

**Tennessee Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised its baseline data and the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data and revised baseline for this indicator are 89%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State's FFY 2006 reported data were not valid and reliable.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all four findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, valid and reliable data that reflect the measurement for this indicator. The State submitted valid and reliable data in the FFY 2007 APR.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the timely service provision requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>In reporting on correction, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has initiated services for each child, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 87.98%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 77.7%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 78.02%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

**Tennessee Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>																												
[Results Indicator]																														
<p>3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs 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</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 310 1446 1138"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 310 1075 493">07-08 Infant and Toddler Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1075 310 1199 493">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1199 310 1323 493">Knowledge &amp; Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1323 310 1446 493">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 493 1075 565">a. % of infants &amp; toddlers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1075 493 1199 565">0</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1199 493 1323 565">1</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1323 493 1446 565">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 565 1075 708">b. % of infants &amp; toddlers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1075 565 1199 708">11</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1199 565 1323 708">9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1323 565 1446 708">9</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 708 1075 813">c. % of infants &amp; toddlers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1075 708 1199 813">34</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1199 708 1323 813">43</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1323 708 1446 813">36</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 813 1075 919">d. % of infants &amp; toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1075 813 1199 919">32</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1199 813 1323 919">28</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1323 813 1446 919">31</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 919 1075 1024">e. % of infants &amp; toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1075 919 1199 1024">23</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1199 919 1323 1024">19</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1323 919 1446 1024">24</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1024 1075 1138">Total (approx. 100%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1075 1024 1199 1138">100.00 %</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1199 1024 1323 1138">100.00 %</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1323 1024 1446 1138">100.00 %</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	07-08 Infant and Toddler Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of infants & toddlers who did not improve functioning.	0	1	0	b. % of infants & toddlers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	11	9	9	c. % of infants & toddlers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	34	43	36	d. % of infants & toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	32	28	31	e. % of infants & toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	23	19	24	Total (approx. 100%)	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	<p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
07-08 Infant and Toddler Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																											
a. % of infants & toddlers who did not improve functioning.	0	1	0																											
b. % of infants & toddlers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	11	9	9																											
c. % of infants & toddlers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	34	43	36																											
d. % of infants & toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	32	28	31																											
e. % of infants & toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	23	19	24																											
Total (approx. 100%)	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %																											

**Tennessee Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>																				
<p>4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:</p> <p>A. Know their rights;                      B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and                      C. Help their children develop and learn.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 272 1478 667"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Know their rights. (%)</td> <td align="center">95</td> <td align="center">94</td> <td align="center">90</td> <td align="center">-1.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Effectively communicate their children's needs. (%)</td> <td align="center">90</td> <td align="center">89</td> <td align="center">95</td> <td align="center">-1.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Help their children develop and learn. (%)</td> <td align="center">94</td> <td align="center">94</td> <td align="center">95</td> <td align="center">0.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The State revised its targets for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>These data represent slippage for 4A and 4B, and remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data for 4C.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target for 4A and did not meet its targets for 4B and 4C.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to address in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, whether its FFY 2007 data were based on a survey response group that was representative of its population, including the variables that the State considered in making a determination of representativeness. The State included a description of the variables it considered in determining the representativeness of the data submitted in the FFY 2007 APR and reported that its survey results were representative of the Part C population. However, the State reported data on a number of "additional variables," including race/ethnicity and rural/urban demographics, which were not representative of the population. The State provided improvement activities to address these issues.</p>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	A. Know their rights. (%)	95	94	90	-1.00%	B. Effectively communicate their children's needs. (%)	90	89	95	-1.00%	C. Help their children develop and learn. (%)	94	94	95	0.00%	<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 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p> <p>The State reported that the data for this indicator were based on a parent survey response group that is not representative of the State's population. In the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must continue to indicate whether its response group is representative of the State's population and, if not, the actions the State has taken to address this issue.</p>
	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress																		
A. Know their rights. (%)	95	94	90	-1.00%																		
B. Effectively communicate their children's needs. (%)	90	89	95	-1.00%																		
C. Help their children develop and learn. (%)	94	94	95	0.00%																		
<p>5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to:</p> <p>A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are .71%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of .71%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>																				

**Tennessee Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>B. National data. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of .85%.</p>	
<p>6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to: A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and B. National data. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 1.80%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 1.68%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 2.07%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 85%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 90%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%. The State reported that four of five findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining finding subsequently was corrected by May 31, 2008. OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009 that the uncorrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 for this indicator was corrected. The State reported that it verified correction of the one remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 on September 30, 2007.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2006 with the 45-day timeline requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a) were corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR. In reporting on correction, the State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has conducted the initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the</p>

**Tennessee Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.
<p>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 99%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the IFSP transition content requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h).</p>
<p>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State's FFY 2006 data were 99.77%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the LEA notification requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1).</p>
<p>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 88%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 87%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that four of five findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining finding was subsequently corrected by October 31, 2008.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance findings identified in FFYs 2005 and 2006 with the timely transition conference requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)) were corrected.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)),</p>

**Tennessee Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	<p>demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009 that the uncorrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 for this indicator was corrected. The State reported that it verified correction of the two remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 on June 30, 2007, and July 31, 2007, respectively.</p>	<p>including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>In reporting on correction, the State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has conducted a transition conference for each child potentially eligible for Part B, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>9. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 87%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 40%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 13 of 15 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining two findings were subsequently corrected by May 31, 2008.</p> <p>As requested in OSEP's January 15, 2009 verification letter, the State confirmed in its March 4, 2009 and FFY 2007 APR submissions that it is using all components of its Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS) as well as data from self-assessments and dispute resolution to identify noncompliance and issue findings. In its FFY 2007 APR and March 4, 2009 submission, the State reported on the identification and correction of</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2007, in accordance with IDEA section 635(a)(10)(A) and 34 CFR §303.501(b) and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance, the State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the State's monitoring system, through the State's data system and by the Department); and (2) verified that</p>

**Tennessee Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	<p>noncompliance identified through its self-assessment and dispute resolution processes.</p> <p>The State also provided the assurance and information requested in OSEP’s January 2009 verification letter, which required the State to provide a written assurance and information that the State has informed its State auditors of the need to review the State’s procedures for tracking the IDEA Part C maintenance of effort (MOE) requirements in IDEA section 637(b)(5)(B) and 34 CFR §303.124(b).</p>	<p>each EIS program with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 1, 7, and 8C in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>OSEP’s January 15, 2009 verification letter requires the State to include in its FFY 2008 APR data on findings made through policy audits and focused monitoring visits and the status of the correction of those findings. The State must continue to keep OSEP apprised of any audit findings regarding compliance with Part C’s MOE requirements in 34 CFR §303.124(b).</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 9 Worksheet.</p>
<p>10. 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on nine complaints. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP’s January 15, 2009 verification letter required the State to provide with its FFY 2009 Part C Application (or earlier) copies of State complaint decisions that include the required content (findings of fact and decision) in 34 CFR §303.512(a)(4)(i) and (ii). The State provided the requisite documents in its March 4, 2009 response. No further action is required related to this issue.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §§303.510 through 303.512.</p>

**Tennessee Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported that it did not receive any signed written requests for due process hearings during the FFY 2007 reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>12. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that no resolution sessions were held during the FFY 2007 reporting period.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2007. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported that one of two mediations resulted in a mediation agreement.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2007. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more mediations were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>14. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 98.9%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616, 618, and 642 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 303.540.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 14 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 14 Data Rubric.</p>