

Tennessee Part B FFY 2010 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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 and baseline for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated in its FFY 2010 APR that it revised its baseline for this indicator, but did not submit a revised SPP or direct OSEP to a revised SPP that reflected those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 85.2%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State changed the way data were reported. The State met its FFY 2010 target of a 1.5% increase.</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 appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013, States must use the same data they used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 4.2%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 3.32%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of a 1.5% decrease.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 19.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 15.38%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 78.1%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.2% for reading and 99.4% for math. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 99.2% for reading and represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 99.1% for math. The State met its FFY 2010 targets of 95%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
with IEPs. [Results Indicator]	The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.	
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]	The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 38.5% for reading and 31.2% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 24.9% for reading and of 19.9% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets of 83.3% for reading and 74.5% for math. The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.	OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.
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]	The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 19%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State revised its calculation methodology. The State met its FFY 2010 target of reducing the percent of districts having a significant discrepancy by 1%. The State reported its definition of "significant discrepancy." The State reported that 16 districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State reported that 52 of 136 districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of "two or more records within a district where students were suspended/ expelled for greater than 10 days in a school year." The State reported that it reviewed the districts' 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010. The State did not identify noncompliance through this review.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
4. Rates of suspension and	The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%.	OSEP appreciates the State's

Tennessee Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>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 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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 11 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.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010. The State did not identify any noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>The State did not report the number of districts that did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement, for any racial /ethnic group, of two or more students with disabilities from a specific racial/ethnic group suspended or expelled for more than ten days.</p>	<p>efforts regarding this indicator.</p> <p>In its FFY 2011 APR, the State must report the number of districts that did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement.</p>																				
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served: A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 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="552 1031 1583 1503"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010</u> <u>Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010</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">62.33</td> <td align="center">63.4</td> <td align="center">55.5</td> <td align="center">1.07%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">12.64</td> <td align="center">12.4</td> <td align="center">12.5</td> <td align="center">0.24%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">1.75</td> <td align="center">1.9</td> <td align="center">2.08</td> <td align="center">-0.15%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010</u> <u>Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	62.33	63.4	55.5	1.07%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	12.64	12.4	12.5	0.24%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	1.75	1.9	2.08	-0.15%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010</u> <u>Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	62.33	63.4	55.5	1.07%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	12.64	12.4	12.5	0.24%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	1.75	1.9	2.08	-0.15%																		

Tennessee Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
	These data represent progress for 5A and 5B and slippage for 5C from the FFY 2009 data. The State met all of its FFY 2010 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 2010 APR.	The State must provide FFY 2011 baseline data, an FFY 2012 target, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 in the SPP that it submits with the FFY 2011 APR.																
<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>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 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="548 948 1583 1455"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 948 957 1045"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="957 948 1163 1045"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 948 1373 1045"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 948 1583 1045"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1045 957 1183">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 1045 1163 1183">91.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1045 1373 1183">90.8</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1045 1583 1183">92.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1183 957 1354">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 1183 1163 1354">89.5</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1183 1373 1354">89.4</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1183 1583 1354">90</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1354 957 1455">Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 1354 1163 1455">92.6</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1354 1373 1455">91.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1354 1583 1455">93.1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	91.7	90.8	92.2	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	89.5	89.4	90	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	92.6	91.3	93.1	<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 2011 APR.</p> <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>															
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	91.7	90.8	92.2															
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	89.5	89.4	90															
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	92.6	91.3	93.1															

Tennessee Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	
	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	57.4	61.3	57.9	
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	55.7	59.2	56.2	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	68.0	71.1	68.5	
	These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2009. The State met part of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator. OSEP’s FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table, dated June 20, 2011, required the State to include in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012 a revised SPP that includes targets reflecting improvement. The State provided all of the required information.				
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 FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 91.1%. The State’s FFY 2009 data for the indicator were 91.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 97%. In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.				OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 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.	The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%. The State reported that two 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 a result of				OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.

Tennessee Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]	<p>inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that two of 140 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of at least 45 students receiving special education and related services. The State also reported the number of districts that did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement, included in the definition of “disproportionate representation,” of “student subgroup enrollments that have an N count equal to or greater than 50” for each racial/ethnic subgroup.</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>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 38 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>The State reported the number of districts by specific disability category that did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of an IDEA child count of equal to or greater than 20. The State also reported the number of districts that did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement, included in the definition of “disproportionate representation,” of “student subgroup enrollments that have an N count equal to or greater than 50” for each racial/ethnic subgroup.</p> <p>The State must delete the reference on page 52 of the APR to the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of “student subgroup enrollments by race/ethnicity that are at least 5% of the district’s total enrollment,” which was included in section 3b of the definition of “Underrepresentation in a Disability Category.”</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</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>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 95.3%. The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 96.25%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 78 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 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 2011 APR, the State’s data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]		<p>§300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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 (OSEP Memo 09-02), dated October 17, 2008. In the FFY 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		them, if necessary to ensure compliance.
<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 FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 98.3%. The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98.83%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all eight of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 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 2011 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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 2011</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 73.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 50.03%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 24 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
		<p>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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 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="548 915 1583 1425"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Enrolled in higher education</td> <td align="center">22</td> <td align="center">16.8</td> <td align="center">22.5</td> <td align="center">-5.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">57</td> <td align="center">51.4</td> <td align="center">57.5</td> <td align="center">-5.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">65</td> <td align="center">63.4</td> <td align="center">66.5</td> <td align="center">-1.6%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet any of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Enrolled in higher education	22	16.8	22.5	-5.2%	B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	57	51.4	57.5	-5.6%	C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	65	63.4	66.5	-1.6%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Enrolled in higher education	22	16.8	22.5	-5.2%																		
B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	57	51.4	57.5	-5.6%																		
C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	65	63.4	66.5	-1.6%																		

Tennessee Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 93.23%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 844 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for three consecutive years based on the State's FFY 2007, FFY 2008, and FFY 2009 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2010 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>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in timely correcting findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009.</p> <p>When reporting in the FFY 2011 APR on the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010: (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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 11, 12, and 13 in the</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		FFY 2011 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.
<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>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</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 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 reported, as of January 31, 2012, that it did not have any fully adjudicated due process hearings during the reporting period.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's FFY 2011 IDEA section 618 data.</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 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 68%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 56%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 6%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>

Tennessee Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 87%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 76%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 62.5%. Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State’s data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 98.89%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving 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 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>