

Tennessee Part B FFY 2009 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the baseline and improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 revised baseline data for this indicator are 67.89%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage or if the State met its target because the State revised its calculation and provided baseline data in their FFY 2009 APR.</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This means that the State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, revised the baseline and improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 revised baseline for this indicator is 3.32%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage or if the State met its target because the State revised its calculation and provided baseline data in their FFY 2009 APR.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 15.38%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 51%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 75.7%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p>	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 99.2% for reading and 99.1% for math. The State met its FFY 2009 targets of 95%. The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 24.9% for reading and 19.9% for math. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 78% for reading and represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 67.7% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 targets of 81.5% for reading and 71.7% for math. The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: 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 provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 33.82%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 26%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of reducing the percent of districts having a significant discrepancy by 1.5%. The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.” The State reported that it does not use a minimum “n” size requirement. The State reported that it reviewed the LEAs’ 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 based on FFY 2008 data. The State did not identify any noncompliance through this review. The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2007 data through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps										
	§300.170(b), was corrected in a timely manner.											
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>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 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]</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline, using FFY 2008 data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 27 districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State also reported that no districts were identified as having 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>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that it does not use a minimum “n” size requirement.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the LEAs’ 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 based on FFY 2008 data. The State did not identify any noncompliance through this review.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State’s methodology for identifying “significant discrepancy” and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</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 provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="552 1312 1583 1516"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td align="center">59.15</td> <td align="center">62.33</td> <td align="center">55</td> <td align="center">3.18%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	59.15	62.33	55	3.18%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
	<u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>								
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	59.15	62.33	55	3.18%								

Tennessee Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	13.24	12.64	13	0.60%	
	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	1.77	1.75	2.10	0.02%	
	These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data. The State met all of its FFY 2009 targets for this indicator.					
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p> <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>	The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2009 APR.					The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.
<p>7. Percent of preschool children age 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>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 in its FFY 2009 APR, but did not include the targets in the SPP. The State provided improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are less rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State's reported FFY 2009 data for this indicator are:</p>					<p>With the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must submit a revised SPP that includes targets reflecting improvement.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR.</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	
	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	92.6	91.7	91.7	
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	89.6	89.5	89.5	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	89.9	92.6	92.6	
	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	
	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	63.4	57.4	57.4	
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	62.2	55.7	55.7	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	75.6	68.0	68.0	
	The State provided revised baseline data using FFY 2009 data; therefore OSEP is not comparing FFY 2009 data to FFY 2008 data. The State met all of its FFY 2009 targets for this indicator.				
	8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services	The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts			

Tennessee Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 91.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 90.54%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 96%.</p> <p>The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population.</p>	<p>improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> <p>The State reported that the response group was not representative of the population. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2010 data are from a group representative of the population, and if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.</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 provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that one district was 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.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that six of 136 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of at least 45 students receiving special education and related services, and were excluded from the calculation.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<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>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p> <p>In its FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must report the total unduplicated</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]	<p>The State reported that 27 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>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>Although the State reported the number of districts by specific disability category that were excluded from the calculation because they did not meet the minimum “n” size requirement of at least 45 students receiving special education and related services, the State did not report the total unduplicated number of districts that were excluded from the calculation for this indicator.</p>	<p>number of districts that did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement and were excluded from the calculation in FFY 2009 and FFY 2010.</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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 96.25%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 96%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 69 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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 2009, 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 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 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</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 February 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2010 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 2010 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 provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98.83%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 95%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 19 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 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 FFY 2010 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 2010 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</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p>	<p>Although OSEP did not consider data for Indicator 13 in its determinations for FFY 2009, OSEP is concerned about the</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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's FFY 2009 reported baseline data for this indicator are 50.03%.</p>	<p>State's very low FFY 2009 data (below 75%) for this indicator. In 2012, OSEP will consider States' FFY 2010 data for Indicator 13 in determinations.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, 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 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(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 corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 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 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</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>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>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s reported FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <p>A. 22% enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. 57% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; and</p> <p>C. 65% 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>The State must report actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</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</p>	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98.23%. These data represent</p>	<p>In reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>one year from identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>progress from the FFY 2008 data of 89%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 388 of 395 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that the seven remaining findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2011.</p> <p>The State reported that it did not verify, as required by OSEP Memo 09-02, that each 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.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFYs 2007 and 2008 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2009 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 did report on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p> <p>The State was also identified as being in need of assistance based on its FFY 2006 APR. In addition to reporting with the FFY 2009 APR on its use of technical assistance, the State was also required to report to OSEP by October 1, 2010 how the technical assistance selected by the State is addressing the factors contributing to the ongoing noncompliance. The State submitted the required information on October 15, 2010.</p>	<p>noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (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.</p> <p>In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State does not report 100% compliance for this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written</p>	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 81.48%. The State met its FFY 2009 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 2007 and 2008 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2009 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 did report 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>The State was also identified as being in need of assistance based on its FFY 2006 APR. In addition to reporting with the FFY 2009 APR on its use of technical assistance, the State was also required to report to OSEP by October 1, 2010 how the technical assistance selected by the State is addressing the factors contributing to the ongoing noncompliance. The State submitted the required information on October 15, 2010.</p>	<p>efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</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 provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on one due process hearing. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 56%. These data represent</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 60%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 5%.	
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 76%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 83.33%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 60%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</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 provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 95.24%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 98.89%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 95%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>