

Tennessee Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

While the State has publicly reported on the performance of each local education agency (LEA) located in the State on the targets in the State’s performance plan as required by IDEA section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I), those reports do not contain the required information. Specifically, the State did not report Indicator 6 data for all school systems and the data reported for Indicator 12 is from FFY 2006.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 55.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 47.7%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 36.2%.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, both the percentage and actual numbers for this indicator. The State provided the required data. OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 16.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 19.8%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 18.3%.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, both the percentage and actual numbers for this indicator. The State provided the required data. OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size meeting the State’s AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 51.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 revised data of 32.5%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 67.3%.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, FFY 2006 progress data that reflects the required measurement for this indicator. The State provided the required data. OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 103.38%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 98% for reading and 99%</p>	<p>In calculating the data for this indicator, the State provided different data sets for</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>for math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 95%.</p>	<p>the number of children with disabilities participating in the statewide assessment versus the total number of children with disabilities in the respective grades based on the December 1, 2006 count. This has resulted in the state reporting data for this indicator that exceeds 100%--including participation rates that exceed 110% for grades 5 through 8 in both the reading and mathematics assessments. In its APR, the State explained this discrepancy due to "but not exclusive to student attrition, moving, absence, sickness, and/or graduation." It appears that these explanations would cause the participation rate to be lower than 100%.</p> <p>In its FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must reexamine its data and revise its explanation as to the reasons why the State's participation data exceeded 100%.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 77.27% for reading and 58.43% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 71.5% for reading and slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 59.47% for math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 74.7% for reading and did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 61.4% for math.</p>	<p>In calculating the data for this indicator, the State provided different data sets for the number of children with disabilities participating in the statewide assessment versus the total number of children with disabilities in the respective grades based on the December 1, 2006 count. As the State relies upon the same data for Indicator 3C as it does for Indicator 3B, OSEP is concerned that the reported data is resulting in a higher rate of children with disabilities who are identified as proficient, and may not be a true reflection of this</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>indicator.</p> <p>In its FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must reexamine its data and to ensure that its proficiency rate is accurately reported for this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 26.47%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 30%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 25.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, clarification that the State reviewed, and if appropriate revised, the policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the 41 LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2005, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). The State reported that it “reviewed its policies, practices, and procedures for compliance with the IDEA relevant to suspensions/ expulsions,” and all districts provide an assurance annually regarding the “LEA’s policies, procedures and practices to insure compliance with IDEA, including development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, procedural safeguards and correct use of Federal definition of suspension for data collection.”</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps								
		<p>The State reported that two findings of noncompliance related to this indicator identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>In reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). In addition, the State must describe the review, and if appropriate, revision, of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the specific LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2006.</p>								
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>									
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1328 1419 1523"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1328 1035 1446"></th> <th data-bbox="1035 1328 1167 1446">FFY 2005 Data</th> <th data-bbox="1167 1328 1299 1446">FFY 2006 Data</th> <th data-bbox="1299 1328 1419 1446">FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1446 1035 1523">A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td data-bbox="1035 1446 1167 1523">53.48%</td> <td data-bbox="1167 1446 1299 1523">63.44%</td> <td data-bbox="1299 1446 1419 1523">53.5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	53.48%	63.44%	53.5%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target							
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	53.48%	63.44%	53.5%							

Tennessee Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</p>	<p>14.69%</p>	<p>10.90%</p>	<p>14.5%</p>	
	<p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p>	<p>1.89%</p>	<p>1.76%</p>	<p>4.0%</p>	
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>				
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p>				<p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide progress data with the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, and baseline data and targets with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p> <p>It is unclear to OSEP whether the State's plan to collect and report data for this indicator will result in the State's ability to provide valid and reliable baseline data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010. OSEP is available to provide technical assistance.</p>
	<p>06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</p>	<p>Social Emotional</p>	<p>Knowledge & Skills</p>	<p>Appropriate Behavior</p>	
	<p>a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</p>	<p>10.7%</p>	<p>15.5%</p>	<p>10.7%</p>	
	<p>b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</p>	<p>3.6%</p>	<p>3.6%</p>	<p>2.4%</p>	

Tennessee Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	21.4%	21.4%	6.0%	
	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	23.8%	15.5%	33.3%	
	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	40.5%	34%	47.6%	
	<p>The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP.</p> <p>In its SPP submission, the State reported that it will not be sampling for this indicator, however based on the timeline in the SPP, it appears that the State will not have baseline data from all districts in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>				
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 92%. These data remain unchanged from FFY 2005 data of 92%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 93%.</p>				<p>The State did not submit valid and reliable data because they do not reflect the required measurement for this indicator. The State submitted data on the percent of positive responses within the survey and did not measure the percent of parents who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. The State provided a plan to collect and report the required data. The State must provide valid and reliable data consistent with the required measurement in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1,</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>2009.</p> <p>The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population. In the State's APR, improvement activities are listed which the State believes will address the representativeness issues. In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must continue to address the representativeness of its response group.</p> <p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 response table required the State to submit a revised sampling plan for this indicator. The State submitted the revised sampling plan for this indicator in its FFY 2006 APR. An evaluation of the sampling plan indicated that it does yield valid and reliable data for this indicator.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP cannot accept that revision because the measurement used to calculate the revised baseline is incorrect. The State identified 2 districts (1.5%) with overrepresentation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification. However, the State did not examine data in FFY 2005 to determine whether there were any districts with underrepresentation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 4.1%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State did not examine data in FFY 2005 to determine whether there were any districts with underrepresentation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>While the State reported the percent of districts, the State did not report the</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, baseline data from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 progress data on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how the State made that determination (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures, etc.). The State provided FFY 2006 progress data, but did not provide complete FFY 2005 baseline data.</p> <p>The State was also required to provide</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>actual number of districts determined in FFY 2006 to have disproportionate representation, both overrepresentation and underrepresentation, of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p>	<p>information that it examines data for all children with disabilities under Indicator 9, not just children in the six high incidence categories and to explain the statistical basis for only examining data in districts that have an enrollment of 200 or more in the racial/ethnic group. In addition, the State was required to provide information that it makes an <i>annual</i> determination of whether significant disproportionality based on race and ethnicity is occurring in LEAs with respect to identification, placement, and disciplinary actions, as required by 34 CFR §300.646, and it has adopted and uses an appropriate method of identifying significant disproportionality. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State must provide complete FFY 2005 baseline data and FFY 2007 progress data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009 that demonstrate that the State has in effect policies and procedures as required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP cannot accept that revision because the measurement used to calculate the revised baseline is incorrect. The State identified districts with overrepresentation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification. However, the State did not examine data in FFY 2005 to determine whether there were any districts with under representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 5.88% (8 districts-Autism) 16.91% (23 districts-emotional disturbance), 14.71% (20 districts-mental retardation), 13.24% (18 districts-other health impairment), 8.82% (12 districts-Specific Learning Disabilities) and 6.62% (9 districts-speech and language impairment). OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State did not examine data in FFY 2005 to determine whether there were any districts with underrepresentation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2006 to have disproportionate representation, both overrepresentation and underrepresentation, of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, baseline data from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 progress data on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how the State made that determination (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures, etc.). The State provided FFY 2006 progress data, but did not provide complete FFY 2005 baseline data.</p> <p>The State was also required to explain the statistical basis for only examining data in districts that have an enrollment of 200 or more in the racial/ethnic group. In addition, the State was required to provide information that it makes an <i>annual</i> determination of whether significant disproportionality based on race and ethnicity is occurring in LEAs with respect to identification, placement, and disciplinary actions, as required by 34 CFR §300.646, and it has adopted and uses an appropriate method of identifying significant disproportionality. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State must provide complete FFY 2005 baseline data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>In the FFY 2006 APR, the State reported the percent of districts with</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups that was the result of inappropriate identification for each disability category. In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must provide FFY 2007 progress data, consistent with the required measurement, on the total percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in any of the specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State has in effect policies and procedures as required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 data for this indicator are 82%.</p> <p>These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 89%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>As required by the FFY 2005 response table and the instructions, the State did not identify for those children whose evaluations were completed within required timelines the number of children determined eligible and the number</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data on the number of children determined not eligible whose evaluations were completed within the State timeline, and data on the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays. The State did not provide</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>determined not eligible. The State also did not indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.</p> <p>The State reported that 28 of 28 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>the required information.</p> <p>The State reported that procedures for collection of these data have been put in place and are being used for the 2007-2008 school year. The State must submit the required data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 47.1%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 99%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the delays.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data on the number of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services and the number of children referred determined to be not eligible <u>and</u> whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays. The State was also required to explain the potential discrepancy between the 99% compliance reported in the FFY 2005 APR submission and the information on p. 97 of the FFY 2005 APR that eight out of 42</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>LEAs monitored by Tennessee were out of compliance for this indicator. The State did not report data on the number of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services, but did report on the number of children referred determined to be not eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthday. With regard to potential discrepancy, the State reported in its FFY 2006 APR that the language regarding the number of districts out of compliance with the early transition requirement was inaccurately reported.</p> <p>The State reported that activities are underway to collect the needed data elements. The State must provide data on the number of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services and the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the delays in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
13. Percent of youth aged 16 and	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and	The State reported that noncompliance

Tennessee Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps						
<p>above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 11%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 60%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 42 of 42 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>						
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 881 1419 1073"> <tr> <td>Percent of youth who are competitively employed.</td> <td align="center">55%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Percent of youth who are in some type of postsecondary school.</td> <td align="center">27%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Percent of youth who are both competitively employed and in some type of postsecondary school.</td> <td align="center">11%</td> </tr> </table>	Percent of youth who are competitively employed.	55%	Percent of youth who are in some type of postsecondary school.	27%	Percent of youth who are both competitively employed and in some type of postsecondary school.	11%	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, information that it includes dropouts in its survey. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 response table required the State to submit a revised sampling plan for this indicator. The State submitted the revised sampling plan for this indicator in its FFY 2006 APR. An evaluation of the sampling plan indicated that it does yield valid and reliable data for this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State’s data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
Percent of youth who are competitively employed.	55%							
Percent of youth who are in some type of postsecondary school.	27%							
Percent of youth who are both competitively employed and in some type of postsecondary school.	11%							
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data</p>	<p>The State reported under the heading “through dispute resolution” that “findings identified during the 2006-2007 school year that have been or will be corrected</p>						

Tennessee Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>possible but in no case later than one year from identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100% The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%. The State reported that 131 of 131 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>within one year of identification are summarized in indicators 16-19 and the accompanying table 7 for FFY 06.” The measurement for Indicator 15 requires States to report on the number of findings of noncompliance, including findings of noncompliance identified through complaints and hearings, that were corrected as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from identification. In the FFY 2006 APR, the State was required to report on correction of findings of noncompliance identified through dispute resolution (i.e., State complaints and due process hearings) during FFY 2005 (2005-2006), not findings identified during FFY 2006 (the 2006-2007 school year). Second, reporting that the State is meeting the timely complaint and due process hearing resolution requirements under Indicators 16 and 17 is not the same as reporting the number of findings of noncompliance identified through complaints and due process hearings and the number of those findings that were timely corrected. In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must clarify that its FFY 2007 progress data on the timely correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (2006-2007) includes findings of noncompliance that were identified during 2006-2007 through complaints and due process hearings. OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State’s data demonstrating that the State timely</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (2006-2007) under this indicator in accordance with (Part B) 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on three hearings. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the timely due process hearing resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 55%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 50%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 52%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 67%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 56%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	The State met its FFY 2006 target of 52.5%.	
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 98.3%. However, OSEP’s calculation of the data for this indicator are 79.0%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely and accurate data requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>