will drive continual improvement, differentiate performance, use multiple valid measures, regularly evaluate teachers, provide meaningful feedback, and inform personnel decisions.
4. ***Reducing Duplication and Unnecessary Burden:*** an SEA should remove duplicative and burdensome reporting requirements that have little or no impact on student outcomes.

**Where We Are**

To address Principle 1, we are detailing our previous Race to the Top plan for transition to Common Core standards.

To address Principle 3, we will inform USED of what we have already developed and implemented with TEAM.

To address Principle 4, we will assure USED that we will continue to seek opportunities to reduce unnecessary bureaucracy, as outlined in TDOE's strategic plan.

Principle 2 – designing a new, differentiated accountability system – is the biggest piece of work.

**What Differentiated Accountability Means**

The waiver application mandates that we create <u>two</u> accountability systems:

1. Absolute performance against school-specific AMOs
2. Relative performance against the performance of other schools

The opportunity to create new AMOs is something we expected and welcome. We are in the process of determining a set of AMOs that will establish meaningful accountability while not creating an unreasonable number of measures.

For the waiver application, we must present state AMOs and describe the process we will undertake to arrive at corresponding district and school AMOs. In general, we believe that approximately 4 to 5 percent annual growth strikes the right balance between ambitious and achievable, and we will use these growth rates to inform our state AMOs. When we have received the waiver, we will engage with districts to set district and school AMOs that will be incorporated into to the state AMOs.

While some elements of a relative accountability system align with our July waiver letter, the breadth required in this system is new. For example, we expected to identify the bottom 5 percent of schools (what the waiver calls "Priority" schools), however we did not expect that there would be a mandate to identify and intervene with the 10 percent of schools with the largest achievement gaps ("Focus" schools).

For the waiver application, we must describe our methodology for identifying Priority, Focus, and Reward schools; we must describe the interventions these classifications will trigger for schools; and we must present draft lists of Priority schools, Focus schools, and Reward schools based on current data.

We are in the process of determining the methodology and performing the analysis to arrive at what would be the list of Priority, Focus, and Reward schools based on previous years' data. Although

these preliminary lists will be in the public domain upon submission of the waiver application, we will re-run the analysis at the end of the 2011-2012 school year, including this year's data, to determine the final lists of schools. As mandated in the waiver, schools identified in the final Priority and Focus lists will face minimum three-year interventions beginning in the 2012-2013 school year.

**Key Areas for Input**

At this stage, we would particularly appreciate any input on the following questions. We anticipate that there will be a range of opinions which will help us identify innovative solutions and prevent unintended consequences.

1. **What are the right AMOs to include at the state, district, school, and sub-group levels?**

2. **What types of interventions could TDOE undertake with Focus schools to help them hasten achievement gap closure, considering:**
    - Ten percent of Title I school represents approximately **115** schools; 10 percent of all schools represents approximately **180** schools.
    - TDOE capacity is limited (In addition, TDOE must also intervene with approximately **90** Priority schools).
    - TDOE should only commit to interventions that the state is able to effectively implement at scale.

**Next Steps**

- Please join me this Thursday, October 27 for the district webinar to share feedback.
- Expect a draft of the waiver application, including draft lists of priority and focus schools, to be disseminated for review and final input on November 7.
- Prepare, as necessary, for questions you might receive as our waiver application becomes publicly available upon submission on November 14.
- Expect that we will follow up with districts on setting district and school level AMOs in the next several months.

For any waiver related questions in the meantime, please contact: **Dominique Baillet (dominique.baillet@tn.gov)**

**From:** Kevin S. Huffman
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 08, 2011 8:02 AM

**Subject:** Draft waiver and appendices

Colleagues,

I am attaching for your attention four documents:

- A draft waiver application in the format required by the U.S. Education Department
- Two additional appendices for the waiver that will help explain some of the key content (note: the formal waiver rules require numerous additional appendices, which we are not attaching here).
- A short memo identifying the most important sections of the waiver for consideration

We have made a number of changes since the webinar, thanks to thoughtful input and suggestions from many of you and from additional experts. We anticipate making some additional changes this week prior to submitting the request next Monday, November 14.

If you have any additional feedback, please send it to Dominique.baillet@tn.gov, so that we can compile and review suggestions. Also, please note that we will make many stylistic and editing changes this week, but we did not want to hold up substantive feedback while we edit the document.

Thank you, as always, for your time and thoughts.

Best,

Kevin

**From:** Kevin S. Huffman
**Sent:** Monday, November 14, 2011 11:39 AM

**Subject:** ESEA waiver: school lists

Colleagues,

Last Tuesday, I shared with you a draft of our application for a waiver from the U.S. Department of Education. We appreciate the feedback and will release the final version of the application later this afternoon.

As I noted in the brief memo accompanying the draft, we are required under the federal waiver rules to include a list with preliminary designations of three types of schools when we submit our application later today: Reward, Focus, and Priority schools. These lists are preliminary (though obviously publicly available as part of the application) because we will run the lists again at the conclusion of this school year using the 2011-12 data. As a reminder:

- Reward schools are the 5 percent of schools in the state with the highest overall proficiency and the top 5 percent with fastest overall growth by TVAAS
- Focus schools include any high schools with a graduation rate below 60 percent not included in Priority schools; any school with any sub-group at less than 5 percent proficiency; and those schools (up to 10 percent of schools) with the largest achievement gaps among sub-groups of students (between non-white and white students economically disadvantaged students and their peers, students with disabilities and their peers, and students with limited English proficiency and their peers); and
- Priority schools are the 5 percent of schools with lowest overall proficiency rates on state tests.

I have attached here the list of schools we will be submitting to USED later today with preliminary designations as reward, focus, or priority. You will also find attached a short summary explaining how these lists were generated, as well as the more detailed methodology for each list. The summary will also be used to inform conversations with the media.

Please note that these lists are for your internal review, but are embargoed, as we will be sharing with the press on an embargoed basis until we submit the application later this evening. I will be sending an open letter to teachers and principals to share the application with them tomorrow, as well.

Thank you all for your help in shaping our application with your feedback and questions, and I look forward to keeping you updated on the status of it. If you have questions, please reach out to Patrick Smith or Barry Olhausen, since I may be hard to reach while we finish the application and submit it today.

Best,

Kevin

| Category of feedback | Representative Concerns/Comments | TDOE Action |
|---|---|---|
| *Achievement AMO* | The current method of setting goals horizontally (setting 7th grade goals based on 7th grade results last year) may be problematic small class sizes. In small classes, especially in elementary school, the horizontal method leads to goals that are too high or too low (i.e., last year's 5th grade had 72% passing on RLA. 4th grade had 45% passing. That cohort now has a 5th grade goal of 77%. Alternatively, last year's 7th grade had 32% passing on math, but 6th grade had 41%. Same cohort can meet this year's goal even with lower achievement rate. Suggestion to set goals diagonally; i.e., set 7th grade goals for based on 6th grade results from previous year (same cohort) | - TDOE understands the challenges posed by the volatitility of cohort sizes and year-to-year proficiency baselines<br>- To address this, TVAAS scores will be used as a "safe harbor" for achievement based AMOs |
| *Achievement AMO* | Not enough relief to LEAs on students with disabilities. | - TDOE believes that it is imperative to aspire toward closing the achievement gaps for all subgroups |
| *Achievement AMO* | LEAs should get to count one year, two year, or three year data for meeting AMOs as currently get to for AYP. | - TDOE may consider this suggestion as we anticipate the potential for future refinements |
| *Achievement AMO* | Need to keep safe harbor as a way to meet AYP | - TDOE agrees. There will be two forms of safe harbor: (1) we are proposing safe harbor based on "green" TVAAS scores, (2) we will continue safe harbor based on reductions of percent below proficient (see "safe harbors" in section 2B of waiver application) |
| *Achievement AMO* | Shouldn't add 3rd grade math and 7th grade reading AMO categories when also included in aggregate 3-8 scores. | - 3rd grade math and 7th grade reading already exist as goals under Tennessee's Race to the Top plan and we believe it is important to align our AMOs with RttT where sensible |
| *Achievement AMO* | Using aggregate data is better than narrow data points which can change too easily and are too narrow for real evaluations of school effectiveness and can be easily affected by the particular class or group. Let districts decide what is best, and use only grad rate and achievement gap closure | - TDOE is proposing a combination of AMOs based on aggregated grades and individual grades, as they align with our RttT plan |
| *Achievement AMO* | Need multiple years of data for Alg II before set a baseline, if we use Alg II instead of Alg I. | - TDOE agrees. We intend on incorporating Algebra II data when it is sufficiently available. In the meantime, we will rely on Algebra I as the high school math measure. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *Achievement* | Leave n count for subgroups at 45, instead of changing to 30 | - TDOE has decided to use an N count of 30 because the prior N count of 45 masks many subgroups at a school level. Research shows that a majority of states (26 in a 2005 study) use N counts of 30 or less for subgroup accountability. We believe that reducing our N count will create greater transparency and drive student improvement for all subgroups. |
| *Achievement* | Consider using English III for new measure instead of English II | - TDOE agrees. We intend on incorporating English III data when it is sufficiently available. |
| *AMO* | | |
| *Gap Closure* | 10% each year is high (NCLB allowed safe harbor for a 10% improvement already but many districts have not been able to make gains that large). | - TDOE has seriously considered this feedback and after thoughtful analysis has decided to reset gap closure AMOs at 6% annual reduction. |
| *Gap Closure* | When comparing gaps for subgroups, compare each group to the school. The overall p/a should be compared to the subgroups. Our goal should be to move all of our groups forward. if we move whites forward and nonwhites forward at the same pace we do not close the gap. The policy suggested would make one want to slow down the groups with the best scores. The gaps for which we are held accountable should be subgroups compared to an all inclusive school average | - TDOE recognizes that there can be a tension between raising overall proficiency and closing achievement gaps. However, we believe the combination of having dual categories of AMOs set around (1) overall Achievement, and (2) Gap Closure, with differentiated interventions based on how goals were missed (e.g. if gaps did not narrow because all subgroups increased achievement vs. if gaps widened because subgroups moved backwards) will create incentives to aspire toward achieving both goals while not punishing growth. |
| *AMO* | | |
| *Gap Closure AMO* | Use 3 year average for closing gap, because talking about different sub-groups | - TDOE may consider this suggestion as we anticipate the potential for future refinements |
| *School Designation* | Use all schools in designating Focus schools, not just Title I schools (17 Districts) | - TDOE will include all schools when assessing all priority, focus, and reward schools in order to create equitable systems of accountability. |
| *School Designation* | Use Title I schools only in designating Focus schools (3 Districts) | - See above |
| *School Designation* | Use number of Title I schools to compute the number of Focus schools but then have all schools eligible to be part of the Focus schools list (1 District) | - See above |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *School Designation* | No school exceeding state average achievement should ever be Focus school | - A school will be exempt from "focus" designation if all subgroups are performing above the state averages for their respective subgroups. See the Focus Methodology explanation for more detail. |
| *Assorted* | Tie in AP scores with TVAAS | - TDOE may consider this suggestion as we anticipate the potential for future refinements |
| *Assorted* | GED should count toward grad rate; Rigorous enough and counts for admission to community college | - TDOE may consider this suggestion as we anticipate the potential for future refinements |
| *Assorted* | When offering technical assistance, allow districts to have input as to the personnel providing it | - TDOE is committed to providing LEAs with high quality, differentiated support. |
| *Assorted* | Assessment should correspond with the state standards – now going to national core standards – but we also need to make sure that the assessment is in a form that can show what students know about the content of the assessment, and the technology aspect of that may be questionable, especially for some students who have never even used crayons or colored before, or for whom school has been a rote memorization process due to lack of resources in their native countries | - TDOE will consider this suggestion as we engage in more detailed planning around the implementation of PARCC assessments in 2014-15 |

Attachment 3 Notice and information provided to the public regarding the request

TN.GOV
Department of Education
Kevin Huffman, Commissioner

Governor Bill Haslam

Search

For Residents
For Visitors
For Business
Accessibility Help
Educators
Administrators
Parents - Community
Students
First To The Top
Report Card
Newsroom
Glossary
Contact Us

## Message From Our Agency

A quality education is the fundamental right of every child in Tennessee.

The department provides many services, and it is our responsibility to ensure equal, safe, and quality learning opportunities for all students, pre-kindergarten through 12th grade.

Therefore, our mission is to help teachers teach and children learn. *More*




More about Commissioner Huffman

U.S. House Committee on Education and Labor Testimony - July 27, 2011

## Elementary and Secondary Education Act (NCLB) Flexibility Request

The Tennessee Department of Education has officially requested a waiver from certain portions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, known as No Child Left Behind. If approved, the waiver would allow Tennessee to adopt a new accountability model and be a significant driver for improving instruction and increasing student achievement.

ESEA Waiver Application

U.S. Department of Education's Overview of ESEA Flexibility

## Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM)

TEAM TENNESSEE

This year, educators across Tennessee will begin using the new teacher evaluation system, the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). Additional information about TEAM, including valuable tools and resources, is available here. These pages will be updated regularly, so please check back often for the most current information.

Please watch this message from Commissioner Kevin Huffman on teacher evaluation




## 2011 TCAP Results

The 2010-11 Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program (TCAP) achievement test results are now available. The data tables show the percentage of students who scored at the below basic, basic, proficient, and advanced levels in grades 3-8 in all school systems, as well as the percent growth over last year. High school end of course results and adequate yearly progress determinations under No Child Left Behind are not yet finalized and will likely be released in the coming weeks.

State TCAP Results Grades 3-8

**By Grade**

Tables show student performance separated by grade level within each school system.

- Math: Grades 3-8
- Reading: Grades 3-8
- Science: Grades 3-8
- Social Studies: Grades 3-8

**System Totals**

Tables show combined grades 3-8 student performance for each school system.

- Math
- Reading
- Science
- Social Studies

Excel file containing all data (right-click for option to save)

## TDOE Headlines

**Commissioner Huffman previews and discusses Tennessee's application for an ESEA waiver**

Waiver Application Overview Presentation

Corresponding Audio to Waiver Application Presentation (.mp3)

Tennessee Department of Education Strategic Plan

## Related Topics

- Pre-K
- Teach Tennessee
- TN Diploma Project
- HOPE Scholarship

*More*

TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Budget Hearings Watch Live

Transparency
TNRecovery.gov
Open Government

RACE TO THE TOP FIRST TO THE TOP

## Featured Sites

- TN Diploma Project
- TN Electronic Learning Center

*More*

## Agency Services

- Public School Directory
- Teacher Employment
- Teacher Look-up

*More*

## TN.GOV Services

- Renew Driver's License
- One Stop Business Registration

*More*

# MINUTES
# STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
# JULY 30, 2010

The State Board of Education met for its regular meeting in the First Floor Conference Room of the Davy Crockett Tower, Nashville, Tennessee, at 8:30 a.m., CDT, on July 30, 2010.

**Present..... 11** **Absent.....0**

**Mr. Fielding Rolston, Chair**
**Mr. Jim Ayers**
**Mr. Flavius Barker**
**Ms. Vernita Justice**
**Ms. Carolyn Pearre**
**Mr. Richard Ray**
**Dr. Jean Anne Rogers**
**Ms. Teresa Sloyan**
**Dr. Melvin Wright**
**Dr. Richard Rhoda, Ex-Officio**
**Mr. Dallas "Chip" Woods, Student**

**Chairman Rolston** called the meeting to order and welcomed members of the audience. He then welcomed Dallas "Chip" Woods as the new student member of the Board.

## I. Consent Items

***A. Adoption of Agenda***
***B. Approval of Minutes from April 16, 2010***

**ACTION**: **Mr. Ray** moved acceptance. **Vice Chair Pearre** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

## II. Report Items

### *A. Milken Educator Award Winner Recognition*

**Mr. Bruce Opie**, Department of Education, introduced **Mr. Matt Marlatt** from Siegel High School in Murfreesboro winner of the Milken Educator Award for 2010. **Mr. Marlatt** addressed the Board. He thanked the Board and expressed his appreciation to his Rutherford County colleagues and all Tennessee teachers.

**Mr. Ray** asked **Mr. Marlatt** about the one thing he could share that could be used to inform all teachers about his success. **Mr. Marlatt** responded that students learn best when they are able to "discover" rather than "work."

**Dr. Rogers** commented that her daughter had the pleasure of having **Mr. Marlatt** as a teacher while in school and that his passion for love of learning is contagious. She added her personal congratulations to him.

***B. Tennessee Council for Career & Technical Education Biennial Report***

**Mr. Thom Smith**, Department of Education, presented this report as required by statute. **Vice Chair Pearre** commented that she was struck by the high graduation percentage of CTE completers and wanted that particular statistic to be recognized.

## III. Action Items (First Reading)

***A. Charter School Appeals Policy***

**Mr. Rich Haglund**, State Board of Education, explained that the staff has developed the procedure for handling charter school appeals over the last several years. This item puts those procedures into a policy.

**Mr. Rolston** noted that the staff has done a good job and refined the procedures based on practice.

**ACTION**: **Vice Chair Pearre** moved acceptance on first reading. **Mr. Ray** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

***B. Preliminary List of Textbooks for Section 1 (Mathematics)***

This item supports the SBE's *Master Plan* by providing a rigorous, relevant curriculum for all students. The Department on Education recommends acceptance of the list for Section I Mathematics on first reading.

**ACTION**: **Dr. Wright** moved acceptance on first reading. **Ms. Justice** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

***C. Curriculum Standards for K-12 Music, 6-12 Theatre, and K-12 Visual Art***

**Ms. Jeanette Crosswhite**, Department of Education, reviewed the standard revision process associated with updating curriculum for music, theater, and the visual arts.

**ACTION**: **Vice Chair Pearre** moved acceptance on first reading. **Ms. Justice** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

***D. Marketing Education Curriculum Standards***

***E. Health Science Education Curriculum Standards***

***F. Business Technology Education Curriculum Standards***

***G. Trade & Industrial Education Curriculum Standards***

**ACTION**: **Mr. Ray** moved acceptance on first reading of these items as a block. **Vice Chair Pearre** seconded. The motion passed unanimously without discussion.

***H. Business Education Teacher Licensure Standards Revision***

**Ms. Kara Burkett**, Department of Education, presented this item and noted these were an update from 2000 and represented the knowledge and skills necessary for licensure in Trade and Industrial areas.

**Vice Chair Pearre** asked about degree requirements for T&I teachers and **Ms. Burkett** responded that a Bachelor of Science degree is a minimal requirement along with a professional license.

***I. Teacher Licensure Standards: English, World Languages, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, and English as a Second Language***

**Mr. Martin Nash**, Department of Education, presented this item and noted that these standards represent the knowledge and skills necessary to complete a traditional teacher education program. He noted that the revision process was done in a new way and involved the formation of ad hoc committees led by the Department of Education subject area specialists.

**Vice Chair Pearre** asked about the major revisions that had occurred and **Mr. Nash** highlighted the major revisions in each area. These licensure standards, when appropriate, have been informed by the Common Core Standards.

**ACTION**: **Dr. Wright** moved acceptance on first reading. **Vice Chair Pearre** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

## *IV. Action Items (Final Reading)*

***A. Health Science Teacher Licensure Clarification***

**Ms. Sheila Carlton**, Department of Education, presented this item. She noted that this guideline amendment would aid local school districts regarding the type of previous employment is acceptable for a licensed health science teacher.

**ACTION**: **Dr. Wright** moved approval. **Vice Chair Pearre** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

***B. Tennessee Standards for Family School Partnerships***

**Mr. Fuller** reviewed how Senate Bill Number 293 directed the Tennessee Department of Education to develop parental involvement standards. He also stated how the standards were aligned with the National Parent Teacher Association standards.

**ACTION**: **Vice Chair Pearre** moved approval. **Dr. Wright** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

***C. Standards for Child Care Centers and School Age Child Care Program Rule Update***

**Mr. Fuller** reviewed how the proposed rule would ensure child care programs were compliant with rules of the Department of Safety as they used vehicles to transport students.

**ACTION**: **Mr. Ray** moved approval. **Dr. Wright** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

***D. Charter School Appeals - Boys Preparatory Nashville, Drexel Preparatory Academy***

**Mr. Haglund**, State Board of Education, reminded the Board members that this item was discussed during the workshop the day before. **Dr. Gary Nixon**, Executive Director of the State Board of Education, recommended that the Board affirm the decision of the Metropolitan Board of Public Education (MBPE) to deny both charter school applications.

**Mr. Ray** moved to vote separately on each appeal. **Dr. Wright** seconded the motion.

**ACTION**: **Mr. Ray** moved to accept Dr. Nixon's recommendation to affirm MBPE's decision to deny Boys Preparatory Nashville. **Dr. Wright** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**ACTION**: **Dr. Wright** moved to remand the decision to the Metropolitan Board of Public Education with instructions to approve the charter contingent upon Drexel addressing, to the satisfaction of the Metropolitan Board of Public Education, the four concerns outlined by the review committee regarding the amended application and sent to Drexel with the June 23, 2010 letter from Mr. Coverstone to Drexel. **Mr. Ray** seconded. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

***E. Praxis Exam Passing Score, Special Education Exam, Policy***

**Mr. Vance Rugaard**, Department of Education, presented this item and discussed how the proposed cut score was 1.0 SEM lower than the recommended.

**Mr. Ray** asked whether this was in the best interest of students – having teachers who were not meeting recommended expectations – and **Mr. Rugaard** responded that setting cut scores requires a balance between finding appropriate level of candidate measurement and having enough employable teacher candidates to meet the numbers necessary for appropriate staffing.

**ACTION**: **Vice Chair Pearre** moved approval. **Dr. Wright** seconded. The motion passed by majority vote with **Mr. Ray** casting a dissenting vote.

***F. High School Mathematics Course Revisions***

**Dr. Sevier** and **Dr. Scott Eddins**, Department of Education, presented this item and stated that these were updates to current courses with the addition of two new courses designed for high school seniors who either 1) had not met the requisite ACT mathematics subtest score, or 2) did not anticipate a career in a STEM area. These courses were created with alignment to the Common Core Standards in mind.

**Mr. Ray** thanked **Dr. Eddins** for the Department's due diligence in the Bridge Math course.

**ACTION**: **Mr. Ray** moved approval. **Dr. Wright** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

***G. Basic Education Program Salary Schedule for Licensed Instructional Personnel and State Mandated Minimum Salary Schedule for Superintendents/Directors of Schools for Fiscal Year 2010-2011***

**Mr. Fuller** stated that the minimum salary schedule had not changed from the previous year.

**ACTION**: **Vice Chair Pearre** moved approval. **Mr. Ray** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

***H. BEP 2.0 Allocations for Fiscal Year 2010-2011***

**Mr. Fuller** reviewed how the BEP was fully funded at a level of $82 million in new dollars to cover inflationary costs. The funding for BEP 2.0 was kept at the same level as originally infused into the formula, two years go.

**Chairman Rolston** recognized the importance of maintaining full funding for the BEP in the midst of significant budget shortfalls.

**ACTION**: **Dr. Wright** moved approval. **Vice Chair Pearre** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

## *I. Common Core Curriculum Standards*

**Mr. Dan Long**, Department of Education, presented this item. These are the Reading/Language Arts standards created in collaboration with the National Governor's Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers. The verbatim adoption of these standards is required for Race to the Top approval.

**Ms. Sloyan** asked about side-by-side analysis with Tennessee standards and **Mr. Long** responded that this process will occur with the 15% of the standards that are optional. She then asked how many states have adopted common core standards. **Mr. Long** responded that 13 states have adopted these standards. **Ms. Sloyan** then asked if he expected science to be added and **Mr. Long** responded that it is anticipated that science will be added in 2012.

**Mr. Ray** stated that he wanted to recognize **Mr. Ralph Barnett**, Department of Education, and CTE for efforts in saying that all children should be on the same course of study.

**ACTION**: **Vice Chair Pearre** moved approval. **Ms. Justice** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

## *J. TCAP Achievement Levels: Standards Setting Process and Implementation*

**Mr. Long** presented this item. **Chairman Rolston** proposed, without objection, breaking the item into two parts; the achievement scores and the implementation process.

**Ms. Sloyan** recognized the 400+ educators that were involved, the third party evaluators, and all the other involved with the process. **Commissioner Tim Webb** expressed his pride and gratitude.

**Chairman Rolston** commented on the 1) legal and psychometric defensibility of the process, 2) the correct alignment to the curriculum, and 3) the appropriateness of the level of rigor of the scores.

**Mr. Woods** expressed his appreciation for the truthfulness of the standards and how these send the correct message to students regarding their achievement.

**ACTION**: **Mr. Ray** moved approval. **Ms. Sloyan** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Next, the Board turned its attention to implementation, especially the setting of annual measureable objectives (AMOs). **Mr. Long** outlined the AMO setting process and the three models for discussion presented to the board. USDOE standards transition plan require a resetting

resulting in the formation of new trajectories toward the goal of 100% proficiency as required by the federal NCLB Act.

**ACTION**: **Mr. Ray** that implementation model three be approved. **Ms. Sloyan** asked for reiteration that this resetting was required and **Mr. Long** replied that it was. **Ms. Sloyan** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

## *V. Teacher Licensure Actions*

***A.*** (b)(6)

**ACTION**: **Mr. Ray** moved approval. **Dr. Wright** seconded. A roll call vote was taken as follows:

| | Yes | No | Absent |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Jim Ayers** | X | | |
| **Flavius Barker** | X | | |
| **Vernita Justice** | X | | |
| **Carolyn Pearre** | X | | |
| **Dick Ray** | X | | |
| **Jean Anne Rogers** | X | | |
| **Fielding Rolston** | X | | |
| **Teresa Sloyan** | X | | |
| **Melvin Wright** | X | | |
| **Chip Woods** | X | | |

The motion passed unanimously.

***B.*** (b)(6)

**ACTION**: **Mr. Ray** moved approval. **Dr. Wright** seconded. A roll call vote was taken as follows:

| | Yes | No | Absent |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Jim Ayers** | X | | |
| **Flavius Barker** | X | | |
| **Vernita Justice** | X | | |
| **Carolyn Pearre** | X | | |
| **Dick Ray** | X | | |
| **Jean Anne Rogers** | X | | |
| **Fielding Rolston** | X | | |
| **Teresa Sloyan** | X | | |
| **Melvin Wright** | X | | |
| **Chip Woods** | X | | |

**C.** (b)(6)

**ACTION**: **Mr. Ray** moved approval. **Dr. Wright** seconded. A roll call vote was taken as follows:

| | Yes | No | Absent |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Jim Ayers** | X | | |
| **Flavius Barker** | X | | |
| **Vernita Justice** | X | | |
| **Carolyn Pearre** | X | | |
| **Dick Ray** | X | | |
| **Jean Anne Rogers** | X | | |
| **Fielding Rolston** | X | | |
| **Teresa Sloyan** | X | | |
| **Melvin Wright** | X | | |
| **Chip Woods** | X | | |

The motion passed unanimously.

***D.*** (b)(6)

**ACTION**: **Mr. Ray** moved approval. **Dr. Wright** seconded. A roll call vote was taken as follows:

| | Yes | No | Absent |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Jim Ayers** | X | | |
| **Flavius Barker** | X | | |
| **Vernita Justice** | X | | |
| **Carolyn Pearre** | X | | |
| **Dick Ray** | X | | |
| **Jean Anne Rogers** | X | | |
| **Fielding Rolston** | X | | |
| **Teresa Sloyan** | X | | |
| **Melvin Wright** | X | | |
| **Chip Woods** | X | | |

The motion passed unanimously.

**E.** (b)(6)

**ACTION**: **Mr. Ray** moved approval. **Dr. Wright** seconded. A roll call vote was taken as follows:

| | Yes | No | Absent |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Jim Ayers** | X | | |
| **Flavius Barker** | X | | |
| **Vernita Justice** | X | | |
| **Carolyn Pearre** | X | | |

| | Yes | No | Absent |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Dick Ray** | X | | |
| **Jean Anne Rogers** | X | | |
| **Fielding Rolston** | X | | |
| **Teresa Sloyan** | X | | |
| **Melvin Wright** | X | | |
| **Chip Woods** | X | | |

The motion passed unanimously.

***F.*** (b)(6)

**ACTION**: **Mr. Ray** moved approval. **Dr. Wright** seconded. A roll call vote was taken as follows:

| | Yes | No | Absent |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Jim Ayers** | X | | |
| **Flavius Barker** | X | | |
| **Vernita Justice** | X | | |
| **Carolyn Pearre** | X | | |
| **Dick Ray** | X | | |
| **Jean Anne Rogers** | X | | |
| **Fielding Rolston** | X | | |
| **Teresa Sloyan** | X | | |
| **Melvin Wright** | X | | |
| **Chip Woods** | X | | |

***G.*** (b)(6)

**ACTION**: **Mr. Ray** moved approval. **Dr. Wright** seconded. A roll call vote was taken as follows:

| | Yes | No | Absent |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Jim Ayers** | X | | |
| **Flavius Barker** | X | | |
| **Vernita Justice** | X | | |
| **Carolyn Pearre** | X | | |
| **Dick Ray** | X | | |
| **Jean Anne Rogers** | X | | |
| **Fielding Rolston** | X | | |
| **Teresa Sloyan** | X | | |
| **Melvin Wright** | X | | |
| **Chip Woods** | X | | |

## VI. Adjournment

**Chairman Rolston** then thanked the Board members for their thoughtful deliberations and announced that the Board will meet next on October 29 and that the 2011 meetings have been scheduled as follows:

January 28

April 15

August 5

October 28

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

application of content. The criteria used to develop the college- and career-readiness standards, as well as the K-12 standards for math and English/language arts were as follows: align with college and work expectations; include rigorous content and application of knowledge through high-order skills; build upon strengths and lessons of current state standards; informed by top-performing countries, so that all students are prepared to succeed in our global economy and society; and are evidence and/or research-based.

The K-8 Math Standards are organized by Domain, Clusters, and Standards. The Domain is considered the overarching ideas that connect topics across the grade levels. The Clusters are designed to demonstrate the grade-by-grade progression of task complexity. The Standards define what a student should be able to know and do at that grade level. The 9-12 Math Standards are organized by conceptual categories: *number and quantity, algebra, functions, modeling, geometry, statistics and probability.*

The K-12 English/language arts Standards are benchmarked to 10 College and Career Readiness Standards. K-8 standards are listed by grade level. Standards in grades 9-12 are listed in two-year bands to allow flexibility in course design. The K-12 standards are separated into four strands: *Reading, Writing, Speaking and Listening.* The use of media is integrated into all areas of the K-12 standards. The standards require students to learn information across disciplines including literacy in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects. The K-12 English/language arts standards are based on learning progressions. Students are required to demonstrate mastery of knowledge and application through several avenues and environments suitable for the work and college environment.

**The Master Plan Connection:**

This item supports the State Board's *Master Plan* by providing a rigorous, relevant curriculum in the areas of elementary and middle school English and mathematics.

**First to the Top Connection:**

Tennessee Race to the Top Application, Section B(1)(i): *Tennessee has been a leader in the grassroots push by states to adopt a common set of high-quality, internationally benchmarked standards that prepare students for college- and career-readiness. We will continue to lead by adopting the Common Core standards at a special State Board of Education meeting the last two weeks of July 2010.*

**The Recommendation:**

The Department of Education recommends adoption of the Common Core mathematics and English/language arts standards on final reading. The SBE staff concurs with this recommendation.

# ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM
# MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

This Memorandum of Agreement ("MOA") is entered into by and between the following States: Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Virginia (collectively the "Participating States" or "Assessment Consortium").

**1. Purpose**. The purpose of this MOA is to form a coalition of states with a shared vision for common assessments that are internationally-benchmarked; build toward college and career readiness by the time of high school graduation; measure a common core of standards for K-12 pursuant to the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices Memorandum of Understanding ("Common Core Standards"); utilize technology for efficiency of delivery and scoring; and are cost effective. An outcome of this shared vision will be a proposal for the federal Race to the Top Assessment Competition in 2010 to develop and implement common, high-quality assessments aligned with the Common Core Standards.

**2. Lead State.** The Participating States agree that Florida shall be designated as the Lead State, and Florida accepts the designation. The Lead State shall manage the work process under this MOA and competitively bid, when determined by the Assessment Consortium, for all services and commodities required to achieve the objectives of this MOA.. In particular, the Lead State shall:

a. Direct and oversee meetings of the Assessment Consortium and set the agendas.

b. Pursuant to the laws of the Lead State, procure any necessary goods and services needed to carry out the intent of this MOA, using the most reasonable form of competitive solicitation and by quotes if no competitive solicitation is required.

c. Although the Lead State shall manage and administer the primary contracts, each Participating State shall be a party to any multi-state agreement, by direct execution or by addendum,. However, each Participating State shall be responsible for enforcing their portion of the work on any multi-state contract. In addition, the Lead State shall not be responsible for any of the contractual obligations of a Participating State.

d. Coordinate, assist, and task the Management Entity as may be reasonably necessary.

e. Serve as liaison with the U.S. Department of Education, and all other third parties on behalf of the Assessment Consortium.

f. The Lead State may resign by notifying the Participating States at least 30 days in advance by written notice. A majority of the Participating States will then appoint a new Lead State.

g. The Participating States may remove the Lead State and appoint a new Lead State by vote of a majority of the Participating States. Upon the resignation or removal of the Lead State, all contracts and other rights and obligations of the Lead State shall be assigned to the new Lead State.

**3. Management Entity.** Services of a Management Entity will be procured and utilized to assist the Consortium in conducting its work. A majority vote of the Assessment Consortium is required to award a contract to the Management Entity.

The Management Entity shall perform the following services:

a. Assist the Lead State in coordinating and running the Assessment Consortium meetings, including acting as a facilitator at the meetings.

b. Perform research and draft reports necessary for developing Requests for Proposals for goods and services.

c. Assist the Lead State in procuring goods and services as agreed upon by Participating States.

d. Provide advice and grant-writing services to the Assessment Consortium to assist them in developing the proposal for the Race to the Top Assessment Competition.

e. Perform any other activities and services that are reasonably requested by the Lead State or any Participating State in order to achieve the purposes of this MOA.

**4. Scope of Work and Responsibilities of the Participating States.** Each Participating State in the Assessment Consortium shall adopt the Common Core Standards which were developed to be internationally benchmarked and to build toward college and career readiness by the time of high school graduation. The Assessment Consortium shall, if funded by Race to the Top Assessment Competition funds, develop common, high-quality assessments which are aligned with the Common Core Standards, utilize technology for efficiency of delivery and scoring, result in a common definition of proficiency, and are cost effective. In order to achieve these deliverables, the Assessment Consortium and the individual Participating States shall perform the following activities.

a. Each Participating State will adopt the Common Core Standards using their state-approved standards-adoption process.

b. The Assessment Consortium will meet to define the process for procuring the services of a Management Entity by April 30, 2010

c. The Assessment Consortium will develop and submit a proposal for funding through the Race to the Top Assessment Competition by June 2010 or the due date established by the U.S. Department of Education.

d. The Assessment Consortium will meet, with the assistance of a Management Entity, to review the status of each Participating State's Common Core Standards adoption by August 2, 2010.

e. The Assessment Consortium will develop a plan by December 10, 2010, for sharing of test items and tasks aligned with the Common Core Standards for use in Participating States' LEAs for formative and interim assessment purposes.

**5. Meetings and Quorum.** Meetings may be called by the Lead State or a majority of the Participating States. Meetings may either be in person or by conference call. Written notice of the meeting shall be sent to all Participating States at least 48 hours in advance, by email, facsimile, or certified mail.

a. A Quorum for any meeting shall consist of designated representatives from at least two-thirds of the Participating States. An individual state may appear by phone and be counted as part of the Quorum. Each Participating State shall have one vote.

b. All actions or decisions of the Assessment Consortium shall, unless otherwise designated elsewhere in this MOA, require a majority vote to pass.

c. Actions and decisions of the Assessment Consortium may also be taken by written directive executed by a majority of the Participating States without a formal meeting.

d. Notwithstanding the above, any amendment to this MOA shall require a unanimous vote of the Participating States.

**6. Exam Results.** Each Participating State shall own their respective assessment results and any other documentation which are developed as a result of any particular state assessment. All Participating States shall jointly own all deliverables produced as a result of this MOA, and shall have the right to utilize all deliverables and documents produced under this MOA for the benefit of their respective state, subject to all state and federal confidentiality laws and regulations.

**7. Termination and Withdrawal of Parties.**

a. This MOA may be terminated by agreement of all the Participating States.

b. Any Participating State may withdraw from this MOA upon thirty days written notice to all Participating States. In addition, any Participating State may immediately withdraw from this MOA upon notice of a loss of state funding to support the assessment work. A notice specifying the reasons for immediate termination shall be sent as soon as possible after the termination to the Participating States.

c. A withdrawn Participating State may only participate in a contract or agreement it executed prior to its withdrawal from the Assessment Consortium and this MOA.

d. A Participating State may have their rights hereunder terminated in the event it fails to perform or comply with any of its material covenants or obligations contained in this MOA, and such failure is not remedied and cured in all material respects within fifteen (15) days after the date written notice of such failure is delivered to the Participating State by the Lead State. A termination for default under this provision shall effectively terminate all contracts and agreements entered into by the terminated Participating State which have been procured through this MOA. Upon demand by the Lead State, the terminated Participating State shall provide written proof that such agreements have been terminated. However, the determination of default must be made by a majority of the Participating States before the Lead State is authorized to take any action against a defaulting Participating State.

**8. Confidential Information.** The Participating States warrant they shall not disclose to any third party any personally identifiable information about any student, without the written consent of the Participating State that owns the data. This applies to information which came from any record or report used by the Assessment Consortium or from any education record which is subject to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, 20 U.S.C. Section 1232g. The term "educational record" shall have the meaning prescribed in 20 U.S.C. Section 1232g(a)(4).

**9. Expenses.** It is the intent of the Participating States to seek funding from various third parties for the development of the common, high quality assessments and other shared deliverables under this MOA, and for the cost of a Management Entity. However, prior to obtaining such funds, the Participating States agree that they shall equally share these expenses. Decisions on whether to incur a shared expense and the amount to incur shall be decided by a majority vote of the Assessment Consortium. Notwithstanding the above, the Participating States also agree that they shall individually pay for any state specific expenses, including travel and the costs related to any state's use of an assessment.

**10. Miscellaneous Provisions.**

**a. Rules of Interpretation.** The Participating States waive application of the principle of contract construction that ambiguities are to be construed against a contract's drafter, and agree that this MOA is a joint product of all Participating States.

**b. Assignment.** No Participating State may assign any of its rights or obligations hereunder without the prior written consent of the Assessment Consortium.

**c. Additional Documentation.** Each Participating State agrees to take such action and to execute and deliver all documents necessary to carry out the terms and conditions of this MOA.

**d. Invalidity and Severability.** In the event that any provision of this Contract shall be held to be invalid, such provision shall be null and void. The validity of the remaining provisions of the MOA shall not in any way be affected thereby.

**e. Counterparts.** This Contract maybe executed in multiple counterparts, each of which shall be deemed to be an original and all of which shall constitute one contract, notwithstanding that all parties are not signatories to the original or the same counterpart, or that signature pages from different counterparts are combined, and the signature of any party to any counterpart shall be deemed to be a signature too and may be appended to any other counterpart.

**f. Authority to Execute.** Each Participating State warrants that it has the authority to enter into this MOA, and the party executing hereunder has the full authority to bind that state.

**IN WITNESS WHEREOF**, the Participating States have, through their duly authorized representative, executed this Memorandum of Agreement, which shall be effective, as of the last signature date below.

**STATE OF ARKANSAS**

By:_____

Name:_____
Title:_____
Date:_____

**STATE OF COLORADO**

By:_____

Name:_____
Title:_____
Date:_____

**STATE OF FLORIDA**

By:_____

Name:_____
Title:_____
Date:_____

**STATE OF ILLINOIS**

By:_____

Name:_____
Title:_____
Date:_____

**STATE OF INDIANA**

By:_____

Name:_____
Title:_____
Date:_____

**STATE OF LOUISIANA**

By:_____

Name:_____
Title:_____
Date:_____

**COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS**

By:_____

Name:_____
Title:_____
Date:_____

**STATE OF MINNESOTA**

By:_____

Name:_____
Title:_____
Date:_____

**STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA**

By:_____

Name:
Title:_____
Date:_____

**STATE OF OHIO**

By:_____

Name:
Title:_____
Date: _____

**COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA**

By:_____

Name:_____
Title:_____
Date:_____

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA**

By:_____

Name:_____
Title:_____
Date:_____

**STATE OF TENNESSEE**

By: _____

Name: Timothy K. Webb, Ed.D.
Title: Commissioner
Date: 01/13/2010

Average statewide proficiency

2010-2011 Achievement Data

| Subject | School Year | Subgroup | State # Tested | State % Tested | State # Below Basic | State % Below Basic | State # Basic | State % Basic | State # Prof | State % Prof | State # Advanced | State % Advanced |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Math | 2010-11 | All Students | 443,140 | 99.7 | 95893 | 21.6 | 165310 | 37.3 | 119897 | 27.1 | 61977 | 14 |
| | 2010-11 | African American | 105,961 | 99.7 | 37718 | 35.6 | 43716 | 41.3 | 18885 | 17.8 | 5632 | 5.3 |
| | 2010-11 | Asian/Pacific Islander | 7,651 | 99.8 | 743 | 9.7 | 1843 | 24.1 | 2399 | 31.4 | 2662 | 34.8 |
| | 2010-11 | Hispanic | 26,399 | 99.8 | 6531 | 24.8 | 11333 | 43 | 6352 | 24.1 | 2161 | 8.2 |
| | 2010-11 | Native American/Alaskan | 950 | 99.4 | 196 | 20.6 | 369 | 38.8 | 270 | 28.4 | 115 | 12.1 |
| | 2010-11 | White | 301,417 | 99.7 | 50553 | 16.8 | 107767 | 35.8 | 91779 | 30.5 | 51292 | 17 |
| | 2010-11 | Ethnic Origin Not Reported | 225 | 98.7 | 63 | 28.1 | 99 | 44.2 | 39 | 17.4 | 23 | 10.1 |
| | 2010-11 | Economically Disadvantaged | 255,505 | 99.6 | 74269 | 29.1 | 104944 | 41.1 | 56792 | 22.2 | 19451 | 7.6 |
| | 2010-11 | Not Economically Disadvantaged | 187,635 | 99.8 | 21624 | 11.5 | 60366 | 32.2 | 63105 | 33.6 | 42526 | 22.7 |
| | 2010-11 | Students with Disabilities | 53,640 | 99.3 | 19689 | 36.7 | 17039 | 31.8 | 10073 | 18.8 | 6817 | 12.7 |
| | 2010-11 | Students w/out Disabilities | 389,500 | 99.8 | 76204 | 19.6 | 148271 | 38.1 | 109824 | 28.2 | 55160 | 14.2 |
| | 2010-11 | Limited English Proficiency (LEP) | 10,189 | 99.8 | 3892 | 38.3 | 4581 | 45 | 1395 | 13.7 | 306 | 3 |
| | 2010-11 | Not LEP | 432,951 | 99.7 | 92001 | 21.3 | 160729 | 37.1 | 118502 | 27.4 | 61671 | 14.2 |
| | 2010-11 | Migrant | 194 | 100 | 49 | 25.3 | 93 | 47.9 | 41 | 21.1 | 11 | 5.7 |
| | 2010-11 | NonMigrant | 442,946 | 99.7 | 95844 | 21.6 | 165217 | 37.3 | 119856 | 27.1 | 61966 | 14 |
| | 2010-11 | Male | 227,409 | 99.7 | 53384 | 23.5 | 81239 | 35.7 | 59715 | 26.3 | 33034 | 14.5 |
| | 2010-11 | Female | 215,635 | 99.7 | 42479 | 19.7 | 84030 | 39 | 60164 | 27.9 | 28936 | 13.4 |
| | 2010-11 | Gender Not Reported | 96 | 99 | 30 | 31.3 | 41 | 42.7 | 18 | 18.8 | 7 | 7.3 |
| | 2010-11 | | 537 | 99.6 | 89 | 16.6 | 183 | 34.1 | 173 | 32.2 | 92 | 17.1 |
| Reading/Language Arts | 2010-11 | All Students | 443,263 | 99.7 | 56174 | 12.7 | 171510 | 38.8 | 164822 | 37.3 | 49795 | 11.3 |
| | 2010-11 | African American | 106,008 | 99.7 | 25374 | 24 | 50372 | 47.6 | 25200 | 23.8 | 4915 | 4.6 |
| | 2010-11 | Asian/Pacific Islander | 7,646 | 99.8 | 613 | 8.3 | 1929 | 26 | 3247 | 43.8 | 1629 | 22 |
| | 2010-11 | Hispanic | 26,374 | 99.7 | 4805 | 18.4 | 12002 | 46.1 | 7769 | 29.8 | 1481 | 5.7 |
| | 2010-11 | Native American/Alaskan | 949 | 99.3 | 118 | 12.5 | 398 | 42 | 345 | 36.4 | 86 | 9.1 |
| | 2010-11 | White | 301,524 | 99.7 | 25146 | 8.3 | 106587 | 35.4 | 127962 | 42.5 | 41565 | 13.8 |
| | 2010-11 | Ethnic Origin Not Reported | 225 | 98.7 | 67 | 30.2 | 45 | 20.3 | 72 | 32.4 | 38 | 17.1 |
| | 2010-11 | Economically Disadvantaged | 255,592 | 99.6 | 47310 | 18.6 | 116899 | 45.9 | 74835 | 29.4 | 15862 | 6.2 |
| | 2010-11 | Not Economically Disadvantaged | 187,671 | 99.8 | 8864 | 4.7 | 54611 | 29.1 | 89987 | 48 | 33933 | 18.1 |
| | 2010-11 | Students with Disabilities | 53,672 | 99.3 | 15573 | 29.1 | 16407 | 30.6 | 12021 | 22.4 | 9574 | 17.9 |
| | 2010-11 | Students w/out Disabilities | 389,591 | 99.8 | 40601 | 10.4 | 155103 | 39.9 | 152801 | 39.3 | 40221 | 10.3 |
| | 2010-11 | Limited English Proficiency (LEP) | 10,145 | 99.4 | 4418 | 43.7 | 4640 | 45.9 | 885 | 8.8 | 166 | 1.6 |
| | 2010-11 | Not LEP | 433,118 | 99.7 | 51756 | 12 | 166870 | 38.6 | 163937 | 37.9 | 49629 | 11.5 |

Average statewide proficiency

2010-2011 Achievement Data

| Subject | School Year | Subgroup | State # Tested | State % Tested | State # Below Basic | State % Below Basic | State # Basic | State % Basic | State # Prof | State % Prof | State # Advanced | State % Advanced |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2010-11 | Migrant | 194 | 100 | 50 | 26.6 | 82 | 43.6 | 47 | 25 | 9 | 4.8 |
| | 2010-11 | NonMigrant | 443,069 | 99.7 | 56124 | 12.7 | 171428 | 38.8 | 164775 | 37.3 | 49786 | 11.3 |
| | 2010-11 | Male | 227,476 | 99.7 | 35424 | 15.6 | 89617 | 39.5 | 79180 | 34.9 | 22749 | 10 |
| | 2010-11 | Female | 215,691 | 99.8 | 20715 | 9.6 | 81874 | 38 | 85616 | 39.8 | 27032 | 12.6 |
| | 2010-11 | Gender Not Reported | 96 | 99 | 35 | 37.2 | 19 | 20.2 | 26 | 27.7 | 14 | 14.9 |
| | 2010-11 | | 537 | 99.6 | 51 | 9.5 | 177 | 33 | 227 | 42.4 | 81 | 15.1 |
| Science | 2010-11 | All Students | 442,718 | 99.6 | 83741 | 18.9 | 114311 | 25.8 | 183341 | 41.4 | 61271 | 13.8 |
| | 2010-11 | African American | 105,876 | 99.6 | 40757 | 38.5 | 34110 | 32.2 | 26324 | 24.9 | 4676 | 4.4 |
| | 2010-11 | Asian/Pacific Islander | 7,647 | 99.8 | 897 | 11.7 | 1290 | 16.9 | 3387 | 44.3 | 2072 | 27.1 |
| | 2010-11 | Hispanic | 26,359 | 99.7 | 6600 | 25 | 8709 | 33 | 9240 | 35.1 | 1807 | 6.9 |
| | 2010-11 | Native American/Alaskan | 946 | 99 | 151 | 16 | 251 | 26.5 | 418 | 44.2 | 126 | 13.3 |
| | 2010-11 | White | 301,128 | 99.6 | 35201 | 11.7 | 69769 | 23.2 | 143644 | 47.7 | 52474 | 17.4 |
| | 2010-11 | Ethnic Origin Not Reported | 225 | 98.7 | 71 | 31.7 | 57 | 25.4 | 72 | 32.1 | 24 | 10.7 |
| | 2010-11 | Economically Disadvantaged | 255,204 | 99.5 | 69918 | 27.4 | 78946 | 30.9 | 87507 | 34.3 | 18798 | 7.4 |
| | 2010-11 | Not Economically Disadvantaged | 187,514 | 99.8 | 13823 | 7.4 | 35365 | 18.9 | 95834 | 51.1 | 42473 | 22.7 |
| | 2010-11 | Students with Disabilities | 53,556 | 99.1 | 18518 | 34.6 | 14031 | 26.2 | 13289 | 24.8 | 7676 | 14.3 |
| | 2010-11 | Students w/out Disabilities | 389,162 | 99.7 | 65223 | 16.8 | 100280 | 25.8 | 170052 | 43.7 | 53595 | 13.8 |
| | 2010-11 | Limited English Proficiency (LEP) | 10,180 | 99.8 | 4841 | 47.6 | 3566 | 35 | 1625 | 16 | 148 | 1.5 |
| | 2010-11 | Not LEP | 432,538 | 99.6 | 78900 | 18.2 | 110745 | 25.6 | 181716 | 42 | 61123 | 14.1 |
| | 2010-11 | Migrant | 194 | 100 | 53 | 27.3 | 77 | 39.7 | 54 | 27.8 | 10 | 5.2 |
| | 2010-11 | NonMigrant | 442,524 | 99.6 | 83688 | 18.9 | 114234 | 25.8 | 183287 | 41.4 | 61261 | 13.8 |
| | 2010-11 | Male | 227,173 | 99.6 | 42591 | 18.8 | 53919 | 23.7 | 94085 | 41.4 | 36539 | 16.1 |
| | 2010-11 | Female | 215,449 | 99.7 | 41109 | 19.1 | 60366 | 28 | 89235 | 41.4 | 24724 | 11.5 |
| | 2010-11 | Gender Not Reported | 96 | 99 | 41 | 42.7 | 26 | 27.1 | 21 | 21.9 | 8 | 8.3 |
| | 2010-11 | | 537 | 99.6 | 64 | 11.9 | 125 | 23.3 | 256 | 47.7 | 92 | 17.1 |

Average statewide proficiency

2010-2011 Achievement Data

| es | Subject | School Year | Subgroup | State # Tested | State % Tested | State # Below Basic | State % Below Basic | State # Basic | State % Basic | State # Prof | State % Prof | State # Advanced | State % Advanced | Sta P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Algebra I | 2010-11 | All Students | 80,106 | 98.3 | 15941 | 19.9 | 22698 | 28.3 | 21001 | 26.2 | 20433 | 25.5 | |
| | | 2010-11 | African American | 19,354 | 96.8 | 5807 | 30 | 6841 | 35.4 | 4548 | 23.5 | 2142 | 11.1 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Asian/Pacific Islander | 1,330 | 99.5 | 107 | 8 | 220 | 16.5 | 284 | 21.4 | 719 | 54.1 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Hispanic | 4,151 | 98.7 | 956 | 23 | 1275 | 30.7 | 1070 | 25.8 | 847 | 20.4 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Native American/Alaskan | 226 | 99.1 | 53 | 23.5 | 62 | 27.4 | 59 | 26.1 | 52 | 23 | |
| | | 2010-11 | White | 54,899 | 98.8 | 8988 | 16.4 | 14264 | 26 | 15001 | 27.3 | 16632 | 30.3 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Ethnic Origin Not Reported | 31 | 93.9 | 6 | 19.4 | 10 | 32.3 | 7 | 22.6 | 8 | 25.8 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Economically Disadvantaged | 42,393 | 97.4 | 11861 | 28 | 14187 | 33.5 | 10170 | 24 | 6145 | 14.5 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Not Economically Disadvantaged | 37,656 | 99.3 | 4068 | 10.8 | 8488 | 22.5 | 10820 | 28.7 | 14277 | 37.9 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Economic Status Not Reported | 57 | 90.5 | 12 | 21.1 | 23 | 40.4 | 11 | 19.3 | 11 | 19.3 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Students with Disabilities | 7,746 | 97.7 | 4256 | 55 | 2447 | 31.6 | 813 | 10.5 | 226 | 2.9 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Students w/out Disabilities | 72,360 | 98.4 | 11685 | 16.2 | 20251 | 28 | 20188 | 27.9 | 20207 | 27.9 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Limited English Proficiency (LEP) | 1,217 | 98.7 | 532 | 43.7 | 426 | 35 | 173 | 14.2 | 86 | 7.1 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Not LEP | 78,889 | 98.3 | 15409 | 19.5 | 22272 | 28.2 | 20828 | 26.4 | 20347 | 25.8 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Migrant | 13 | 100 | 5 | 38.5 | 4 | 30.8 | 3 | 23.1 | 1 | 7.7 | |
| | | 2010-11 | NonMigrant | 80,093 | 98.3 | 15936 | 19.9 | 22694 | 28.3 | 20998 | 26.2 | 20432 | 25.5 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Male | 41,642 | 98 | 9822 | 23.6 | 12010 | 28.9 | 10177 | 24.4 | 9617 | 23.1 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Female | 38,399 | 98.6 | 6101 | 15.9 | 10670 | 27.8 | 10812 | 28.2 | 10799 | 28.1 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Gender Not Reported | 65 | 98.5 | 18 | 27.7 | 18 | 27.7 | 12 | 18.5 | 17 | 26.2 | |
| | | 2010-11 | | 115 | 99.1 | 24 | 20.9 | 26 | 22.6 | 32 | 27.8 | 33 | 28.7 | |
| | Biology 1 | 2010-11 | All Students | 70,914 | 97.7 | 16706 | 23.6 | 17707 | 25 | 26568 | 37.5 | 9919 | 14 | |
| | | 2010-11 | African American | 17,331 | 95.7 | 7275 | 42 | 5313 | 30.7 | 4110 | 23.7 | 628 | 3.6 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Asian/Pacific Islander | 1,233 | 98.4 | 185 | 15 | 199 | 16.2 | 468 | 38 | 380 | 30.8 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Hispanic | 3,477 | 97.9 | 1126 | 32.4 | 964 | 27.7 | 1147 | 33 | 240 | 6.9 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Native American/Alaskan | 213 | 98.6 | 52 | 24.4 | 58 | 27.2 | 80 | 37.6 | 23 | 10.8 | |
| | | 2010-11 | White | 48,557 | 98.3 | 8051 | 16.6 | 11150 | 23 | 20718 | 42.7 | 8631 | 17.8 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Ethnic Origin Not Reported | 30 | 100 | 6 | 20 | 9 | 30 | 11 | 36.7 | 4 | 13.3 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Economically Disadvantaged | 36,375 | 96.4 | 12520 | 34.4 | 10738 | 29.5 | 10916 | 30 | 2191 | 6 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Not Economically Disadvantaged | 34,486 | 99 | 4164 | 12.1 | 6956 | 20.2 | 15639 | 45.4 | 7723 | 22.4 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Economic Status Not Reported | 53 | 94.6 | 22 | 41.5 | 13 | 24.5 | 13 | 24.5 | 5 | 9.4 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Students with Disabilities | 6,541 | 96.9 | 3919 | 59.9 | 1667 | 25.5 | 825 | 12.6 | 129 | 2 | |

ed due to student N count ( - ) = Not Applicable or Not Available

Average statewide proficiency

2010-2011 Achievement Data

| es | Subject | School Year | Subgroup | State # Tested | State % Tested | State # Below Basic | State % Below Basic | State # Basic | State % Basic | State # Prof | State % Prof | State # Advanced | State % Advanced | Sta P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 2010-11 | Students w/out Disabilities | 64,369 | 97.7 | 12786 | 19.9 | 16038 | 24.9 | 25742 | 40 | 9790 | 15.2 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Student Disability Status Not Reported | * | 100 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | |
| | | 2010-11 | Limited English Proficiency (LEP) | 1,017 | 98.6 | 668 | 65.8 | 232 | 22.9 | 110 | 10.8 | 5 | 0.5 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Not LEP | 69,897 | 97.6 | 16038 | 22.9 | 17475 | 25 | 26458 | 37.9 | 9914 | 14.2 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Migrant | 10 | 100 | 3 | 30 | 6 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | |
| | | 2010-11 | NonMigrant | 70,904 | 97.7 | 16703 | 23.6 | 17701 | 25 | 26568 | 37.5 | 9918 | 14 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Male | 36,348 | 97.4 | 9296 | 25.6 | 8674 | 23.9 | 12861 | 35.4 | 5507 | 15.2 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Female | 34,521 | 97.9 | 7400 | 21.4 | 9019 | 26.1 | 13699 | 39.7 | 4399 | 12.7 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Gender Not Reported | 45 | 100 | 10 | 22.2 | 14 | 31.1 | 8 | 17.8 | 13 | 28.9 | |
| | | 2010-11 | | 73 | 98.6 | 11 | 15.3 | 14 | 19.4 | 34 | 47.2 | 13 | 18.1 | |
| | English I | 2010-11 | All Students | 71,417 | 97.9 | 7972 | 11.2 | 16149 | 22.6 | 38385 | 53.8 | 8835 | 12.4 | |
| | | 2010-11 | African American | 17,341 | 95.9 | 3378 | 19.5 | 5907 | 34.1 | 7438 | 42.9 | 605 | 3.5 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Asian/Pacific Islander | 1,134 | 99.4 | 82 | 7.2 | 155 | 13.7 | 611 | 53.9 | 285 | 25.2 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Hispanic | 3,497 | 98.2 | 505 | 14.5 | 993 | 28.4 | 1816 | 52 | 177 | 5.1 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Native American/Alaskan | 214 | 98.6 | 22 | 10.3 | 51 | 23.8 | 123 | 57.5 | 18 | 8.4 | |
| | | 2010-11 | White | 49,121 | 98.6 | 3975 | 8.1 | 9026 | 18.4 | 28331 | 57.7 | 7733 | 15.8 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Ethnic Origin Not Reported | 21 | 84 | 5 | 23.8 | 3 | 14.3 | 9 | 42.9 | 4 | 19 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Economically Disadvantaged | 37,056 | 96.7 | 6361 | 17.2 | 11374 | 30.7 | 17360 | 46.9 | 1919 | 5.2 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Not Economically Disadvantaged | 34,308 | 99.3 | 1596 | 4.7 | 4762 | 13.9 | 21003 | 61.3 | 6913 | 20.2 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Economic Status Not Reported | 53 | 93 | 15 | 28.3 | 13 | 24.5 | 22 | 41.5 | 3 | 5.7 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Students with Disabilities | 6,685 | 97.5 | 2616 | 39.2 | 2622 | 39.3 | 1361 | 20.4 | 70 | 1.1 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Students w/out Disabilities | 64,731 | 97.9 | 5355 | 8.3 | 13527 | 20.9 | 37024 | 57.3 | 8765 | 13.6 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Student Disability Status Not Reported | * | 100 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | |
| | | 2010-11 | Limited English Proficiency (LEP) | 682 | 97.7 | 331 | 48.7 | 284 | 41.8 | 64 | 9.4 | 0 | 0 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Not LEP | 70,735 | 97.9 | 7641 | 10.8 | 15865 | 22.5 | 38321 | 54.2 | 8835 | 12.5 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Migrant | 7 | 100 | 2 | 28.6 | 1 | 14.3 | 4 | 57.1 | 0 | 0 | |
| | | 2010-11 | NonMigrant | 71,410 | 97.9 | 7970 | 11.2 | 16148 | 22.6 | 38381 | 53.8 | 8835 | 12.4 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Male | 36,611 | 97.5 | 5425 | 14.8 | 9118 | 24.9 | 18466 | 50.5 | 3557 | 9.7 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Female | 34,764 | 98.3 | 2541 | 7.3 | 7026 | 20.2 | 19899 | 57.3 | 5267 | 15.2 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Gender Not Reported | 42 | 97.7 | 6 | 14.3 | 5 | 11.9 | 20 | 47.6 | 11 | 26.2 | |
| | | 2010-11 | | 89 | 97.8 | 5 | 5.6 | 14 | 15.7 | 57 | 64 | 13 | 14.6 | |

Average statewide proficiency

2010-2011 Achievement Data

| es | Subject | School Year | Subgroup | State # Tested | State % Tested | State # Below Basic | State % Below Basic | State # Basic | State % Basic | State # Prof | State % Prof | State # Advanced | State % Advanced | Sta P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | English II | 2010-11 | All Students | 71,399 | 98.2 | 9657 | 13.5 | 20714 | 29 | 34373 | 48.2 | 6616 | 9.3 | |
| | | 2010-11 | African American | 17,562 | 96.8 | 4339 | 24.7 | 7077 | 40.3 | 5704 | 32.5 | 432 | 2.5 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Asian/Pacific Islander | 1,121 | 98.9 | 82 | 7.3 | 237 | 21.2 | 584 | 52.2 | 216 | 19.3 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Hispanic | 3,182 | 98.4 | 574 | 18.1 | 1149 | 36.2 | 1305 | 41.1 | 145 | 4.6 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Native American/Alaskan | 210 | 98.1 | 42 | 20.1 | 66 | 31.6 | 90 | 43.1 | 11 | 5.3 | |
| | | 2010-11 | White | 49,211 | 98.7 | 4610 | 9.4 | 12156 | 24.7 | 26627 | 54.1 | 5801 | 11.8 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Ethnic Origin Not Reported | 26 | 100 | 4 | 15.4 | 6 | 23.1 | 14 | 53.8 | 2 | 7.7 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Economically Disadvantaged | 35,637 | 97.2 | 7410 | 20.8 | 13357 | 37.5 | 13611 | 38.2 | 1228 | 3.4 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Not Economically Disadvantaged | 35,687 | 99.2 | 2212 | 6.2 | 7335 | 20.6 | 20746 | 58.1 | 5387 | 15.1 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Economic Status Not Reported | 75 | 93.8 | 35 | 47.3 | 22 | 29.7 | 16 | 21.6 | 1 | 1.4 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Students with Disabilities | 6,928 | 97.7 | 3167 | 45.8 | 2736 | 39.6 | 965 | 14 | 44 | 0.6 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Students w/out Disabilities | 64,468 | 98.3 | 6489 | 10.1 | 17976 | 27.9 | 33408 | 51.8 | 6572 | 10.2 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Student Disability Status Not Reported | * | 100 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | |
| | | 2010-11 | Limited English Proficiency (LEP) | 689 | 98.1 | 352 | 51.2 | 285 | 41.5 | 49 | 7.1 | 1 | 0.1 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Not LEP | 70,710 | 98.2 | 9305 | 13.2 | 20429 | 28.9 | 34324 | 48.6 | 6615 | 9.4 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Migrant | 11 | 100 | 3 | 27.3 | 3 | 27.3 | 5 | 45.5 | 0 | 0 | |
| | | 2010-11 | NonMigrant | 71,388 | 98.2 | 9654 | 13.5 | 20711 | 29 | 34368 | 48.2 | 6616 | 9.3 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Male | 36,345 | 97.9 | 6084 | 16.8 | 11037 | 30.4 | 16459 | 45.3 | 2741 | 7.5 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Female | 35,005 | 98.5 | 3563 | 10.2 | 9664 | 27.6 | 17890 | 51.1 | 3873 | 11.1 | |
| | | 2010-11 | Gender Not Reported | 49 | 98 | 10 | 20.4 | 13 | 26.5 | 24 | 49 | 2 | 4.1 | |
| | | 2010-11 | | 87 | 100 | 6 | 6.9 | 23 | 26.4 | 49 | 56.3 | 9 | 10.3 | |

Table 2: Reward, Priority, and Focus Schools
Draft list as of November 14, 2011

| LEA Name | School Name | Title I 2011-12 | School NCES ID # | REWARD SCHOOL (Performance) | REWARD SCHOOL (Progress) | PRIORITY SCHOOL | FOCUS SCHOOL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alcoa | Alcoa High School | | 470006000235 | ***A*** | | | |
| Alvin C. York Institute | Alvin C. York Institute | * | 470014402133 | | ***B*** | | |
| Athens | Ingleside Elementary | * | 470012000027 | | | | ***F*** |
| Bedford | Community Elementary | * | 470018000582 | | ***B*** | | |
| Bedford | Harris Middle School | * | 470018000037 | | | | ***G*** |
| Bells | Bells Elementary | * | 470021000045 | | ***B*** | | |
| Blount | Montvale Elementary | * | 470030001916 | | | | ***F*** |
| Bradford | Bradford Elementary | * | 470139000606 | | | | ***F*** |
| Bradley | Michigan Avenue | * | 470033000096 | ***A*** | | | |
| Bradley | North Lee Elementary | | 470033000098 | ***A*** | | | |
| Bradley | Oak Grove Elementary | * | 470033000099 | | | | ***F*** |
| Bradley | Parkview Elementary School | * | 470033002224 | | | | ***F*** |
| Campbell | Caryville Elementary | * | 470042000118 | | | | ***F*** |
| Campbell | Jacksboro Middle School | * | 470042000123 | | ***B*** | | |
| Campbell | Valley View Elementary | * | 470042000135 | | | | ***F*** |
| Carter | Cloudland Elementary School | * | 470051000152 | | | | ***F*** |
| Carter | Little Milligan | * | 470051000161 | | ***B*** | | |
| Cheatham | East Cheatham Elementary | * | 470057000229 | | ***B*** | | |
| Cheatham | Sycamore Middle School | | 470057000361 | | ***B*** | | |
| Claiborne | Cumberland Gap High School | | 470063001690 | | | | ***F*** |
| Claiborne | Ellen Myers Elementary | * | 470063000246 | | | | ***F*** |
| Clay | Hermitage Springs Elementary School | * | 470066000261 | | | | ***F*** |
| Cleveland | Mayfield Elementary | * | 470069000269 | | | | ***F*** |
| Clinton | Clinton Elementary | * | 470072000271 | ***A*** | ***B*** | | |
| Coffee | Deerfield Elementary School | * | 470078002234 | | | | ***F*** |
| Coffee | Hickerson Elementary | * | 470078000288 | | | | ***F*** |
| Coffee | Hillsboro Elementary | * | 470078000289 | | | | ***F*** |
| Crockett | Gadsden Elementary | * | 470085001899 | | | | ***F*** |
| Cumberland | Frank P. Brown Elementary | * | 470090002052 | | ***B*** | | |
| Cumberland | Homestead Elementary School | * | 470090000306 | ***A*** | | | |
| Cumberland | South Cumberland Elementary | * | 470090001835 | | ***B*** | | |
| Cumberland | The Phoenix School | * | 470090002130 | | | | ***F*** |
| Davidson | Bailey Middle School | * | 470318001647 | | | ***C*** | |
| Davidson | Brick Church Middle School | * | 470318001400 | | | ***C*** | |
| Davidson | Buena Vista Elementary Enhanced Option | * | 470318001267 | | | ***C*** | |
| Davidson | Gra-Mar Middle School | * | 470318001307 | | | ***C*** | |
| Davidson | Jere Baxter Middle School | * | 470318001323 | | | ***C*** | |
| Davidson | John Early Paideia Middle Magnet | * | 470318001701 | | | ***C*** | |
| Davidson | Napier Elementary Enhancement Option | * | 470318001350 | | | ***C*** | |
| Davidson | Nashville Diploma Plus | * | 470318002194 | | | ***C*** | |

* A school that achieved both high overall proficiency and high overall growth is designated as both a reward-performance and reward-progress school

Table 2: Reward, Priority, and Focus Schools
Draft list as of November 14, 2011

| LEA Name | School Name | Title I 2011-12 | School NCES ID # | REWARD SCHOOL (Performance) | REWARD SCHOOL (Progress) | PRIORITY SCHOOL | FOCUS SCHOOL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Davidson | Robert Churchwell Museum Magnet Elementary School | * | 470318002201 | | | *C* | |
| Davidson | Smithson-Craighead Middle School | * | 470318002206 | | | *C* | |
| Davidson | Antioch Middle School | * | 470318001052 | | | | *G* |
| Davidson | Cameron Middle School | * | 470318001270 | | | | *G* |
| Davidson | Carter Lawrence Elementary Magnet | * | 470318001379 | | | | *F* |
| Davidson | Chadwell Elementary | * | 470318001273 | | | | *F* |
| Davidson | Charlotte Park Elementary | * | 470318001274 | | *B* | | |
| Davidson | Dan Mills Elementary | * | 470318001283 | | | | *F* |
| Davidson | Dodson Elementary | * | 470318001284 | | | | *F* |
| Davidson | Donelson Middle School | * | 470318001243 | | | | *G* |
| Davidson | Dupont Tyler Middle School | * | 470318001288 | | | | *G* |
| Davidson | Eakin Elementary | | 470318001290 | | | | *F* |
| Davidson | East Literature Magnet | * | 470318000592 | | | | *F* |
| Davidson | Glendale Elementary School | | 470318002054 | *A* | | | |
| Davidson | Goodlettsville Elementary | * | 470318001304 | | | | *F* |
| Davidson | Harpeth Valley Elementary | | 470318001310 | *A* | | | |
| Davidson | Head Middle Mathematics / Science Magnet | | 470318001697 | | | | *F* |
| Davidson | Hillsboro Comp High School | | 470318001318 | | | | *F* |
| Davidson | Hume - Fogg High Academic Magnet | | 470318001320 | *A* | | | |
| Davidson | Joelton Elementary | * | 470318001324 | *A* | *B* | | |
| Davidson | John F. Kennedy Middle School | * | 470318001401 | | | | *G* |
| Davidson | Jones Paideia Magnet | * | 470318001702 | | *B* | | |
| Davidson | Lead Academy | * | 470318002122 | | *B* | | |
| Davidson | Lockeland Elementary Design Center | | 470318001755 | | | | *F* |
| Davidson | M N P S Middle College @ Nashville State Community College | | 470318002101 | *A* | | | |
| Davidson | Madison Middle School | * | 470318002202 | | | | *G* |
| Davidson | Margaret Allen Middle School | * | 470318001338 | | | | *G* |
| Davidson | Martin Luther King Jr Magnet- Pearl High School | | 470318001962 | *A* | *B* | | |
| Davidson | May Werthan Shayne Elementary School | * | 470318002059 | | | | *F* |
| Davidson | Neely's Bend Elementary | * | 470318001351 | | | | *G* |
| Davidson | Neely's Bend Middle School | * | 470318001352 | | | | *G* |
| Davidson | New Vision Academy | * | 470318002235 | | *B* | | |
| Davidson | Percy Priest Elementary | | 470318001361 | *A* | | | |
| Davidson | Rose Park Math/ Science Middle Magnet | * | 470318001365 | | | | *F* |
| Davidson | Stanford Elementary Montessori Design Center | | 470318001707 | | *B* | | |
| Davidson | Sylvan Park Paideia Design Center | | 470318001372 | | | | *F* |
| Davidson | Tusculum Elementary | * | 470318001374 | | | | *F* |

* A school that achieved both high overall proficiency and high overall growth is designated as both a reward-performance and reward-progress school

Table 2: Reward, Priority, and Focus Schools
Draft list as of November 14, 2011

| LEA Name | School Name | Title I 2011-12 | School NCES ID # | REWARD SCHOOL (Performance) | REWARD SCHOOL (Progress) | PRIORITY SCHOOL | FOCUS SCHOOL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Davidson | Una Elementary | * | 470318001376 | | | | *F* |
| Davidson | West End Middle School | | 470318001382 | | *B* | | |
| Dickson | Charlotte Elementary | * | 470102001073 | | *B* | | |
| Dickson | The Discovery School | | 470102001102 | *A* | *B* | | |
| Dickson | White Bluff Elementary | * | 470102000335 | | *B* | | |
| Dyer | Holice Powell Elementary | * | 470105000342 | | | | *F* |
| Dyer | Three Oaks Middle School | * | 470105000934 | | *B* | | |
| Dyer | Trimble Elementary | * | 470105000345 | | | | *F* |
| Dyersburg | Dyersburg High School | | 470108000347 | | | | *F* |
| Dyersburg | Dyersburg Intermediate School | * | 470108000346 | | *B* | | |
| Dyersburg | Dyersburg Middle School | * | 470108001402 | | | | *F* |
| Elizabethton | East Side Elementary | * | 470111000350 | | | | *F* |
| Elizabethton | West Side Elementary | * | 470111000355 | *A* | | | |
| Fayette | East Jr. High School | * | 470117001411 | | | | *F* |
| Fayetteville | Ralph Askins School | * | 470120000372 | | | | *F* |
| Franklin County | Cowan Elementary | * | 470129000386 | | | | *F* |
| Franklin County | Sewanee Elementary | | 470129000402 | *A* | | | |
| Franklin SSD | Franklin Elementary | * | 470126000390 | | | | *F* |
| Franklin SSD | Johnson Elementary | | 470126000396 | | | | *F* |
| Franklin SSD | Liberty Elementary | * | 470126001951 | | | | *F* |
| Gibson Co Sp Dist | Medina Elementary | | 470140000417 | *A* | | | |
| Gibson Co Sp Dist | Spring Hill Elementary | * | 470140000421 | | | | *F* |
| Giles | Giles Co High School | | 470141000429 | | | | *G* |
| Giles | Minor Hill School | * | 470141000430 | | | | *F* |
| Giles | Richland Elementary | * | 470141000432 | | *B* | | |
| Greene | Chuckey Doak Middle School | * | 470147002062 | | *B* | | |
| Greene | McDonald Elementary | * | 470147000450 | | | | *F* |
| Greene | North Greene High School | * | 470147000453 | | *B* | | |
| Greene | South Greene High School | * | 470147000455 | *A* | *B* | | |
| H Rock Bruceton | Central Elementary | * | 470189000627 | | | | *F* |
| Hamblen | Fairview Marguerite | * | 470000100480 | | *B* | | |
| Hamblen | Union Heights Elementary | * | 470000100485 | | *B* | | |
| Hamilton | Brainerd High School | * | 470159000626 | | | *C* | |
| Hamilton | Howard School Of Academics Technology | * | 470159000759 | | | *C* | |
| Hamilton | Battle Academy For Teaching Learning | * | 470159001787 | | | | *F* |
| Hamilton | Chattanooga Girls Leadership Academy | * | 470159002211 | | | *C* | |
| Hamilton | Chattanooga School For Arts And Sciences CSAS Lower | | 470159000674 | *A* | | | |
| Hamilton | Chattanooga School For Arts And Sciences CSAS Upper | | 470159000669 | *A* | | | |
| Hamilton | Chattanooga School For The Liberal Arts | | 470159000763 | *A* | | | |

* A school that achieved both high overall proficiency and high overall growth is designated as both a reward-performance and reward-progress school

Attachment 9

Table 2: Reward, Priority, and Focus Schools
Draft list as of November 14, 2011

| LEA Name | School Name | Title I 2011-12 | School NCES ID # | REWARD SCHOOL (Performance) | REWARD SCHOOL (Progress) | PRIORITY SCHOOL | FOCUS SCHOOL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hamilton | Dalewood Middle School | * | 470159000704 | | | ***C*** | |
| Hamilton | Dupont Elementary | * | 470159000711 | | | | ***F*** |
| Hamilton | East Ridge High School | * | 470159000501 | | | | ***G*** |
| Hamilton | Falling Water Elementary | * | 470159000503 | | | | ***F*** |
| Hamilton | Harrison Elementary | * | 470159000506 | | | | ***F*** |
| Hamilton | Lakeside Academy | * | 470159000762 | | | | ***F*** |
| Hamilton | Lookout Mountain Elementary | | 470159000509 | ***A*** | | | |
| Hamilton | Lookout Valley Middle / High School | * | 470159000781 | | | | ***F*** |
| Hamilton | Orchard Knob Elementary | * | 470159000800 | | | ***C*** | |
| Hamilton | Orchard Knob Middle | * | 470159000801 | | | ***C*** | |
| Hamilton | Sale Creek Middle / High School | | 470159000520 | | | | ***F*** |
| Hamilton | Sequoyah High School | * | 470159000521 | | | | ***G*** |
| Hamilton | Signal Mountain Middle/High School *(High School)* | | 470159000523 | ***A*** | | | |
| Hamilton | Signal Mountain Middle/High School *(Middle School)* | | 470159000523 | ***A*** | | | |
| Hamilton | Snow Hill Elementary | | 470159000524 | | ***B*** | | |
| Hamilton | Thrasher Elementary | | 470159000529 | ***A*** | | | |
| Hamilton | Tommie F. Brown International Academy | * | 470159001791 | | | | ***F*** |
| Hamilton | Woodmore Elementary | * | 470159000828 | | | ***C*** | |
| Hardeman | Bolivar Elementary | * | 470165000539 | | | | ***F*** |
| Hardeman | Bolivar Middle School | * | 470165000540 | | | | ***F*** |
| Hardeman | Central High School | * | 470165000541 | | | | ***F*** |
| Hardeman | Middleton High School | * | 470165000547 | | | | ***F*** |
| Hardin | East Hardin Elementary | * | 470168002246 | | | | ***F*** |
| Hawkins | Church Hill Intermediate School | * | 470174002240 | | ***B*** | | |
| Hawkins | Mt Carmel Elementary | * | 470174000585 | | ***B*** | | |
| Haywood | Haywood High School | | 470177000597 | | | | ***F*** |
| Haywood | Haywood Jr High School | | 470177001952 | | | | ***F*** |
| Henderson | South Side Elementary | * | 470180001953 | | ***B*** | | |
| Humboldt | East Elementary School | * | 470195002239 | | | | ***F*** |
| Humboldt | Humboldt Middle School | * | 470195000635 | | ***B*** | | |
| Humphreys | Mc Ewen Elementary | * | 470198001442 | | ***B*** | | |
| Humphreys | Mc Ewen High School | | 470198000641 | | | | ***F*** |
| Humphreys | Waverly Elementary | * | 470198000643 | | | | ***F*** |
| Huntingdon | Huntingdon High School | | 470201000646 | | | | ***F*** |
| Huntingdon | Huntingdon Primary | * | 470201000647 | | | | ***F*** |
| Jefferson | Talbott Elementary | * | 470210000689 | | | | ***F*** |
| Johnson | Mountain City Elementary | * | 470216000699 | ***A*** | | | |
| Johnson City | Woodland Elementary | * | 470213000673 | | ***B*** | | |
| Kingsport | Jefferson Elementary | | 470219000708 | ***A*** | ***B*** | | |

* A school that achieved both high overall proficiency and high overall growth is designated as both a reward-performance and reward-progress school

Attachment 9

Table 2: Reward, Priority, and Focus Schools
Draft list as of November 14, 2011

| LEA Name | School Name | Title I 2011-12 | School NCES ID # | REWARD SCHOOL (Performance) | REWARD SCHOOL (Progress) | PRIORITY SCHOOL | FOCUS SCHOOL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kingsport | Washington Elementary | | 470219000715 | ***A*** | ***B*** | | |
| Knox | Beaumont Elementary/Magnet | * | 470222000772 | | | | ***F*** |
| Knox | Blue Grass Elementary | | 470222000720 | ***A*** | | | |
| Knox | Copper Ridge Elementary | | 470222001846 | | ***B*** | | |
| Knox | Corryton Elementary | | 470222000730 | | | | ***F*** |
| Knox | Dr. Paul L. Kelley Volunteer Academy | * | 470222002249 | | | | ***H*** |
| Knox | Mooreland Heights Elementary | * | 470222000796 | | ***B*** | | |
| Knox | New Hopewell Elementary | | 470222000753 | | | | ***F*** |
| Knox | Northwest Middle School | * | 470222000797 | | | | ***G*** |
| Knox | Norwood Elementary | * | 470222000798 | | ***B*** | | |
| Knox | Powell High School | | 470222000755 | | ***B*** | | |
| Knox | Sequoyah Elementary | | 470222000810 | ***A*** | | | |
| Knox | South Doyle High School | | 470222000732 | | ***B*** | | |
| Knox | Sterchi Elementary | | 470222000817 | ***A*** | | | |
| Knox | Vine Middle/Magnet | * | 470222000820 | | | | ***G*** |
| Knox | West High School | | 470222000822 | | | | ***F*** |
| Lake | Lake Co High School | * | 470228000826 | | | | ***F*** |
| Lauderdale | Lauderdale Middle School | * | 470231001970 | | | | ***F*** |
| Lauderdale | Ripley High School | * | 470231000838 | | | | ***F*** |
| Lawrence | David Crockett Elementary | * | 470234000841 | ***A*** | ***B*** | | |
| Loudon | Eaton Elementary | * | 470252000892 | ***A*** | ***B*** | | |
| Loudon | Greenback School | * | 470252000896 | | | | ***F*** |
| Loudon | Steekee Elementary | * | 470252000905 | | | | ***F*** |
| Madison | Arlington Elementary School | * | 470258001336 | | | | ***F*** |
| Madison | Denmark Elementary | * | 470258000915 | | | | ***F*** |
| Madison | Liberty Technology Magnet High School | * | 470258002032 | | ***B*** | | |
| Madison | Lincoln Magnet Elementary | * | 470258000655 | | ***B*** | | |
| Madison | Madison Academic Magnet High School | | 470258002033 | ***A*** | ***B*** | | |
| Madison | North Side High School | * | 470258000920 | | ***B*** | | |
| Madison | Northeast Middle School | * | 470258000083 | | | | ***F*** |
| Madison | Parkview Montessori Magnet School | | 470258000656 | ***A*** | | | |
| Madison | Pope Elementary | * | 470258000924 | | | | ***F*** |
| Madison | South Side High School | * | 470258000925 | | ***B*** | | |
| Marion | South Pittsburg High School | | 470264000941 | | | | ***F*** |
| Marshall | Cornersville School *(High School)* | * | 470267000948 | | ***B*** | | |
| Marshall | Cornersville School *(Middle School)* | * | 470267000948 | | ***B*** | | |
| Maryville | Fort Craig | | 470270000956 | ***A*** | | | |
| Maryville | John Sevier Elementary | * | 470270000957 | | ***B*** | | |
| Maryville | Maryville Intermediate School | * | 470270001242 | ***A*** | ***B*** | | |
| Maryville | Maryville Middle School | | 470270000959 | ***A*** | | | |
| Maury | Mt Pleasant High School | | 470276000974 | | | | ***F*** |

* A school that achieved both high overall proficiency and high overall growth is designated as both a reward-performance and reward-progress school

Attachment 9

Table 2: Reward, Priority, and Focus Schools
Draft list as of November 14, 2011

| LEA Name | School Name | Title I 2011-12 | School NCES ID # | REWARD SCHOOL (Performance) | REWARD SCHOOL (Progress) | PRIORITY SCHOOL | FOCUS SCHOOL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Maury | Spring Hill Middle School | | 470276002227 | | ***B*** | | |
| McMinn | Calhoun Elementary | * | 470282000986 | | ***B*** | | |
| McNairy | Michie Elementary | * | 470288001001 | | | | ***F*** |
| McNairy | Selmer Elementary | | 470288001003 | | | | ***F*** |
| Meigs | Meigs South Elementary | * | 470291001005 | | | | ***F*** |
| Memphis | Airways Middle School | * | 470294001012 | | | ***C*** | |
| Memphis | Alcy Elementary | * | 470294001013 | | | ***C*** | |
| Memphis | Alton Elementary | * | 470294001014 | | ***B*** | | |
| Memphis | American Way Middle | * | 470294002040 | | | ***C*** | |
| Memphis | B T Washington High School | * | 470294001016 | | ***B*** | | |
| Memphis | Bellevue Junior High School | * | 470294001018 | | ***B*** | | |
| Memphis | Brookmeade Elementary | * | 470294001021 | | | ***C*** | |
| Memphis | Brownsville Rd Elementary | * | 470294001022 | | | | ***F*** |
| Memphis | Campus School | | 470294001025 | ***A*** | | | |
| Memphis | Carver High School | * | 470294001027 | | | ***C*** | |
| Memphis | Cherokee Elementary | * | 470294001030 | | | ***C*** | |
| Memphis | Chickasaw Junior High School | * | 470294001032 | | | ***C*** | |
| Memphis | City University Boys Preparatory | * | 470294002209 | | | ***C*** | |
| Memphis | Coleman Elementary | * | 470294001034 | | | ***C*** | |
| Memphis | Cordova Middle School | * | 470294000176 | | | | ***G*** |
| Memphis | Corning Elementary | * | 470294001037 | | | ***C*** | |
| Memphis | Corry Middle School | * | 470294001039 | | | ***C*** | |
| Memphis | Craigmont Middle School | * | 470294001927 | | | | ***F*** |
| Memphis | Cypress Middle School | * | 470294001044 | | | ***C*** | |
| Memphis | Delano Elementary | * | 470294001045 | | | | ***F*** |
| Memphis | Denver Elementary | * | 470294001046 | | | ***C*** | |
| Memphis | Douglass Elementary | * | 470294001048 | | | ***C*** | |
| Memphis | Douglass High School | * | 470294002150 | | | | ***G*** |
| Memphis | Downtown Elementary | * | 470294002041 | | | | ***F*** |
| Memphis | Egypt Elementary | * | 470294001055 | | | ***C*** | |
| Memphis | Fairley Elementary | * | 470294001057 | | | ***C*** | |
| Memphis | Fairley High School | * | 470294001058 | | | ***C*** | |
| Memphis | Fairview Jr High School | * | 470294001059 | | | ***C*** | |
| Memphis | Florida-Kansas Elementary | * | 470294001140 | | ***B*** | | |
| Memphis | Ford Road Elementary | * | 470294001061 | | | ***C*** | |
| Memphis | Frayser Elementary | * | 470294001063 | | | ***C*** | |
| Memphis | Freedom Preparatory Academy | * | 470294002208 | | ***B*** | | |
| Memphis | Geeter Middle School | * | 470294001066 | | | ***C*** | |
| Memphis | Georgia Ave Elementary | * | 470294001067 | | | ***C*** | |
| Memphis | Georgian Hills Elementary | * | 470294001068 | | | ***C*** | |
| Memphis | Grandview Heights Elementary School | * | 470294001075 | | | ***C*** | |

* A school that achieved both high overall proficiency and high overall growth is designated as both a reward-performance and reward-progress school

Table 2: Reward, Priority, and Focus Schools
Draft list as of November 14, 2011

| LEA Name | School Name | Title I 2011-12 | School NCES ID # | REWARD SCHOOL (Performance) | REWARD SCHOOL (Progress) | PRIORITY SCHOOL | FOCUS SCHOOL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Memphis | Graves Elementary | * | 470294001077 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Hamilton Elementary | * | 470294001079 | | *B* | | |
| Memphis | Hamilton High School | * | 470294001080 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Hamilton Middle School | * | 470294001081 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Hanley Elementary | * | 470294001082 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Hickory Ridge Middle School | * | 470294001615 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Hillcrest High School | * | 470294001085 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Hollis F. Price Middle College High School | * | 470294002081 | *A* | *B* | | |
| Memphis | Humes Middle School | * | 470294001087 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Ida B Wells Academy | * | 470294000861 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Idlewild Elementary | * | 470294001088 | | | | *F* |
| Memphis | Kingsbury Middle School | * | 470294002126 | | | | *G* |
| Memphis | KIPP DIAMOND Academy | * | 470294001928 | | | | *G* |
| Memphis | Kirby Middle School | * | 470294001978 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Klondike Elementary | * | 470294001096 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Lanier Middle School | * | 470294001099 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Lester Elementary School | * | 470294001958 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Lucie E. Campbell Elementary | * | 470294002043 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Magnolia Elementary | * | 470294001112 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Manassas High School | * | 470294001113 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Manor Lake Elementary | * | 470294001114 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | MCS Prep School - Northeast | * | 470294002191 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | MCS Prep School - Northwest | * | 470294002188 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | MCS Prep School - Southeast | * | 470294002190 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | MCS Prep School - Southwest | * | 470294002189 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Melrose High School | * | 470294001115 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Memphis Academy Of Health Sciences | * | 470294002046 | | | | *F* |
| Memphis | Memphis Business Academy High School | * | 470294002178 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Middle College High School | * | 470294001974 | | *B* | | |
| Memphis | Newberry Elementary | * | 470294001123 | | | | *G* |
| Memphis | Norris Elementary | * | 470294001124 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Northside High School | * | 470294001125 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Oakhaven Middle School | * | 470294002148 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Oakshire Elementary | * | 470294001128 | | | | *F* |
| Memphis | Omni Prep Academy - North Pointe Middle School | * | 470294002243 | | *B* | | |
| Memphis | Overton High School | * | 470294001130 | | | | *F* |
| Memphis | Peabody Elementary | * | 470294001132 | | | | *F* |
| Memphis | Power Center Academy | * | 470294002171 | | *B* | | |
| Memphis | Raleigh- Bartlett Meadows School | * | 470294001137 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Raleigh Egypt Middle School | * | 470294001136 | | | *C* | |

* A school that achieved both high overall proficiency and high overall growth is designated as both a reward-performance and reward-progress school

Table 2: Reward, Priority, and Focus Schools
Draft list as of November 14, 2011

| LEA Name | School Name | Title I 2011-12 | School NCES ID # | REWARD SCHOOL (Performance) | REWARD SCHOOL (Progress) | PRIORITY SCHOOL | FOCUS SCHOOL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Memphis | Ridgeway High School | * | 470294001142 | | | | *F* |
| Memphis | Ridgeway Middle School | * | 470294001625 | | | | *G* |
| Memphis | Ridgeway/Balmoral Elementary | * | 470294001141 | | | | *F* |
| Memphis | Riverview Middle School | * | 470294001144 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Robert R. Church Elementary School | * | 470294001626 | | *B* | | |
| Memphis | Shady Grove Elementary | * | 470294001149 | | | | *F* |
| Memphis | Sheffield Elementary | * | 470294001152 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Sherwood Middle School | * | 470294001156 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Snowden School | * | 470294001158 | | | | *F* |
| Memphis | South Park Elementary | * | 470294001159 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | South Side Middle | * | 470294002127 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Southern Avenue Middle | * | 470294002232 | | *B* | | |
| Memphis | Spring Hill Elementary | * | 470294001161 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Springdale Elementary | * | 470294001162 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Treadwell Elementary | * | 470294001164 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Treadwell Middle School | * | 470294002217 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Trezevant High School | * | 470294001166 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Vance Middle School | * | 470294001168 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Veritas College Preparatory | * | 470294002248 | | *B* | | |
| Memphis | Vollentine Elementary | * | 470294001169 | | *B* | | |
| Memphis | Westside Elementary | * | 470294001172 | | | | *G* |
| Memphis | Westside Middle | * | 470294002135 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Westwood Elementary | * | 470294001175 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Westwood Middle/ High School | * | 470294001176 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | White Station Elementary | * | 470294001177 | | | | *F* |
| Memphis | White Station High School | | 470294001178 | | | | *F* |
| Memphis | White Station Middle School | | 470294001960 | | *B* | | |
| Memphis | Whitehaven Elementary | * | 470294001180 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Whitney Elementary | * | 470294001183 | | | *C* | |
| Memphis | Willow Oaks Elementary | * | 470294001184 | | | | *F* |
| Memphis | Wooddale Middle | * | 470294001187 | | | *C* | |
| Milan | Milan Elementary | * | 470297000464 | | *B* | | |
| Monroe | Coker Creek Elementary | * | 470300001193 | | | | *F* |
| Monroe | Rural Vale Elementary | * | 470300001198 | | | | *F* |
| Monroe | Tellico Plains Elementary | * | 470300001200 | | | | *F* |
| Montgomery | Montgomery Central Elementary | * | 470303001208 | | *B* | | |
| Montgomery | Moore Magnet Elementary | * | 470303001216 | | | | *F* |
| Montgomery | Rossview Elementary | | 470303002156 | *A* | | | |
| Moore | Moore County High School | | 470306001224 | | | | *F* |
| Morgan | Coalfield School | * | 470309001230 | | | | *F* |
| Morgan | Oakdale School | * | 470309001235 | | | | *F* |

* A school that achieved both high overall proficiency and high overall growth is designated as both a reward-performance and reward-progress school

Table 2: Reward, Priority, and Focus Schools
Draft list as of November 14, 2011

| LEA Name | School Name | Title I 2011-12 | School NCES ID # | REWARD SCHOOL (Performance) | REWARD SCHOOL (Progress) | PRIORITY SCHOOL | FOCUS SCHOOL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Morgan | Petros Joyner Elementary | * | 470309001236 | | | | ***F*** |
| Murfreesboro | Cason Lane Academy | * | 470315000374 | | ***B*** | | |
| Murfreesboro | Hobgood Elementary | * | 470315001250 | | ***B*** | | |
| Murfreesboro | The Discovery School @ Reeves-Rogers | | 470315001248 | ***A*** | | | |
| Oak Ridge | Glenwood Elementary | | 470324001393 | ***A*** | | | |
| Oak Ridge | Willow Brook Elementary | * | 470324001398 | | | | ***F*** |
| Perry | Linden Elementary | * | 470339001432 | | | | ***F*** |
| Polk | Copper Basin Elementary School | * | 470345002070 | | | | ***F*** |
| Putnam | Capshaw Elementary | | 470348001451 | ***A*** | ***B*** | | |
| Putnam | Monterey High School | | 470348001454 | | | | ***F*** |
| Putnam | Park View Elementary | * | 470348001456 | | | | ***F*** |
| Rhea | Frazier Elementary | | 470351001463 | ***A*** | | | |
| Roane | Bowers Elementary | * | 470359000569 | | | | ***F*** |
| Roane | Cherokee Middle School | | 470359001475 | | ***B*** | | |
| Roane | Harriman High School | | 470359000567 | | | | ***F*** |
| Roane | Midtown Elementary | * | 470359001480 | | | | ***F*** |
| Roane | Midway Elementary | * | 470359001481 | | | | ***F*** |
| Robertson | Jo Byrns High School *(High School)* | | 470360001500 | | ***B*** | | |
| Robertson | Jo Byrns High School *(Middle School)* | | 470360001500 | | ***B*** | | |
| Robertson | Springfield Middle School | | 470360001504 | | | | ***G*** |
| Rogersville | Rogersville Elementary | * | 470366001508 | | ***B*** | | |
| Rutherford | Barfield Elementary | | 470369000955 | ***A*** | ***B*** | | |
| Rutherford | Central Magnet School *(High School)* | | 470369002247 | ***A*** | | | |
| Rutherford | Central Magnet School *(Middle School)* | | 470369002247 | ***A*** | | | |
| Rutherford | Eagleville School *(Elementary/Middle School)* | | 470369001516 | ***A*** | | | |
| Rutherford | Homer Pittard Campus School | | 470369001521 | ***A*** | | | |
| Rutherford | John Colemon Elementary | * | 470369001512 | | | | ***F*** |
| Rutherford | McFadden School Of Excellence | | 470369001522 | ***A*** | | | |
| Rutherford | Smyrna Middle School | | 470369001529 | | | | ***G*** |
| Scott | Burchfield Elementary | * | 470372001533 | | | | ***F*** |
| Scott | Fairview Elementary | * | 470372001965 | | | | ***F*** |
| Scott | Huntsville Elementary | * | 470372001535 | | | | ***F*** |
| Scott | Scott High School | * | 470372001539 | | ***B*** | | |
| Sevier | Catons Chapel Elementary | * | 470378001548 | | | | ***F*** |
| Sevier | Gatlinburg Pittman High | | 470378001549 | | | | ***G*** |
| Shelby | Bailey Station Elementary School | | 470381002076 | ***A*** | | | |
| Shelby | Barrets Elementary School | | 470381001568 | ***A*** | | | |
| Shelby | Collierville Elementary | | 470381001573 | ***A*** | | | |
| Shelby | Collierville Middle School | | 470381001575 | ***A*** | | | |
| Shelby | Crosswind Elementary | | 470381000147 | ***A*** | | | |

* A school that achieved both high overall proficiency and high overall growth is designated as both a reward-performance and reward-progress school

Attachment 9

Table 2: Reward, Priority, and Focus Schools
Draft list as of November 14, 2011

| LEA Name | School Name | Title I 2011-12 | School NCES ID # | REWARD SCHOOL (Performance) | REWARD SCHOOL (Progress) | PRIORITY SCHOOL | FOCUS SCHOOL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Shelby | E A Harrold Elementary | * | 470381001858 | | | | ***F*** |
| Shelby | Houston High School | | 470381002001 | ***A*** | ***B*** | | |
| Shelby | Lakeland Elementary School | | 470381001547 | ***A*** | | | |
| Shelby | Rivercrest Elementary | * | 470381000972 | | | | ***F*** |
| Shelby | Shadowlawn Middle School | | 470381001594 | | | | ***F*** |
| Smith | Defeated Elementary | * | 470387001598 | | | | ***F*** |
| Smith | New Middleton Elementary | * | 470387001602 | | | | ***F*** |
| South Carroll | Clarksburg School | * | 470390000064 | ***A*** | | | |
| Stewart | Dover Elementary | * | 470396001610 | | ***B*** | | |
| Sullivan | Central Heights Elementary | * | 470399001623 | | | | ***F*** |
| Sullivan | Sullivan Elementary | * | 470399001649 | | | | ***F*** |
| Sumner | Bethpage Elementary | * | 470402001657 | ***A*** | ***B*** | | |
| Sumner | Indian Lake Elementary | | 470402001864 | ***A*** | | | |
| Sumner | Merrol Hyde Magnet School *(High School)* | | 470402001665 | ***A*** | | | |
| Sumner | Merrol Hyde Magnet School *(Elementary/Middle School)* | | 470402001665 | ***A*** | | | |
| Sumner | Union Elementary School | | 470402001676 | ***A*** | | | |
| Sumner | Westmoreland High School | | 470402001683 | | | | ***G*** |
| Tipton | Brighton Elementary | * | 470408001689 | | ***B*** | | |
| Tipton | Brighton Middle School | * | 470408001228 | | ***B*** | | |
| Tipton | Covington High School | | 470408001692 | | ***B*** | | |
| Tipton | Crestview Middle School | * | 470408000043 | | | | ***F*** |
| Trenton | Peabody High School | * | 470410001703 | | | | ***F*** |
| Trenton | Trenton Elementary | * | 470410001705 | | | | ***F*** |
| Trousdale | Trousdale Co High School | | 470417001709 | | ***B*** | | |
| Tullahoma | Jack T Farrar Elementary | * | 470420001713 | | | | ***F*** |
| Unicoi | Rock Creek Elementary | * | 470423001721 | ***A*** | | | |
| Unicoi | Unicoi Co High School | * | 470423001723 | | ***B*** | | |
| Unicoi | Unicoi Co Middle School | * | 470423000047 | | ***B*** | | |
| Union City | Union City Elementary School | * | 470426001726 | | | | ***F*** |
| Union City | Union City High School | | 470426001729 | | | | ***F*** |
| Union City | Union City Middle School | * | 470426001730 | | | | ***F*** |
| Van Buren | Spencer Elementary | * | 470432001737 | | | | ***F*** |
| Van Buren | Van Buren Co High School | | 470432001738 | | | | ***F*** |
| Warren | Centertown Elementary | * | 470435001740 | | ***B*** | | |
| Warren | Dibrell Elementary | * | 470435001741 | | ***B*** | | |
| Washington | Boones Creek Elementary | * | 470438001753 | | ***B*** | | |
| Washington | Ridgeview Elementary School | | 470438002154 | ***A*** | | | |
| Washington | University School *(Elementary/Middle School)* | | 470438001893 | ***A*** | | | |
| Washington | University School *(High School)* | | 470438001893 | ***A*** | | | |

* A school that achieved both high overall proficiency and high overall growth is designated as both a reward-performance and reward-progress school

Table 2: Reward, Priority, and Focus Schools
Draft list as of November 14, 2011

| LEA Name | School Name | Title I 2011-12 | School NCES ID # | REWARD SCHOOL (Performance) | REWARD SCHOOL (Progress) | PRIORITY SCHOOL | FOCUS SCHOOL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Wayne | Collinwood Elementary | * | 470444001767 | | ***B*** | | |
| Wayne | Frank Hughes School | * | 470444001771 | ***A*** | | | |
| Weakley | Dresden Elementary | * | 470447001777 | | ***B*** | | |
| Weakley | Gleason School | * | 470447001780 | ***A*** | ***B*** | | |
| Weakley | Greenfield School | * | 470447001782 | | | | ***F*** |
| West Carroll Sp Dist | West Carroll Junior/Senior High School *(High School)* | | 470449001913 | | ***B*** | | |
| West Carroll Sp Dist | West Carroll Junior/Senior High School *(Middle School)* | | 470449001913 | | ***B*** | | |
| White | Northfield Elementary School | * | 470450001363 | | | | ***F*** |
| Williamson | Allendale Elementary School | | 470453002244 | ***A*** | | | |
| Williamson | College Grove Elementary | * | 470453001802 | ***A*** | | | |
| Williamson | Fairview Middle School | | 470453001895 | ***A*** | ***B*** | | |
| Williamson | Fred J Page High School | | 470453001806 | ***A*** | ***B*** | | |
| Williamson | Grassland Elementary | | 470453001807 | ***A*** | | | |
| Williamson | Heritage Elementary | * | 470453001239 | ***A*** | | | |
| Williamson | Hunters Bend Elementary | | 470453000456 | ***A*** | | | |
| Williamson | Kenrose Elementary | | 470453001240 | ***A*** | | | |
| Williamson | Lipscomb Elementary | | 470453001810 | ***A*** | | | |
| Williamson | Middle College High School | | 470453001031 | ***A*** | | | |
| Williamson | Pearre Creek Elementary School | | 470453002252 | ***A*** | | | |
| Williamson | Scales Elementary | | 470453001867 | ***A*** | | | |
| Williamson | Spring Station Middle School | | 470453002237 | ***A*** | ***B*** | | |
| Williamson | Sunset Elementary School | | 470453002097 | ***A*** | | | |
| Williamson | Trinity Elementary | | 470453001814 | ***A*** | ***B*** | | |
| Williamson | Walnut Grove Elementary | | 470453002021 | ***A*** | | | |
| Williamson | Winstead Elementary School | | 470453002027 | ***A*** | | | |
| Wilson | W A Wright Elementary | | 470455000054 | | ***B*** | | |

**TOTAL # OF SCHOOLS IN TENNESSEE:** 1687
**TOTAL # OF TITLE I SCHOOLS IN TENNESSEE:** 1120
**TOTAL # OF TITLE I PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS IN TENNESSEE WITH GRADUATION RATES LESS THAN 60%:** 9

**USED Criteria and Legend**

Reward School Criteria
**A -** Highest-performing school
**B -** Highest-progress school

Priority School Criteria
**C -** Lowest 5% of schools based on proficiency in the "all students" group

* A school that achieved both high overall proficiency and high overall growth is designated as both a reward-performance and reward-progress school

Attachment 9

Table 2: Reward, Priority, and Focus Schools
Draft list as of November 14, 2011

| LEA Name | School Name | Title I 2011-12 | School NCES ID # | REWARD SCHOOL (Performance) | REWARD SCHOOL (Progress) | PRIORITY SCHOOL | FOCUS SCHOOL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *D - N/A: High school with graduation rate less than 60% --> not considered separately* | | | | | | | |
| *E - N/A: Tier I or Tier II SIG school --> re-identified all priority schools based on new methodology* | | | | | | | |
| Focus School Criteria | | | | | | | |
| **F** - Has the largest within-school gaps between the hgihest-achieving subgroup(s) and the lowest-achieving subgroup(s) | | | | | | | |
| **G** - Has a subgroup or subgroups with low achievement (5% threshold determined by TDOE) | | | | | | | |
| **H** - High schools with graduation rates less than 60% over a number of years that is not identified as a priority school | | | | | | | |

Note:
- Schools were excluded from the analysis if they are Alternative, SPED, Adult, or CTE; and if there was insufficient data.
- Elementary/Middle Schools and High Schools were assessed separately; Schools that span both levels were assessed twice, once for each category
- Draft list based on two years of achievement data (2009-10 and 2010-11) except when TVAAS composite index scores were used to calculate Reward Progress schools, which includes three years of data (2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11)

* A school that achieved both high overall proficiency and high overall growth is designated as both a reward-performance and reward-progress school

# Final Report of the Teacher Evaluation Advisory Committee

*Prepared by the TN Department of Education for Senate Finance Ways and Means Sunset Hearing*
*May 10, 2011*

## TEAC Context and Statutory Responsibility

Established under Tennessee's *First to the Top Act* in January 2010, the 15-member Teacher Evaluation Advisory Committee (TEAC) is charged with developing and recommending broad parameters for the components to be included in the state's new educator evaluation system.

### TEAC Statutory Responsibilities and Timeline

Statutory charge outlined in *TN code Annotated, Section 49-1-302(d)(1) and (2)* includes:

- *"The committee shall develop and recommend to the board, guidelines and criteria for the annual evaluation of all teachers and principals employed by LEAs, including a local-level evaluation grievance procedure"*
  - Teacher and Principal Evaluation guidelines and criteria (see p.2 for highlights)
    - Approved by SBOE on first reading on 10.29.10
    - Final TEAC review and approval on 4.6.11
    - Approved on final reading by SBOE on 4.15.11
  - Teacher and Principal Evaluation local-level grievance procedures (see p.2 for highlights)
    - Approved by SBOE on first reading on 1.28.11
    - Final TEAC review and approval on 4.6.11
    - Approved on final reading by SBOE on 4.15.11
- *"Fifteen percent (15%) shall be based on other measures of student achievement selected from a list of such measures developed by the TEAC and adopted by the board."*
  - Teacher and Principal Evaluation 15% student achievement options (see p. 2)
    - TEAC unanimously approved list of options for each educator group on 1.27.11
    - Final TEAC review and approval on 4.6.11
    - Approved on final reading by SBOE on 4.15.11
- *"(iii) Notwithstanding subdivisions (i) and (ii) above, if a particular teacher's or principal's growth data, as described in subdivision (1) above, reflects attainment of a specific achievement level, to be recommended by the TEAC and adopted by the board, then such student growth data may, at the choice of the individual being evaluated, comprise fifty percent (50%) of their evaluation."*
    - Approved by SBOE on first reading on 10.29.10
    - Final TEAC review and approval on 4.6.11
    - Approved on final reading by SBOE on 4.15.11

### TEAC Non-Statutory Areas to Consider

Members of the Committee raised a number of issues for the Tennessee Department of Education (DOE) and the State Board of Education (SBOE) to consider that help support and fully implement the state's new evaluation system. These issues, though integral to the fidelity of implementation of the new system, are not part of the TEAC statutory requirements. As such, the committee prepared a memo outlining these remaining considerations, which has been submitted to the Commissioner of

Education, State Board and Governor since the final TEAC meeting on 4.6.11. These considerations include: evaluator training, data delivery, oversight, and future evaluation of central office staff.

**Highlights of the TEAC recommended and SBOE approved policy for the new evaluation system include:**

*"The committee shall develop and recommend to the board, guidelines and criteria for the annual evaluation of all teachers and principals employed by LEAs, including a local-level evaluation grievance procedure"*

- Evaluations will differentiate teachers and principals into five effectiveness groups: significantly below expectations, below expectations, meets expectations, above expectations, and significantly above expectations;
- The Department of Education will work to develop growth measures for those educators without TVAAS data; in lieu of approved growth measures, school-wide value-added data will be used for those educators' 35 percent growth component while other measures are developed;
- Local-level evaluation grievance procedures provide a means for evaluated teachers and principals to challenge only the accuracy of the data used in the evaluation and the adherence to the evaluation policies adopted by the State Board of Education; disputes are to be resolved at the lowest possible level.

*"Fifteen percent (15%) shall be based on other measures of student achievement selected from a list of such measures developed by the TEAC and adopted by the board."*

- For the 15 percent menus of options, educators can, in collaboration with their supervisors, choose from their educator category's menu of options; options include state assessments, TVAAS, ACT/SAT suites, national or state off-the-shelf assessments approved by the Department of Education, AP/IB/NIC suites, graduation rate/CTE concentrator graduation rate, postsecondary matriculation/persistence/placement, completion/success in advanced coursework, 9$^{th}$ grade promotion to the 10$^{th}$ grade.

*"(iii) Notwithstanding subdivisions (i) and (ii) above, if a particular teacher's or principal's growth data, as described in subdivision (1) above, reflects attainment of a specific achievement level, to be recommended by the TEAC and adopted by the board, then such student growth data may, at the choice of the individual being evaluated, comprise fifty percent (50%) of their evaluation."*

- Educators whose growth score is in the top three quintiles will be able to use this score for the entire 50% student achievement component.

Other criteria for the evaluations:

- 50 percent of the evaluation will be based on qualitative data in four domains, Planning, Environment, Professionalism, and Instruction, drawn from:
  - Multiple and frequent observations (four annually for professionally licensed staff, six annually for apprentice staff)
  - Written and in-person feedback within a week of observation
- Principals and assistant principals who spend at least 50 percent of their time on administrative duties will be evaluated according to a qualitative appraisal instrument based on the Tennessee Instructional Leadership Standards (TILS).

# Tennessee Department of Education
# Application for Approval of Alternate Qualitative Evaluation Instrument/Process Developer Form
# Due May 2, 2011

Directions: Provide the information requested below. This application form is a Word document, so where narrative is required, please insert it directly into the document. **Attach a copy of the rubric and the observation recording forms to this application for submission.** A hard copy of the application with required original signatures should be submitted to:

Tim Gaddis, TN Department of Education
710 James Robertson Parkway
Andrew Johnson Tower, 5th Floor
Nashville, TN 37243

**Developer Information**

**Name of Organization or District:** _____

**Primary Contact Person:** _____

**Address:** _____

**Phone:** _____ **E-mail Address:** _____

**Department Use Only**

**Received: Date**_____

**Reviewed by:** _____ _____ _____

## Assurances

**I/we hereby assure that this alternate model meets all guidelines and criteria set forth by the Tennessee State Board of Education on April 15, 2011, including the following:**

(1) The primary purpose of annual teacher and principal evaluations is to identify and support instruction that will lead to high levels of student achievement.
(2) Evaluations will be used to inform human capital decisions, including, but not limited to individual and group professional development plans, hiring, assignment and promotion, tenure and dismissal, and compensation.
(3) Annual evaluations will differentiate teacher and principal performance into five effectiveness groups according to the individual educator's evaluation results. The five effectiveness groups are: significantly above expectations, above expectations, at expectations, below expectations, significantly below expectations.
(4) The qualitative appraisal instrument must contain the following domains: Planning, Environment, Professionalism, Instruction.
(5) All approved models shall include, but are not limited to a review of prior evaluations, personal conferences to discuss strengths, weaknesses, and remediation, and classroom observation visits.
(6) All educators, other than apprentice teachers and administrators, will have a minimum of four observations, with at least two observations in each semester, for a minimum of at least 60 minutes each school year. Apprentice teachers will have at least six observations, with three in each semester, for a minimum total of at least 90 minutes each school year.
(7) Evaluators will provide written feedback within one week of each observation visit to the educator and schedule an in-person debrief with the educator within one week of each observation visit.

**Authorized Signature for Model Developer** **Date**

**I/we hereby assure that the model developer will cooperate with TN CRED in the ongoing study of the effectiveness of the model through the 2013-14 academic year.**

**Authorized Signature for Model Developer** **Date**

**In the space below, describe the research base that informed the development of this model.**

(Use as much space as necessary)

**In the space below, describe the pilot of the instrument, including but not limited to the description and number of participants, timeframe of the pilot, the training process, and documented outcomes.**

(Use as much space as necessary)

# MINUTES
# STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
# APRIL 15, 2011

The State Board of Education met for its regular meeting in Room 12 of the Legislative Plaza, Nashville, Tennessee, at 9:00 a.m., CDT, on April 15, 2011.

**Present..... 8** **Absent..... 3**

**Mr. Fielding Rolston, Chair**
**Ms. Vernita Justice**
**Ms. Carolyn Pearre**
**Dr. Jean Anne Rogers**
**Ms. Teresa Sloyan**
**Dr. Melvin Wright**
**Dr. Richard Rhoda, Ex-Officio**
**Mr. Chip Woods, Student Member**

**Mr. Jim Ayers**
**Mr. Flavius Barker**
**Mr. Richard Ray**

**Chairman Rolston** called the meeting to order and welcomed members of the audience. He then recognized **Ms. Dannelle Walker** who was recently appointed as General Counsel to the State Board of Education.

## I. Consent Items

***A. Adoption of Agenda***
***B. Approval of Minutes from January 28, 2011***

**ACTION**: **Dr. Wright** moved acceptance. **Ms. Sloyan** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

## II. Report Items

### *A. Blue Ribbon Schools Recognition*

**Mr. James Frances**, Department of Education, recognized 10 schools throughout the state that exceeded the state's accountability criteria for the past 3 years.

Blue Ribbon Schools must be first nominated by the chief state school officer (CSSO) as eligible. Based on state data, the CSSO certifies that the nominated schools meet one of two criteria:

1. At least 40 percent of their students from disadvantaged backgrounds and show dramatic improvement in test scores to high levels in at least the past three years in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics.

1. **Bethpage Elementary**
   Sumner County Schools
   Bill Johnson, Principal
   420 Pld Hwy 31 E
   Bethpage, TN 37022

2. **Cowan Elementary**
   Franklin County Schools
   Cynthia Young, Principal
   501 E. Cumberland Street
   Cowan, TN 37318

2. Regardless of demographics, achieves in the top 10 percent of schools in the state in the school's grade category as measured by state tests of reading (language arts or English) and mathematics in at least the last grade tested in the last year tested.

1. **Big Sandy School**
   Benton County Schools
   Marty Caruthers, Principal
   13305 Hwy69A
   Big Sandy, TN 38221

2. **Douglass Elementary School**
   Shelby County Schools
   Angela Brown, Principal
   1650 Ash Street
   Memphis, TN 38108

3. **Grundy County High School**
   Grundy County Schools
   William Childers, Principal
   24970 SR 108
   Coalmont, TN 37313

4. **Townsend Elementary**
   Blount County Schools
   John Dalton, Principal
   140 Tiger Drive
   Townsend, TN 37882

The nominated schools must successfully complete an intensive application process which is reviewed by the U.S. Department of Education.

**Dr. Debbie Owens**, Department of Education, presented the awards and the schools will also receive a certificate signed by Governor Haslam.

The schools' best practices will be profiled on the Tennessee Department of Education's website in addition to the schools participating in best practice sharing sessions throughout the year.

## *B. Title I Distinguished Schools Recognition*

Mr. Francis recognized four schools as Title I distinguished schools in the following categories:

***National Title I Closing the Achievement Gap Between Student Groups***

**Hollis F. Price**
Memphis City Schools
Daphne Beasley, Principal
807 Walker Avenue
Memphis, TN 38126

***National Title I Exceptional Student Performance***

**South Greene High School**
Greene County Schools
Cindy Bowman, Principal
7469 Asheville Highway
Greeneville, TN 37743

***State Title I Closing the Achievement Gap Between Student Groups***

**North Greene High School**
Greene County Schools
Dr. Vicki Kirk
4675 Old Baileyton
Greeneville, TN 37745

***State Title I Exceptional Student Performance***

**A.H. Roberts Elementary**
Overton County Schools
Matt Eldridge, Principal
302 Zachary Street
Livingston, TN 38570

**Dr. Owens** presented the awards and the schools will also receive a certificate signed by Governor Haslam.

## *C. 2009 Presidential Award Winner Recognition*

Each year the President names more than one hundred science and math teachers as recipients of the prestigious *Presidential Awards for*

*Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching*. These educators receive their awards during a White House ceremony given in their honor.

Winners are selected by a panel of distinguished scientists, mathematicians, and educators following an initial selection process done at the state level. Each year the award alternates, going either to science and math teachers in grades K through 6 or to those teaching in grades 7 through 12 (as it was in this year).

**Ms. Linda Jordan**, Department of Education, recognized (b)(6) Oak Ridge High School and (b)(6), St. Mary's Episcopal School as 2009 winners of the Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching. She noted that these two teachers were among the finest in the nation and were excellent representatives of the State of Tennessee. In addition to being recognized by the State Board of Education, these teachers traveled to Washington, D.C. for meetings and to receive additional rewards.

**Chairman Rolston** congratulated all of these individuals on their achievements.

## III. Action Items (First Reading)

### A. Identification of the Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools Policy

**Dr. Debbie Owens** discussed the reason and rationale for removing one component of the Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools definition. The original definition contained a multiplier for schools not making adequate yearly progress over 6 or more years. Due to the state administering tougher standards and tests, this multiplier definition is being removed.

**Ms. Sloyan** asked if there was a timeline for the reauthorization of *No Child Left Behind*. **Dr. Owens** stated the Department of Education is taking a wait and see approach, but there is momentum building towards a more definite timeline.

**Ms. Sloyan** asked if this would increase or decrease the number of schools on the list. **Dr. Owens** stated that the number of schools identified will remain the same, however, the criteria upon which the school is identified for inclusion on the list is different. Instead of identifying schools based on low performance within potentially just one student subgroup. The new definition is now based on the performance of all students.

**Chairman Rolson** asked for clarification regarding how many new schools will be on the list. **Dr. Owens** stated that there is one school which fell into this category based on the performance of just one student subgroup that will no longer be on the list.

**Vice Chair Pearre** asked if there would be any changes in the funding formula, based on this new change. **Dr. Owens** stated that there would not. However, there is the anticipation of potentially significant cuts for the upcoming fiscal year.

**ACTION**: **Ms. Sloyan** moved acceptance on first reading. **Dr. Wright** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

***B. Definition of a Tennessee Public School, Rule***

**Dr. David Sevier**, State Board of Education, presented this item. He noted that removing the words "one plant" from the definition of a public school would allow for increased flexibility for school districts and also allow for the formation of stand-alone virtual schools. He noted that all other provisions of the definition remain in place.

**ACTION**: **Vice Chair Pearre** moved acceptance on first reading. **Dr. Wright** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

***C. Adult High Schools, Rule***

***D. Summer Schools, Rule***

**Dr. Sevier** presented these items together for consideration. He told members that summer school and adult high schools were the two remaining areas with seat time requirements for advancement. This change to SBE rules and regulations would allow LEAs to advance summer school students and adult students on mastery of content.

**Vice Chair Pearre** suggested the removal of archaic language in the adult high school rule relating to obsolete testing requirements.

**ACTION**: **Vice Chair Pearre** moved acceptance on first reading. **Dr. Wright** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

***E. Computer Technology***

**Mr. Morgan Branch**, Department of Education, presented revisions to the computer technology curriculum. **Mr. Morgan** stated that most of the courses were joint courses between CTE and the academic departments.

**ACTION**: **Dr. Wright** moved acceptance on first reading. **Ms. Sloyan** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

***F. Middle Grades STEM Teacher License Standards***

**Dr. Sevier** presented this. He noted that these are the licensure standards that support the Board's recently approved Middle Grades STEM endorsement. He gave Board members background on the various

constituencies that were involved in the development of the standards and reminded the board the Advisory Council on Teacher Education and Certification (ACTEC) would have an opportunity to review and give input on these standards before final approval.

**Ms. Sloyan** asked whether these had been reviewed by industry and business. **Dr. Sevier** responded that these standards were gleaned from existing math and science licensure standards that had received prior scrutiny. These are the standards for teacher training programs, but there was a conscious effort to ensure that these standards will prepare teacher to deliver the upgraded student curriculum.

**Mr. Woods** asked whether these standards would help ACT scores. **Dr. Sevier** responded that he believed that this new endorsement would certainly be an important part of preparing teachers who were well-prepared to teach the content necessary for success on the Explore, PLAN, and ACT exams.

**ACTION**: **Vice Chair Pearre** moved acceptance on first reading. **Dr. Wright** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

## *IV. Action Items (Final Reading)*

### *A. Introduction to Fine Arts*

**Dr. Sevier** presented this item and reminded the Board that this course would fulfill the high school graduation requirements for one unit of fine arts and that there were no changes from since the first reading.

**ACTION**: **Dr. Wright** moved approval. **Ms. Sloyan** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

### *B. High School Transition Policy*

**Dr. Sevier** presented this and gave Board members some background information on the confusion that has occurred with regard to students enrolled in dual credit courses and end-of-course examinations.

**Dr. Gary Nixon**, Executive Director, State Board of Education, added that most confusion was coming in the area of U.S. History when local districts were requiring students to taken state exams even though they were not enrolled in the high school course.

**Mr. Woods** commented that, in his experience, dual enrollment courses could actually be less challenging than the parallel course at the high school level.

**Dr. Rhoda** responded that higher education works with PreK-12 under a set of assumptions that everyone involved is doing so in a good faith effort to deliver the best instruction possible.

**ACTION**: **Dr. Wright** moved approval. **Ms. Sloyan** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

### *C. Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policy*

**Dr. Nixon** presented this item. He explained that it combines the criteria and guidelines for teacher and principal evaluations and guidelines for grievance procedures that were recommended by the Teacher Evaluation Advisory Council.

**Dr. Rogers** stated that she was concerned as to how cumbersome some of the rubiks are.

**Chairman Rolston** told **Commissioner Patrick Smith** that we needed to see how to simplify them.

**ACTION**: **Ms. Sloyan** moved approval. **Vice Chair Pearre** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

### *D. Non-public Schools – Categories I and VII, Rule Consolidation*

**Ms. Walker**, State Board of Education, presented this item and stated that this rule change would allow students in special purpose schools to be eligible for the HOPE scholarship.

**ACTION**: **Dr. Wright** moved approval. **Vice Chair Pearre** seconded. A roll call vote was taken as follows:

| | Yes | No | Absent |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Jim Ayers** | | | X |
| **Flavius Barker** | | | X |
| **Vernita Justice** | X | | |
| **Carolyn Pearre** | X | | |
| **Dick Ray** | | | X |
| **Jean Anne Rogers** | X | | |
| **Fielding Rolston** | X | | |
| **Teresa Sloyan** | X | | |
| **Melvin Wright** | X | | |
| **Chip Woods** | X | | |

The motion passed unanimously.

***E. Cambridge AICE Substitutions***

**Dr. Sevier** presented this item and reminded the Board that they had heard a presentation of the Cambridge AICE program at the workshop the preceding day. This change would allow the SDE to conduct a course-by-course analysis before presenting the Cambridge AICE program to the Board for approval as a stand-alone path to graduation.

**ACTION**: **Vice Chair Pearre** moved approval. **Dr. Wright** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

***F. International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme***

**Dr. Sevier** told the Board that this was simply a technical correction to earlier SBE action and would add the *International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme* to the list of approved diploma paths.

**ACTION**: **Dr. Wright** moved approval. **Vice Chair Pearre** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

***G. Distance and e-Learning Policy***

This policy revision, presented by **Dr. Sevier**, changes the process by which e-learning content is validated and requires LEAs to ensure that course content meets or exceeds SBE curriculum standards. Likewise, it removes the course approval provisions and treats distance learning and e-learning as a strategy, rather than a type of special course.

**Dr. Sevier** commented that e-learning is an area that is moving quickly and that the Board should expect to see many revisions to this policy over the years to come.

**ACTION**: **Dr. Wright** moved approval. **Vice Chair Pearre** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**V. Adjournment**

**Chairman Rolston** then thanked the Board members for their thoughtful deliberations and announced that the Board will meet next on August 5, 2011 for its regularly scheduled quarterly meeting.

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

**Tennessee State Board of Education**
**April 15, 2011**

**Agenda**
**Final Reading Item: IV. C.**

## Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policy

### The Background:

The First to the Top Legislation passed in the Extraordinary Session of 2010 calls for teachers and principals to be evaluated annually. The legislation established a Teacher Evaluation Advisory Council (TEAC) and charged it with the responsibility of developing and recommending criteria and guidelines for teacher and principal evaluations to the State Board of Education. The legislation also charged the TEAC to recommend to the Board a grievance procedure for LEAs to implement regarding the accuracy of the data and the fidelity to the process used to evaluate teachers and principals.

This item presents the Board's Teacher Evaluation Policy for the State Model Plan for LEA's, including the purpose, responsibility, basic standards, and procedures.

### The Master Plan Connection:

This item supports the State Board's *Master Plan* to improve the quality of teachers and leaders in Tennessee's schools.

### The Race to the Top Connection:

This item implements the requirement of the First to the Top legislation to evaluate teachers and principals annually.

### The Recommendation:

The State Board of Education staff recommends this item be adopted on final reading.

# Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policy

## Guidelines and Criteria

Local boards of education shall develop or adopt evaluation models for teachers and principals. To be approved, these evaluation models must meet the following guidelines and criteria.

General Guidelines

(1) The primary purpose of annual teacher and principal evaluations is to identify and support instruction that will lead to high levels of student achievement.

(2) Evaluations will be used to inform human capital decisions, including, but not limited to individual and group professional development plans, hiring, assignment and promotion, tenure and dismissal, and compensation.

(3) Annual evaluations will differentiate teacher and principal performance into five effectiveness groups according to the individual educator's evaluation results. The five effectiveness groups are: significantly above expectations, above expectations, at expectations, below expectations, significantly below expectations.

Local Evaluation of Teachers, Principals and Non-Instructional, Certified Staff.

Fifty percent of the evaluation criteria shall be comprised of student achievement data, including thirty-five percent based on student growth data and fifteen percent based on other measures of student achievement. The remaining fifty percent of the evaluation criteria shall be based on a rating using the qualitative appraisal instrument contained in each approved evaluation model.

(1) Fifty percent student achievement data. This portion of the evaluation model will use multiple data sources to evaluate educators' effectiveness in affecting student learning growth.

(a) Thirty-five percent student growth measures.

1. For teachers with individual value-added scores, the student growth measures shall be comprised of TVAAS scores.

2. For teachers, librarians, counselors and other groups of educators who do not have individual TVAAS scores, LEAs will choose from a list of options that have been shown capable of measuring student growth. The list of options will be approved by the Department of Education prior to the start of each school year. The Department of Education will continually monitor and revise the list of options under this category based on increasing availability of higher-quality measures of performance. Additionally, the Department of

Education will work to develop valid and reliable student growth measures for those areas that do not currently have them. In lieu of the availability of growth measures for all educators without individual TVAAS scores, school-level value-added scores will be the standard student growth measure while other growth measures are in development. LEAs must:

(i) Provide training to evaluators to assess whether the students instructed by the educator being evaluated have demonstrated sufficient growth for the chosen measure, and

(j) Implement the state's multiple rating categories to measure levels of performance for the chosen measure.

3. For principals and other school administrators who spend at least 50 percent of their time on administrative duties, the student growth measure will be school-level value-added scores.

(b) Fifteen percent other measures of student achievement.

1. Principals and assistant principals, classroom teachers, librarians and all other educators in grades K-8 and 9-12 will select, in collaboration with the evaluator, from the following list of measures. The agreed-upon measure should be a measure aligned as closely as possible to the educator's primary responsibility. If the two parties do not agree on a measure, the evaluator will select a measure.

Principals and teachers in the top three quintiles for student growth may elect to use their growth scores for fifty percent of their evaluation in lieu of selecting another achievement measure for the fifteen percent.

| | State assessments (discipline-specific/TCAP) | School-wide TVAAS or individual TVAAS for teachers in top 3 quintiles | ACT suite of assessments/SAT suite of assessments | National/State-used "off the shelf" assessments based on criteria developed by the TDOE | AP/IB/NIC suites of assessments | Graduation rate / CTE concentrator graduation rate | Postsecondary matriculation/persistence/ placement as defined by TDOE and THEC | Completion/success in advanced coursework, including dual credit and dual enrollment | 9th grade promotion to the 10th grade/ 9th grade retention rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers with TVAAS (4-8) | X | X | X | X | | | | X | |
| Teachers with TVAAS (9-12) | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Principals/ Assistant Principals | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| PK-3 | X | X | | X | | | | | |
| Fine Arts | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Middle/High School non-assessed courses | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| World Languages | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Computer Technology | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Academic Interventionists | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X |
| Library Media Specialists | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X |
| English Language Learner Specialists | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Special Education Specialists | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| CTE | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Caseload Educators | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X |
| PE and Health Educators | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X |

State assessments (discipline-specific/TCAP): Includes, TCAP Achievement (all forms, grades 3-8), TCAP EOC (secondary), TCAP ELDA (K-12 ELL), TCAP Writing (Grades 5, 8, 11), TCAP Constructed Response (Grades 3 and 7), TCAP Alt (SpEd), TCAP MAAS (SpEd).

TVAAS: School-wide value added composite, Individual Teacher Effect composite for teachers in the top 3 quintiles.

National/State "off the shelf" tests: PreK-12 diagnostic or achievement/attainment assessments (e.g. SAT 10, Dibels, DRA, Kindergarten-readiness, end of course, etc.) DOE will develop standard criteria for approval of tests submitted by LEAs.

AP/IB/NIC suites of assessments: Courses designed for Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), National Industry Certification (NIC) assessments.

Graduation Rate/CTE Concentrator Graduation Rate: School level calculated secondary rates or CTE concentrator rates.

Postsecondary matriculation/persistence/placement as determined by the TDOE and THEC: School rates as calculated for each instance.

Participation in advanced coursework: School level calculated secondary rates (e.g. Honors, AP, IB, NIC, college/high school dual enrollment and dual credit) according to SBE uniform grading policy.

9th grade Promotion and Retention Rate: School level calculated rates

2. The State Department of Education will continually monitor and make recommendations to the State Board of Education for revising the menu of options under this category based on increasing availability of higher-quality measures of performance.

(2) Fifty percent other mandatory criteria. This portion of the evaluation model will use multiple data sources to evaluate educator practice against the qualitative appraisal instrument contained in each approved evaluation model.

(a) For all classroom teachers and non-instructional, certified staff other than principals and assistant principals who spend at least 50 percent of their time on administrative duties, the State Board of Education will approve an evaluation model by which to evaluate all educators' effectiveness. In lieu of the approved model, LEAs may select another model from an approved list. All approved models must contain a qualitative appraisal instrument that addresses the following domains: Planning, Environment, Professionalism, and Instruction. All approved models shall include, but are not limited to: a review of prior evaluations, personal conferences to discuss strengths, weaknesses and remediation, and classroom or school observation visits.

(b) Principals and assistant principals who spend 50 percent or more of their time on administrative duties will be evaluated according to an

approved evaluation model based on the Tennessee Instructional Leadership Standards (TILS) and approved by the State Board of Education. The evaluation process will also include a review of the quality of the principals' teacher evaluations. Principal and assistant principal qualitative appraisals should include school climate and/or teaching and learning conditions surveys. The Department of Education will develop a list of approved surveys that LEAs can use.

(c) All educators, other than apprentice teachers and administrators, will have a minimum of four observations, with at least two observations in each semester, for a minimum total of at least 60 minutes each school year. At least half of all observations will be unannounced. Apprentice teachers will have at least six observations, with three in each semester, for a minimum total of at least 90 minutes each school year.

1. Principals will have at least two onsite observations annually, conducted by the director of schools or designee.

2. The Department of Education will provide user friendly, manageable standardized forms to document observation visits and/or personal conferences. The approved forms will provide space for feedback in enough detail to allow the teacher or principal to understand specific areas of strength and areas for development. LEAs that elect to use an alternative appraisal instrument for evaluation must submit the observation recording forms to the Department of Education for approval.

3. Evaluators will provide written feedback within one week of each observation visit to the educator, and schedule an in-person debrief with the educator within one week of each observation visit. At the end of each school year, evaluators will rate educators based on the selected evaluation model, using notes collected through observation visits, conferences, a review of progress made in relation to the prior year's evaluation (when available) and other means.

**Approved Evaluation Models**

To be determined.

**Local-Level Grievance Procedure**

(1) Purpose.

(a) To comply with Tenn. Code Ann. §49-1-302 which requires, "the development of a local-level evaluation grievance procedure to provide a means for evaluated teachers and principals to challenge only the

accuracy of the data used in the evaluation and the adherence to the evaluation policies adopted by the State Board of Education."

1. "Accuracy of the data" means only that the data identified with a particular teacher is correct.

2. Minor procedural errors in implementing the evaluation model shall be resolved at the lowest possible step in the grievance procedure but shall not constitute grounds for challenging the final results of an evaluation. Minor procedural errors shall be defined as errors that do not materially affect or compromise the integrity of the evaluation results. The final results of an evaluation may only be challenged if the person being evaluated can demonstrate, no later than during step II of the grievance procedure, that the procedural errors made could materially affect or compromise the integrity of the evaluation results. The department of education shall provide guidance on which procedural errors may materially affect of compromise the results of the evaluation.

(b) To efficiently and fairly resolve grievances regarding procedural errors in the evaluation process, not to address disputes regarding employment actions taken based on the results of an evaluation. More significant due process rights are provided pursuant to state law to teachers when actual employment actions are taken.

(c) To ensure evaluations are fundamentally fair because correct procedures have been followed.

(d) To address grievances objectively, fairly, and expeditiously by resolving them at the lowest possible step in the procedure.

(e) To provide teachers and principals a process for resolving grievances without fear, discrimination, or reprisal.

(2) Responsibility.

(a) LEAs shall be responsible for the proper effectuation of this policy at the local level.

(b) Local Boards of Education shall charge Directors with the responsibility for ensuring that all teachers, principals and administrators are aware of the provisions of this policy, including the identification of the administrator designated to conduct Step I of this procedure.

(3) Basic Standards.

(a) A grievance must be filed no later than 15 days from the end of summative evaluation**,** otherwise it will be considered untimely and invalid.

(b) The State Department of Education or LEAs may develop and make available to teachers standard grievance forms. No grievance may be denied because a standard form adopted by a LEA has not been used as long as the components required by this policy are included.

(c) At the informal hearing before the Director of Schools, an attorney or a representative of an employee may speak on behalf of the employee.

(d) An attorney may represent a grievant before the local board of education, which is the final step of this procedure. The grievant and the local board of education may have counsel present at discussions prior to the final step.

(e) Each grievance submitted at every step of the process provided below shall contain:

1 the teacher or principal's name, position, school, and additional title if any;

2 the name of the teacher or principal's immediate supervisor;

3 the name of the evaluator/reviewer;

4 the date the challenged summative evaluation was received;

5 the evaluation period in question;

6 the basis for the grievance;

7 the corrective action desired by grievant; and

8 sufficient facts or other information to begin an investigation.

(f) A failure to state specific reasons shall result in the grievance being considered improperly filed and invalid.

(g) All student achievement data used in evaluations must be made available to individual educators prior to the completion of their evaluations.

(4) Procedures. Grievances shall be processed by working through the 3 steps to finality as follows:

(a) Step I—Evaluator

1 Written grievance submitted to evaluator no later than 15 days from the end of the summative evaluation.

2 Administrative investigation and fact finding.

3 Decision clearly communicated in writing to grievant within fifteen (15) days of receipt of the complaint.

4 To allow disputes to be resolved at the lowest level possible, the Evaluator may take any action necessary, based on the circumstances, to immediately correct any procedural errors made in the evaluation process.

(b) Step II—The Director of Schools or his/her designee who shall have had no input or involvement in the evaluation for which the grievance has been filed.

1 Written grievance and prior step decision submitted to the Director of Schools or his/her designee within fifteen (15) days of receipt of decision from Step I. The designee cannot be used in cases involving a principal's evaluation.

2 Informal discussion or hearing of facts, allegations, and testimony by appropriate witnesses as soon as practical.

3 Investigation, fact finding, and written final decision communicated to grievant in writing within fifteen (15) days of discussion.

4 To allow disputes to be resolved at the lowest level possible, the Director of Schools may take any action necessary, based on the circumstances, to immediately correct any procedural errors made in the evaluation process.

(c) Step III—Local Board of Education

1 Teachers and principals may request a hearing before the local board of education by submitting a written grievance and all relevant documentation to the local board of education within fifteen (15) days of receipt of decision from Step II.

2 The board of education, based upon a review of the record, may grant or deny a request for a full board hearing and may affirm or overturn the decision of the Director of Schools with or without a hearing before the board;

3 Any hearing granted by the board of education shall be held no later than thirty (30) days after receipt of a request for a hearing.

4 The local board of education shall give written notice of the time and place of the hearing to the grievant, Director of Schools and all administrators involved.

5 The local board of education's decision shall be communicated in writing to all parties, no later than thirty (30) days after conclusion of the hearing.

6 The local board of education shall serve as the final step for all grievances.

# MINUTES
# STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
## JUNE 14, 2011

The State Board of Education met via telephone conference call at 11:15 a.m., CDT, on June 14, 2011.

**Present..... 9**
**Mr. Jim Ayers**
**Ms. Vernita Justice**
**Ms. Carolyn Pearre**
**Mr. Richard Ray**
**Mr. Fielding Rolston, Chair**
**Dr. Jean Anne Rogers**
**Ms. Teresa Sloyan**
**Dr. Melvin Wright**
**Mr. Chip Woods**

**Absent.....1**
**Mr. Flavius Barker**

**Others Present**
**Dr. Gary Nixon, State Board of Education (SBE)**
**Dr. David Sevier, SBE**
**Mr. Art Fuller, SBE**
**Ms. Dannelle Walker, SBE**
**Ms. Phyllis Childress, SBE**
**Commissioner Kevin Huffman, Department of Education (DOE)**
**Dr. Sara Heyburn, DOE**
**Mr. Stephen Smith, DOE**
**Mr. Tim Gaddis, DOE**

**Chairman Rolston** called the meeting to order.

**I. Consent Items**

**A. *Adoption of Agenda***

**ACTION:** **Mr. Ray** moved approval. **Ms. Sloyan** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**II. Action Items (First Reading)**

***A. Educator Evaluation Policy and Rule***

**Dr. Gary Nixon**, State Board of Education, presented changes to the approval process of the State's default teacher evaluation model.

**ACTION:** **Mr. Ray** moved approval on first reading. **Vice Chair Pearre** seconded and a roll call vote was taken as follows:

| | Yes | No | Absent |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Jim Ayers** | **X** | | |
| **Flavius Barker** | | | **X** |
| **Vernita Justice** | **X** | | |
| **Carolyn Pearre** | **X** | | |
| **Dick Ray** | **X** | | |
| **Jean Anne Rogers** | **X** | | |
| **Fielding Rolston** | **X** | | |
| **Teresa Sloyan** | **X** | | |
| **Melvin Wright** | **X** | | |
| **Chip Woods** | **X** | | |

The motion passed unanimously.

## *III. Action Items (Final Reading)*

### *A. Educator Evaluation Models*

**Dr. Sara Heyburn**, Department of Education, presented the models recommended by the Commissioner of Education to evaluate Tennessee teachers. She stated that the Department was recommending the TEAM model and listed three alternate models as well that could be used in any LEA.

**Mr. Ray** recommended that the models be limited to 4-5 key items rather than a "laundry list" and stated that after having conversations with principals in East Tennessee, instructional guidance was not high on the list of priorities for principals.

**Chairman Rolston** agreed that experience shows that we need to scale back some.

**Dr. Heyburn** stated that the Department fully expected to refine the models.

**Ms. Sloyan** stated that she felt that all these points were well-taken and that education was taking an important first step.

**Commissioner Huffman** said that he was excited to have multiple models to start with so that each model could be studied.

**Vice Chair Pearre** asked about on-going support such as more staff in the Department and funding.

**Commissioner Huffman** responded that this was a high priority and that **Dr. Heyburn** would be the contact person for hiring people. He stated that guidance would be provided to all systems.

**Ms. Sloyan** asked what the timetable would be when the Commissioner could share with the Board information on the process. He responded that it would be an ongoing process and he could report as they come in real time.

**ACTION:** **Ms. Sloyan** moved approval. **Mr. Ray** seconded and a roll call vote was taken as follows:

| | Yes | No | Absent |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Jim Ayers** | **X** | | |
| **Flavius Barker** | | | **X** |
| **Vernita Justice** | **X** | | |
| **Carolyn Pearre** | **X** | | |
| **Dick Ray** | **X** | | |
| **Jean Anne Rogers** | **X** | | |
| **Fielding Rolston** | **X** | | |
| **Teresa Sloyan** | **X** | | |
| **Melvin Wright** | **X** | | |
| **Chip Woods** | **X** | | |

The motion passed unanimously.

**Chairman Rolston** thanked members for being available to participate in the meeting by telephone. The meeting was adjourned with the remaining meeting dates being August 5 and November 4, 2011.

Approved by: _____ Date _____

**Tennessee State Board of Education**
**June 14, 2011**

**Agenda**
**Final Reading Item: III. A.**

## Educator Evaluation Models

### The Background:

The First to the Top Legislation passed in the Extraordinary Session of 2010 calls for teachers and principals to be evaluated annually. The legislation established a Teacher Evaluation Advisory Council (TEAC) and charged it with the responsibility to develop and recommend to the criteria and guidelines for teacher and principal evaluations for the State Board to consider. The legislation also charged the TEAC to recommend to the State Board a grievance procedure for LEAs to implement regarding the accuracy of the data and the fidelity to the process used to evaluate teachers and principals.

The State Board approved the implementing rules at its January 2011 meeting and the Educator Evaluation policy at its April 2011 meeting.

The current rule states that the Department of Education shall adopt a model plan for teacher evaluation developed in accordance with State Board approved rules and guidelines and criteria. However, TCA 49-5-5205 requires the evaluation plans or procedures to evaluate teachers and used subsequently to advance or renew a license be approved by the State Board. Therefore, the Department of Education is recommending approval of TEAM (Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model), the state's evaluation model. Further, the State Board will be considering a rule amendment to bring the rule in line with the statutory requirements.

Local boards of education shall either use TEAM or an evaluation model that has been adopted by the local board and approved by the State Board of Education.

Prior to review by the State Board of Education, locally adopted models must:

- Be reviewed by the Commissioner of the Department of Education for compliance with the guidelines and criteria adopted by the State Board of Education, and;
- Following conditional approval by the commissioner, have been implemented for a one year pilot in a Tennessee LEA.

As such, the Board heard presentations from representatives of three proposed alternate models, as well as representatives for the state model, at their April 2011 workshop. Since the workshop, applications for approval have been submitted to the commissioner. These applications have been carefully reviewed by the commissioner, other department and SBE staff and shared with the Board.

Evaluation models approved by the State Board may, with local board approval, be used in any LEA.

This item is to submit for State Board approval of TEAM, as well as the following three alternate evaluation models:

- TIGER (Teacher Instructional Growth for Effectiveness and Results)– the Association of Independent and Municipal Schools (AIMS)
- Project COACH – Hamilton County Schools
- TEM (Teacher Effectiveness Model) – Memphis City Schools

**The Master Plan Connection:**

This item supports the State Board's *Master Plan* to improve the quality of teachers and leaders in Tennessee's schools.

**The Race to the Top Connection:**

This item implements the requirement of the First to the Top legislation to evaluate teachers and principals annually.

**The Recommendation:**

The Department of Education recommends adoption of this item on final reading. SBE staff concurs with this recommendation.

To: Tennessee State Board of Education Members

From: Commissioner Kevin S. Huffman

Date: May 25, 2011

RE: Recommendation for approval of alternate evaluation models

Dear Board members,

This memo is to request your consideration of three alternate evaluation models for approval submitted to me by the following school districts:

- TIGER (Teacher Instructional Growth for Effectiveness and Results)– the Association of Independent and Municipal Schools (AIMS)
- Project COACH – Hamilton County Schools
- TEM (Teacher Effectiveness Model) – Memphis City Schools

As you know, I will be calling each of you over the next two weeks to discuss my recommendations and answer any questions prior to your June conference call vote. In the meantime, in this mailing you will find for reference and review, both applications for all three proposed alternate models, as well as information on TEAM (Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model), the state's evaluation model. The table below provides a summary of the key considerations that undergird my recommendation for approval of all models.

I also want to offer you my assurance that TDOE will work closely with these districts, if approved, to monitor the fidelity of implementation and support offered to teachers and principals in districts opting to use any approved alternate model. TDOE will closely monitor and provide support around implementation of the state model, both through ongoing analysis of data entered into the state's evaluation data system, the research and evaluation work of TN CRED, and through the work of designated staff at TDOE. Through these ongoing evaluative efforts, we expect to learn a lot about best practices and areas for refinement of all systems.

| Model | Compliance with Statute | Compliance with SBE Policies | Research Base | Pilot/Field Test | Recommend for SBE Approval |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **AIMS: TIGER** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| **HCS: COACH** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| **MCS: TEM** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

I look forward to talk more with you in the coming weeks.

Sincerely,

Kevin S. Huffman