

Tennessee Part B FFY 2012 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]
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 2012 SPP/APR Results Data Summary

INDICATOR	FFY 2011 DATA	FFY 2012 DATA	FFY 2012 TARGET
1. Graduation	67.4%	73%	$\geq 1.5\%$ ¹ increase
2. Drop Out	9.6%	3.47%	$\leq 1.5\%$ ² decrease
3. A. Percent of Districts Meeting AYP for Disability Subgroup: Percent of Districts Meeting the AMO for Algebra I and II	14.8%	23%	$\geq 6.25\%$ increase
A. Percent of Districts meeting the AMO for English II and III	32.1%	18%	$\geq 6.25\%$ increase
A. Percent of Districts Meeting the AMO for Math (3-8)	15.6%	12%	$\geq 6.25\%$ increase
A. Percent of Districts Meeting the AMO for Reading (3-8)	23.2%	20%	$\geq 6.25\%$ increase
B. Statewide Assessment Participation Rate – Reading	99.1%	99.6%	$\geq 95\%$
B. Statewide Assessment Participation Rate – Math	99.2%	99.7%	$\geq 95\%$
C. Proficiency Rate- Reading	41.4%	31.8%	3-5% increase
C. Proficiency Rate-Math	36.8%	31.3%	3-5% increase
4. A. Percent of Districts with Significant Discrepancy in Suspension/Expulsion	1.9%	.74%	$\leq 1\%$ reduction
5. Educational Environment for Children with IEPs 6-21			
A. In Regular Education 80% or More of Day	63.4%	63.41%	$\geq 60.5\%$
B. In Regular Education Less than 40% of Day	12.3%	11.9%	$\leq 11.5\%$
C. In Separate Schools, Residential Facilities, or Homebound/Hospitals	1.8%	1.8%	$\leq 2.04\%$
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	Not Valid and Reliable	
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.	13.3%	13.8%	$\leq 12.8\%$
7. Preschool Outcomes	See Attached	See Attached	See Attached

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

² As used in this table, the symbol “ \leq ” means that, to meet the target, the State’s data must be less than or equal to the established target.

INDICATOR	FFY 2011 DATA	FFY 2012 DATA	FFY 2012 TARGET
	Table	Table	Table
8. Parents Reporting Schools Facilitated Parent Involvement	91%	97.3%	≥ 97%
14. Percent of Youth No Longer in School, within One Year of Leaving High School:			
A. Enrolled in Higher Education	15%	18.3%	≥ 23.5%
B. Enrolled in Higher Education or Competitively Employed	50.9%	52.3%	≥ 58.5%
C. Enrolled in Higher Education or Other Postsecondary Education or Training or Competitively Employed or in Some Other Employment	60.3%	66.1%	≥ 67.5%
18. Hearing Requests Resolved through Resolution Session Agreements	69%	57%	≥ 8%
19. Mediations Held that Resulted in Mediation Agreements	73%	85%	≥ 67.5%

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

Summary Statement 1 ³	FFY 2011 Data	FFY 2012 Data	FFY 2012 Target
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	90%	88%	≥ 92.7%
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	88.9%	87%	≥ 90.5%
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	89.6%	88.6%	≥ 93.6%
Summary Statement 2 ⁴	FFY 2011 Data	FFY 2012 Data	FFY 2012 Target
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	59.5%	57.8%	≥ 58.4%
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	56.9%	55.5%	≥ 56.7%
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	69.2%	68.3%	≥ 69%

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 2012 Results Data Summary Notes

INDICATOR 1: OSEP's FFY 2011 SPP/APR Response Table required the State to include with the FFY 2012 APR a revised SPP that includes the FFY 2011 baseline data for this indicator. The State provided all of the required information.

INDICATOR 3B: The State provided a Web link to 2012 publicly-reported assessment results.

INDICATOR 3C: The State provided a Web link to 2012 publicly-reported assessment results.

INDICATOR 4A: 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 98 of 136 districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of two or more students with disabilities suspended or expelled for greater than ten days.

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 IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2012. The State did not identify noncompliance through this review.

INDICATOR 6A: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2013 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator. These data are not valid and reliable because the State reported that valid and reliable data for this indicator are not yet available. However, the State reported that it implemented improvement activities for FFY 2012 "to address data collection and reporting," and "anticipates that these improvements will be reflected in the data reported for FFY 2013."

OSEP's FFY 2011 APR Response Table required the State to include in the FFY 2012 APR 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. The State provided an explanation of why valid and reliable data are not yet available for this indicator, and a description of actions being taken to collect and report valid and reliable data in the FFY 2013 APR.

REQUIRED ACTIONS

With the FFY 2013 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 7:

REQUIRED ACTIONS

The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013 in the FFY 2013 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's FFY 2011 SPP/APR Response Table required the State to 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. The State provided all of the required information.

REQUIRED ACTIONS

In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2013 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 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 2013 APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2013 data are from a group representative of the population, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.

Tennessee Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Compliance Summary

INDICATOR	FFY 2011 DATA	FFY 2012 DATA	FFY 2012 TARGET	CORRECTION OF FINDINGS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IDENTIFIED IN FFY 2011
4B. Significant disproportionality 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 did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2011.
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 did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2011.
10. Disproportionate representation by disability of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	0%	1.47%	0%	The State reported that it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2011.
11. Timely Initial Evaluation	97.9%	97.9%	100%	The State reported that all 78 of its findings of noncompliance in FFY 2011 were corrected in a timely manner.
12. Early Childhood Transition	98.5%	98.71%	100%	The State reported that all 12 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 were corrected in a timely manner.
13. Secondary Transition	87.2%	87.6%	100%	The State reported that all 24 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 were corrected in a timely manner.
15. Timely Correction	100%	100%	100%	The State reported that all 915 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 were corrected in a timely manner.

INDICATOR	FFY 2011 DATA	FFY 2012 DATA	FFY 2012 TARGET	CORRECTION OF FINDINGS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IDENTIFIED IN FFY 2011
20. Timely and Accurate Data	98.78%	98.84%	100%	

Tennessee Part B FFY 2012 State Complaint and Hearing Data from IDEA Section 618 Data Reports

REQUIREMENT	FFY 2011 DATA	FFY 2012 DATA
Timely resolution of complaints	100%	100%
Timely adjudication of due process hearing requests	100% (based on three hearings)	100% (based on one due process hearing)

Tennessee FFY 2012 Compliance Data Summary Notes

INDICATOR 4B: The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”

The State reported that one district was 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 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 a significant discrepancies in FFY 2011. The State did not identify any noncompliance through the review.

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

INDICATOR 9: The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education or related services.

The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”

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 reported that 34 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that two districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific 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.

REQUIRED ACTIONS

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2012 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2013 APR, that the districts identified in FFY 2012 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (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 district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.⁵ In the FFY 2013 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 11:

REQUIRED ACTIONS

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2012, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2013 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 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 2013 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 2012, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2013 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 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 2013 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

INDICATOR 13:

REQUIRED ACTIONS

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2012, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2013 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 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 2013 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

INDICATOR 15:

REQUIRED ACTIONS

In addition, in responding to Indicators 10, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2013 SPP/APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.