

Tennessee Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State revised the baseline for this indicator. OSEP cannot accept this revision because the data utilized to determine the baseline are not based on the data that the State is required to report to the Department under Title 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA) as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 63.2%. Rather than reporting the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the State utilized its IDEA section 618 data. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet to graduate with a regular diploma. The State reported that the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular diploma are different than for youth without an IEP. The State explained the difference.</p>	<p>The State did not provide baseline and data based on the required measurement and the State must provide FFY 2008 baseline data based on the required measurement in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State revised the baseline for this indicator. OSEP cannot accept this revision because the data utilized to determine the baseline are not based on the data that the State is required to report to the Department under Title 1 of the ESEA as part of its CSPR.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 14.99%. Rather than reporting the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the State utilized its IDEA section 618 data.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.</p>	<p>The State did not provide baseline and data based on the required measurement and the State must provide FFY 2008 baseline data based on the required measurement in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 51%. These data</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 56.5%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 73%.</p>	<p>demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 99.2% for reading and 99.4% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 99.1% for reading and 99.1% for math. The State met its FFY 2008 targets of 95% for reading and math.</p> <p>The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly reported assessment results. http://edu.reportcard.state.tn.us/pls/apex/f?p=200:80:502639372635814::NO</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, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 78% for reading and 67.7% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 67.42% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 targets of 79.4% for reading and 68.6% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results. http://edu.reportcard.state.tn.us/pls/apex/f?p=200:80:502639372635814::NO</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 26%. Because the State’s actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported for this indicator in the State’s FFY 2007 APR, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State met its FFY 2007 target of reducing the percent of districts having a significant discrepancy by 3.5%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the LEA’s 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, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFYs 2006 and 2007.</p> <p>The State reported that it revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise), the LEA’s 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, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFYs 2006 and 2007.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFYs 2006 and 2007 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2008 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR.</p>	<p>Indicator 4B is new for FFY 2009. Baseline data from 2008-2009, targets (0%), and improvement activities must be submitted with the FFY 2009 APR.</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator; New for FFY 2009]</p>																						
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;</p> <p>B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or</p> <p>C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 816 1467 1286"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td>56.31</td> <td>59.15</td> <td>54.5</td> <td>2.84%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td>13.52</td> <td>13.24</td> <td>13.5</td> <td>0.28%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td>1.98</td> <td>1.77</td> <td>3.71</td> <td>0.21%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data. The State met all of its FFY 2008 targets for this indicator.</p>		FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	56.31	59.15	54.5	2.84%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	13.52	13.24	13.5	0.28%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	1.98	1.77	3.71	0.21%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	56.31	59.15	54.5	2.84%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	13.52	13.24	13.5	0.28%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	1.98	1.77	3.71	0.21%																		
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR.</p>	<p>The instruction package for the FFY 2009 APR/SPP will provide guidance regarding</p>																				

Tennessee Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps									
<p>A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and</p> <p>B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>		<p>the information that States must report for this indicator in their FFY 2009 APRs.</p>									
<p>7. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 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]</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State provided FFY 2008 baseline data, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 865 1444 1286"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 865 919 984">08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data</th> <th data-bbox="919 865 1194 984"><u>Summary Statement 1</u>¹</th> <th data-bbox="1194 865 1444 984"><u>Summary Statement 2</u>²</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 984 919 1118">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 984 1194 1118">92.6</td> <td data-bbox="1194 984 1444 1118">63.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1118 919 1286">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 1118 1194 1286">89.6</td> <td data-bbox="1194 1118 1444 1286">62.2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> ¹	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> ²	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	92.6	63.4	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	89.6	62.2	<p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2009 with the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> ¹	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> ²									
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	92.6	63.4									
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	89.6	62.2									

¹ Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

² Summary Statement 2: The percentage of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

Tennessee Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues			OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	89.9	75.6	
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. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 89.4%. However, OSEP recalculated the data for this indicator to be 90.54%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 97%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 94%. OSEP's June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010 information on whether its response group is representative of the State's population and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State provided all of the required information.			OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.
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. [Compliance Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 0%. The State reported that three districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification. The State provided the definition of disproportionate representation. OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State's definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.			OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator. OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State's definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.
10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 0%. The State met its FFY			OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator. OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State's definition of disproportionate

Tennessee Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>2008 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 25 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State’s definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</p>	<p>representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 96%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 90%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all nine of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State’s data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</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 measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 95%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 84.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 85 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State is not required to provide actual target data for FFY 2008 for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that 28 of 47 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining 19 findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2010.</p>	<p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must provide a revised baseline using data from 2009-2010. Targets must remain 100%.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p>	<p>The State is not required to provide actual target data, targets or improvement activities for FFY 2008 for this indicator.</p>	<p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report a new baseline, targets, and, as needed, improvement activities.</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>		
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 89%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 72.7%. The State did not meet its target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 156 of 175 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and that all 19 remaining findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2010.</p> <p>The State reported that it was unable to verify, as required by OSEP Memo 09-02, that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.</p> <p>OSEP's June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 SPP/APR response table required the State to report in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, if any changes have been made to the draft monitoring procedures provided in the State's March 15, 2009 letter, and if the draft procedures have been finalized. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2006 and 2007 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2008 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which</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 2009 APR, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2008 in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>Although the State did not report for this indicator that it verified correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 consistent with the OSEP Memo 09-02, OSEP accepted the data for this indicator this year because this indicator measures timely correction of noncompliance and OSEP Memo 09-02 was issued after the beginning of the FFY 2008 correction period.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report that it verified that each</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 11 and 12 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described 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, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 81.48%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 1, 2009 response table required the State to submit in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, information clarifying that the data reported for Indicator 16 are consistent with the timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.152(a) and (b)(1) (that the State counts a State complaint decision as timely only if the State issues the decision within 60 days from the date that the State received the complaint or within an appropriately extended timeline).</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2009 APR, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]	<p>The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State also provided the correct calculation for this indicator in response to OSEP's October 29, 2009 review of the State's July 27, 2009 progress report.</p>	
<p>17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on two due process hearings. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline 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 2008 reported data for this indicator are 60%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 16.7%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 4%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 83.33%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 73.9%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 57.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<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 did not provide complete data for this indicator. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 95%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 91%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2006 and 2007 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2008 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.	20 Data Rubric. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.