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ACCOUNTABILITY RESULTS
Students with Disabilities
2011-2012
The accountability system under the waiver has two main objectives:

- Growth for all students, every year
- Closing achievement gaps, by ensuring faster growth for those students who are furthest behind
There were four possible outcomes for districts, based on a totality of results:

- **Exemplary** (21 districts)
- **Intermediate** (57 districts)
- **In Need of Improvement** (3 districts)
- **In Need of Subgroup Improvement** (54 districts)
Of 54 districts in need of sub-group improvement, 36 struggled with students with disabilities
Under the waiver, certain categories of schools were identified

**Priority schools: bottom 5% in overall proficiency**
- 83 schools in 5 districts

**Focus schools: 10% largest achievement gaps within schools**
- 167 schools across the state
  - 65 of the 167 were specifically related to SWD.

**Reward schools: top 5% in overall proficiency, and top 5% with the fastest progress by TVAAS**
- 166 schools across the state
65 Focus Schools had an SWD gap

- 2 Categories (SWD and ED) - 34 schools
- 3 Categories (SWD, ED, Ethnicity) - 30 schools
- 4 Categories (SWD, ED, Ethnicity, ELL) - 1 school

# Two schools were identified as Focus with a composite success rate for SWD subgroup less than 5%.
5 of 16 Gap Closure AMO targets were met, none for students with disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Groups</th>
<th>3-8 Math</th>
<th>3-8 Reading</th>
<th>Algebra I</th>
<th>English II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic Subgroups vs. All Students</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged vs. Non-Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learners vs. Non-English Learners</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities vs. Students without Disabilities</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternative Testing Issues (MAAS and Portfolio)

Last year 26 counties over tested in MAAS
A portion of students were randomly reassigned to Basic
11 were identified as In Need of Improvement for SWD

Additional SPED students 2011 to 2012

+ 6.5%    Achievement 3-8
+ 7.9%    MAAS
+ 7.0%    Portfolio
## Special Education % Testing Gains P/ A 2011-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R/ LA</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Social Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAAS</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2807 additional students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Report Card Achievement Data - Percent P/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>SWD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math 3-8</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 3</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 7</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/LA 3-8</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/LA 3</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/LA 7</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algebra I</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>2010-11 Percent Gap size</td>
<td>2011-12 Target Gap size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/LA</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algebra I</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English II</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2012-13 Goals to lessen the gap approximately 1.2% in each category*
The Common Core State Standards
The Tennessee Implementation Plan
Implementation Plan

Effective communication about the standards, importance, and potential

Assessment alignment and transparency

Student achievement

Quality training & meaningful support

Instructional materials and curriculum

Alignment of accountability structure for LEA's, schools, teachers, and vendors
The Common Core State Standards - Represent six key instructional shifts

**MATH:**

1. **Focus:** strongly where the standards focus
2. **Coherence:** across grades and major topics within grades
3. **Rigor:** conceptual understanding, procedural skill and fluency, and application with intensity.

**ELA:**

1. Building knowledge through **nonfiction and informational texts**
2. Reading and writing grounded in **evidence from text**
3. Regular practice with **complex text** and its academic vocabulary
PARCC: Partners for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers

- 24 states working together to develop common assessments
- Subset of PARCC states, including TN, make up its Governing Board
- Collectively the PARCC states educate more than 31 million students — nearly 63% of K-12 students attending American public schools
- Assessments begin in 2014-15 for ELA and Math 3-12

Source: Achieve
TN State Assessment Plan:
Narrow the focus of TCAP and expand use of Constructed Response

- Remove 15-25% of SPIs that are not reflected in Common Core State Standards from the TCAP NEXT year. The specific list of SPI’s will be shared at the end of April.

- Expand the constructed response assessment for all grades 3-8, focused on the TNCore focus standards.
Preparation for online assessments by 2014-2015

- **Survey of districts** through technology coordinators to assess current readiness

- **Prepare a state-wide readiness plan** by December 2012

- **Online writing** assessment
  - grades 8 and 11 in 2012-13
  - grades 5, 8, and 11 in 2013-14

- **SWD preparation** for high stakes testing
State Level Transformation of Services
Division of Special Populations
2012-13
and beyond
Short Term Goals - by January 2013

- Staffing restructure
- Standardized testing guidance
- Monitoring revisions
- Data support revisions
- Standards based IEPs
- K-2 Guidelines / RTI support
Staffing Restructure

- Deputy serves as Interim Assistant Commissioner
- Assistant Commissioner hired by January 2013
- Director of Monitoring and Support – September 2012
- Director Data Services – October 2012
- CORE Offices – SPED Staff
  - Regional Directors
  - Management Consultants
  - Compliance Monitors
Standardized Testing Guidance

Modified Assessments for Students with Disabilities

- Modified assessments are designed for students with the most severe disabilities.

- 1% of students in tested grades eligible for Portfolio
- 2% of students in tested grades eligible for MAAS

- The MAAS was specifically designed for students with disabilities who failed to meet participation criteria for the Portfolio assessment.

- SWD were proficient or advanced on MAAS last year, are directed to be reassigned to TCAP this school year.
Monitoring and Support revisions
January-May 2013 (Phase 1)

- 27 LEAs cyclical monitoring / 2 LEAs focus monitoring

- Record Review (IEPs) - Desktop monitoring
  - Record Review – online and sampling of accessory documents
  - Findings to be corrected and closure letter sent by May 2013

- Fiscal Monitoring
  - Checklist revised and reduced
  - Upload – inventories, budgets, amendments, personnel lists
  - Phone interview with SPED Supervisor
Data and Support revisions

- APR reporting to continue
- Training to all TDOE SPED Program Directors
- District data to be utilized to inform instruction
- Best practices identified through CORE directors and shared regionally
Standards Based IEPs

1. Based on grade level Common Core content standards

2. Utilizes current student data
   Present Levels of Performance
   Disability and affect on learning

3. Develop measurable annual goals
   Progression of skills specific to gap closure
   Assess and report progress toward goals

4. Determine assessment / accommodations
K-2 Guidelines / RTI Support

- Focus on reading and math in K-2
- Specific guidelines
  - Time expectations in ELA/Math
  - Intervention in a tiered system of support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELA (Core)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>+20</td>
<td>+30</td>
<td>+30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>+20</td>
<td>+30</td>
<td>+30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math (Core)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>+20</td>
<td>+20</td>
<td>+30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>+20</td>
<td>+20</td>
<td>+30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Long Term Goals
January 2013-15

- Monitoring – Phase 2 - Performance Based Monitoring
- Licensure revisions
- Inclusion of student scores for SWD in Teacher Effect
- Decreasing the percentage of identified students
- Fiscal reorganization
- Preparation for PAARC Assessment
- Strategic Plan Development
Strategic Plan: Maximizing TDOE reform to influence district outcome

- District desired outcomes
  - Select high impact goals
- District desired behavior
  - Identify district best practices
- District desired changes
  - Identify obstacles and changes that must occur
- TDOE levers of influence
  - Identify obstacles that SEA can remove / Incentivize for results
- TDOE organizational structure
  - Specific performance goals for SEA staff to align to new goals
Questions?

Kathleen M. Airhart, Ed.D.
Deputy Commissioner of Education

Kathleen.Airhart@tn.gov
615-741-1090