

Tennessee Part B FFY 2011 SPP/APR Response Table

Part B SPP/APR Indicators

1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]
2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]
3. 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/AMO targets for the disability subgroup. [Results Indicator] B. Participation rate for children with IEPs on statewide assessments. [Results Indicator] C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards. [Results Indicator]
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; [Results Indicator] 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]
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]
6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a: A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. [Results Indicator; New]
7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]
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]
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]

10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]
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]
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. [Compliance Indicator]
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. [Compliance Indicator]
14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were: A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school; B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; 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. [Results Indicator]
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]
18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]
19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]
20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]

Timeliness of State Complaint and Due Process Hearing Decisions
(Collected as Part of IDEA Section 618 Data rather than through an SPP/APR Indicator)

Timely Resolution of State Complaints: 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.

Timely Adjudication of Due Process Hearing Requests: Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 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.

Tennessee Part B FFY 2011 SPP/APR Results Data Summary

INDICATOR	FFY 2010 DATA	FFY 2011 DATA	FFY 2011 TARGET
1. Graduation		67.4%	New Baseline
2. Drop Out	4.2%	9.6%	≤ 1/5% decrease ¹
3. A. Percent of Districts Meeting AMO for Algebra I		14.8%	New Baseline
A Percent of Districts Meeting AMO for English II		32.1%	New Baseline
A Percent of Districts Meeting AMO for Math Grades 3-8		15.6%	New Baseline
B Statewide Assessment Participation Rate – Reading	99.2%	99.1%	≥ 95% ²
B. Statewide Assessment Participation Rate – Math	99.4%	99.2%	≥ 95%
C. Proficiency Rate – Reading		41.4%	New Baseline
C. Proficiency Rate – Math		36.8%	New Baseline
4. A. Percent of Districts with Significant Discrepancy in Suspension/Expulsion	19%	1.9%	1% reduction
5. Educational Environment for Children with IEPs 6-21			
A. In Regular Education 80% or More of Day	63.4%	63.4%	≥ 60%
B. In Regular Education Less than 40% of Day	12.4%	12.3%	≤ 12%
C. In Separate Schools, Residential Facilities, or Homebound/Hospitals	1.9%	1.8%	≤ 2.06%
6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending:			
A. Regular early childhood program and receiving majority of special education and related services in regular early childhood program;		Not Valid and Reliable	
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		13.3%	Baseline
7. Preschool Outcomes	See Attached Table	See Attached Table	See Attached Table
8. Parents Reporting Schools Facilitated Parent Involvement	91.1%	91.0%	≥ 97%
14. Percent of Youth No Longer in School, within One Year of Leaving High School:			
A. Enrolled in Higher Education	16.8%	15%	≥ 23.0%
B. Enrolled in Higher Education or Competitively Employed	51.4%	50.9%	≥ 58.0%
C. Enrolled in Higher Education or Other Postsecondary Education or Training or Competitively Employed or in Some Other Employment	63.4%	60.3%	≥ 67.0%

¹ As used in this table, the symbol “≤” means that, to meet the target, the State’s data must be less than or equal to the established target.

² As used in this table, the symbol ≥ means that, to meet the target, the State’s data must be more than or equal to the established target

INDICATOR	FFY 2010 DATA	FFY 2011 DATA	FFY 2011 TARGET
18. Hearing Requests Resolved through Resolution Session Agreements	68%	69%	≥ 7.0%
19. Mediations Held that Resulted in Mediation Agreements	87%e	73%	≥ 65%

7. Percent of Preschool Children Age 3 through 5 with IEPs Who Demonstrate Improved Outcomes

Summary Statement 1³	FFY 2010 Data	FFY 2011 Data	FFY 2011 Target
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	90.8%	90.0%	≥ 92.2%
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication)	89.4%	88.9%	≥ 90.0%
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	91.3%	89.6%	≥ 93.1%
Summary Statement 2⁴	FFY 2010 Data	FFY 2011 Data	FFY 2011 Target
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	61.2%	59.5%	≥ 57.9%
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication)	59.2%	56.9%	≥ 56.2%
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	71.1%	69.2%	≥ 68.5%

³ **Summary Statement 1:** Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

⁴ **Summary Statement 2:** The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Tennessee Part B FFY 2011 Results Data Summary Notes

INDICATOR 1: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

The State indicated in its FFY 2011 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.

REQUIRED ACTIONS

With the FFY 2012 APR, the State must submit a revised SPP that includes the FFY 2011 baseline data for this indicator.

INDICATOR 2: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

INDICATOR 3A: The State provided FFY 2011 baseline data and revised the targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.

The State is reporting Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) data used for accountability reporting under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as a result of ESEA flexibility. The State has reported FFY 2011 baseline data for this indicator based on AMOs.

INDICATOR 3B: The State revised improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

The State provided a Web link to 2011 publicly-reported assessment results.

INDICATOR 3C: The State provided FFY 2011 baseline data and revised the targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.

The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets.

The State provided a Web link to 2011 publicly-reported assessment results.

INDICATOR 4A: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”

The State reported that one district was 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 83 of 136 districts did not meet the State-established “n” size requirement of two or more students with disabilities suspended or expelled.

The State reported that it reviewed the district’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 district identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2011. The State did not identify noncompliance through this review.

INDICATOR 5: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

INDICATOR 6A: The State submitted targets for FFY 2012 and improvement activities for this indicator. OSEP cannot accept that submission because the State did not provide valid and reliable baseline data for this indicator. In its FFY 2011 APR, the State indicated that the reported data for Indicator 6A are not valid and reliable because “the data for Measurement A does not report identification of the total number of preschool students aged three through five with disabilities attending regular early childhood programs in Tennessee.” The State explained that the “Section 618 data collected on December 1, 2011 shows that 82.9% of preschool students with disabilities in Tennessee are attending a regular early childhood program. However, only 9.3% of preschool students with disabilities are reported [Indicator 6A] as receiving their special education services in the regular early childhood program.”

REQUIRED ACTIONS

With the FFY 2012 APR, the State must submit a revised SPP that includes valid and reliable baseline data for this indicator or provide an explanation of why valid and reliable data are not yet available, along with a description of the actions being taken to collect and report valid and reliable data for this indicator.

INDICATOR 6B: The State provided FFY 2011 baseline data, targets for 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 2012.

INDICATOR 7: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

REQUIRED ACTIONS

The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2012 in the FFY 2012 APR.

INDICATOR 8: The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population. OSEP notes that the State included strategies or improvement activities to address this issue in the future.

REQUIRED ACTIONS

In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2012 data are from a group representative of the population, and if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.

INDICATOR 14: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population. OSEP notes that the State included strategies or improvement activities to address this issue in the future.

REQUIRED ACTIONS

In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2012 data are from a group representative of the population, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address the issue.

Tennessee Part B FFY 2011 SPP/APR Compliance Summary

INDICATOR	FFY 2010 DATA	FFY 2011 DATA	FFY 2011 TARGET	CORRECTION OF FINDINGS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IDENTIFIED IN FFY 2010
4B. Significant discrepancy in suspension/expulsion by race/ethnicity, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	0%	0%	0%	The State reported that it identified no findings of noncompliance for this indicator in FFY 2010.
9. Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.	0%	0%	0%	The State reported that it identified no findings of noncompliance for this indicator in FFY 2010.
10. Disproportionate representation by disability of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	0%	0%	0%	The State reported that it identified no findings of noncompliance for this indicator in FFY 2010.
11. Timely Initial Evaluation	95.3%	97.9	100%	The State reported that all 100 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 were corrected in a timely manner.
12. Early Childhood Transition	98.3%	98.5%	100%	The State reported that all eight findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 were corrected in a timely manner.
13. Secondary Transition	73.3%	87.2%	100%	The State reported that all 111 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 were corrected in a timely manner.

INDICATOR	FFY 2010 DATA	FFY 2011 DATA	FFY 2011 TARGET	CORRECTION OF FINDINGS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IDENTIFIED IN FFY 2010
15. Timely Correction	100%	100%	100%	The State reported that all 549 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 were corrected in a timely manner.
20. Timely and Accurate Data	100%	98.78%	100%	

Tennessee Part B FFY 2011 State Complaint and Hearing Data from IDEA Section 618 Data Reports

REQUIREMENT	FFY 2010 DATA	FFY 2011 DATA
Timely resolution of complaints	100%	100%
Timely adjudication of due process hearing requests	The State reported that it did not have any fully adjudicated due process hearings during the reporting period.	100% (based on three hearings)

Tennessee Part B FFY 2011 Compliance Data Summary Notes

INDICATOR 4B: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State reported that eight 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 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010. The State did not identify any noncompliance through this review.

The State reported its definition of "significant discrepancy."

The State reported that it does not use a minimum "n" size requirement for this indicator.

INDICATOR 9: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

The State provided its definition of "disproportionate representation."

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 the result of inappropriate identification.

The State reported that all 136 districts met the State-established minimum "n" size requirements 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.

INDICATOR 10: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State reported that 40 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 disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.

The State provided its definition of "disproportionate representation."

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.

OSEP's June 2012 FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table required the State to include in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 15, 2013, evidence that the State deleted from this indicator 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." The State provided all of the required information.

INDICATOR 11: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

REQUIRED ACTIONS

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator: (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 09-02.⁵ In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

INDICATOR 12:

REQUIRED ACTIONS

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator: (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 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

⁵ OSEP Memorandum 09-02 (OSEP Memo 09-02), dated October 17, 2008, requires that the State report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance: (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.

INDICATOR 13: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State was identified as being in need of assistance for four consecutive years based on the State's FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2011 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.

REQUIRED ACTIONS

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator: (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 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

INDICATOR 15: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

REQUIRED ACTIONS

When reporting in the FFY 2012 APR on the correction of findings of noncompliance, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011: (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 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2012 APR, the State must use and submit the Indicator 15 Worksheet.

In addition, in responding to Indicators 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2012 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.