

**Tennessee, Part C
Annual Performance Report
2008 – 2009**



**State Department of Education
Division of Special Education**

Report Submission Date: February 1, 2010

Revised: 4/8/10

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APR Overview	3
INDICATOR 1	4
Timeliness of Services	
INDICATOR 2	7
Natural Environments	
INDICATOR 3	9
Child Outcomes	
INDICATOR 4	11
Family Outcomes	
INDICATOR 5	14
Birth to One Year Comparison Data	
INDICATOR 6	17
Birth through Two Years Comparison Data	
INDICATOR 7	20
Timeliness of IFSPs	
INDICATOR 8	24
Timeliness of Transitions	
INDICATOR 9	28
Statewide Monitoring of Corrections and Noncompliance	
INDICATOR 10	34
Timeliness of Written Complaints	
INDICATOR 11	35
Timeliness of Due Process Hearings	
INDICATOR 12	36
Resolution Sessions	
INDICATOR 13	37
Mediation Agreements	
INDICATOR 14	38
Timeliness and Accuracy of State Reported Data	
ATTACHMENT LIST	41
(1) State Performance Plan (SPP) Report for Indicator 3	
(2) Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO): Entrance Data Collection Form	
(3) Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO): Exit Data Collection Form	
(4) NCSEAM Family Survey Form	
(5) Tennessee ICC Certification	

Tennessee, Part C Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008-2009

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The Part C, Individuals with Disability Education Act (IDEA) Annual Performance Report (APR) was developed in conjunction with and approved by the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) for the required indicators. Measures to complete the annual report were as follows:

1. Data utilized in the APR and State Performance Plan (SPP) were gathered from Federal 618 Data Reports, **full fiscal year data** from Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS), child outcomes data, family surveys, and monitoring activities.
2. The Part C Monitoring Coordinator took lead responsibility in the APR development and submission, along with necessary updates to the SPP. The Part C Data Manager provided the analysis of data for SPP/APR Indicators. Additional Division of Special Education (DSE) personnel provided consultative assistance on various indicators as needed. DSE Monitoring Team reviewed the APR utilizing the following OSEP documents: Part C Instruction Sheet (11/12/09); Tennessee's 2008 APR Letter and accompanying Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table; Part C Indicator Measurement Table (6/1/09); Part C APR Frequently Asked Questions (9/3/08); APR Checklist (1/23/09); and OSEP Memo 09-02 regarding reporting on the correction of noncompliance in the APR (10/17/08).
3. The first draft was completed December 1 for review and feedback by the Office of Early Childhood (OEC) Director and DSE Assistant Commissioner. A second draft was completed December 11 for an external review and feedback from Mid-South Regional Resource Center.
4. The Part C Monitoring Consultant reviewed a final draft of the Report and obtained input from the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) Chairperson on January 5, 2010. The Chairperson presented the full review of the APR with SICC membership on January 26 at the regularly scheduled meeting. Feedback was incorporated into the final report.
5. The FFY 2008-2009 APR including the updated SPP for Indicator 3 (Attachment 1), were submitted to the Federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on January 28, 2010. In February of 2010, these report documents will be posted on the State's website located at http://tennessee.gov/education/teis/reports_data.shtm. Notification regarding the posting will be sent to all early intervention community and the SICC membership.

Information regarding Tennessee's performance relative to the Federal and State targets is found under each indicator in the APR. Performance of each Early Intervention Service (EIS) Program based on Federal and State targets will be reported in the *Annual Report to the Public* which will be posted on the State's Part C website in March 2010. In Tennessee, EIS programs are defined as the nine Tennessee Early Intervention Point-of-Entry Offices (TEIS-POEs).

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to Overview, page 3.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 1: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Account for untimely receipt of services.

Tennessee’s definition for “timely services”: no longer than 30 calendar days from the date of parent consent on an IFSP for a service.

92% = 3473/3777 x 100

Number of children with service delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances = 184

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-2009	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008-2009:

91.95% - based on 3473 infants and toddlers with timely services out of 3777 infants and toddlers with new services initiated during the fiscal year on any IFSP type (initial, six-month review, annual, review change). Data account for the timely receipt of all services for a child rather than individual services. For example, if a child had four services and any one of the four was delivered untimely, the child had untimely service delivery.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2008-2009:

FFY 2008-2009 data were reported entirely from the Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) – full census data for Part C eligible infants and toddlers across all IFSP types (initial, six-month review, annual, review change). Data were reviewed by the TEIS-POE leadership team with a subsequent review by DSE monitoring personnel in order to ensure accuracy and to identify reasons for untimely service delivery.

Delays due to exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record were included in both the numerator and denominator when determining compliance for timely service delivery.

Total # Infants/Toddlers with Delivered Services	# of Infants/Toddlers with Timely Services	# of Infants/Toddlers with Untimely Services Due to Exceptional Family Circumstances	Total # of Infants/Toddlers with Timely Delivered Services
3777	3289	184	3473

APR – Part C (4)

tn-apr-2009c

Measurement:

- Number of Infants/Toddlers with Timely Delivered Services (3473) = # of Infants/Toddlers with Timely Delivered Services (3289) + # of Infants/Toddlers with Untimely Services Due to Exceptional Family Circumstances (184)
- Percentage of Infants/Toddlers with Timely Delivered Services (92%) = Total # of Infants/Toddlers with Timely Delivered Services (3473) / Total # of Infants/Toddlers with Delivered Services (3777) x 100.

The Lead Agency reports progress from FFY 2007-2008 for Indicator 1. Data for FFY 2008-2009 reveals that 92% of children had timely delivery of services where in FFY 2007-2008 the percentage was 89%. This represents a 3% improvement from FFY 2007-2008.

Status of FFY 2007-2008 Findings

All nine EIS programs were monitored during FFY 2007-2008. The DSE Monitoring Team reviewed subsequent monthly child-level data for all nine POEs prior to the issuance of findings and validated the correction of all noncompliance for eight of the nine POEs. One finding (FT) of noncompliance was made relative to Indicator 1. The Monitoring Team verified that correction for the one finding occurred in a timely manner (i.e., within one year from date written finding was issued). This information is also referenced in the Indicator 9 Worksheet.

DSE personnel have verified that all nine EIS programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, and have initiated services for each infant and toddler, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of TEIS. The Lead Agency utilized direction from both OSEP’s FAQ Regarding Identification and Correction of Noncompliance and Reporting on Correction in the State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report (9-3-08) and OSEP’s Memorandum 09-02.

Correction of FFY 2007-2008 Findings of Noncompliance Timely Corrected (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance).

1. Number of findings of noncompliance that state made during FFY 2007 (the period from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008)	1
2. Number of findings the state verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS programs of the finding)	1
3. Number of findings not verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Additional note: The state reports all four findings relative to Indicator 1 made in FFY 2006-2007 were corrected in a timely manner. Correction of noncompliance for the FFY 2006-2007 reporting period is 100%. Refer to the FFY-2007-2008 APR submitted February 2, 2009 for further details.

FFY 2008-2009 Findings of Noncompliance

All nine EIS programs were monitored during FFY 2008-2009. One finding (MD) of noncompliance was made relative to Indicator 1. Of important note, DSE personnel verified that this finding was also corrected timely. This information will be reported in Indicator 9 of the February 2011 APR.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008-2009:

The state reviewed the effectiveness of SPP/APR Targets and Improvement Activities, including Timelines and Resources outlined in the State Performance Plan (SPP). In an effort to achieve compliance, this review resulted in the development of the additional activities below. The Lead Agency will continue to implement activities already specified in the SPP along with the new activities. The SPP has been updated to reflect the addition of these activities.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources established FFY 2008 (2008-2009)

Activity/ Action	Timelines	Resources
Monitoring through TEIDS for reporting guidelines associated with timely service delivery for part-time personnel.	Spring 2009 and ongoing	DSE Personnel, POE Direct Services Managers and/or District Administrators
Coach part-time personnel when problems are identified	Spring 2009 and ongoing	POE Direct Services Managers and/or District Administrators

APR – Part C (4)**tn-apr-2009c**

Include information in Vendor packet materials relative to TN's definition for timely delivery of services and guidelines for documenting service delivery in TEIDS.	May 2009 and ongoing for new Vendors	Central Reimbursement Office, DSE Data Manager, POE Direct Services Managers and/or District Administrators
--	--------------------------------------	---

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to “Overview”, page 3.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 2: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.¹

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

90% = 3927/4362 x 100 → Exceeded State Target

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-2009	80.36% Home and Community

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008-2009:

90.03% - based on 3927 infants and toddlers in home and community settings out of 4362 children reported in Table 2 of the 618 Data for program settings on December 1, 2008. The Lead Agency exceeded the State Target for this reporting period.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2008-2009:

As previously reported in the 2/1/08 APR (FFY 2006-2007), the Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) contains a validation which requires a statement of justification be completed on an IFSP whenever services are provided outside the natural environment. The TEIDS process validates the presence of a statement of justification.

When comparing data from FFY 2007-2008, the Lead Agency reports progress in the number of infants and toddlers who received IFSP services in home and community settings - 90% in FFY 2008-2009 as compared to 88% infants and toddlers in FFY 2007-2008.

One noteworthy improvement resulting from the TEIS reforms and the establishment of the Central Reimbursement Office (CRO) was that the Lead Agency offered an incentive rate to Part C vendors through the Authorization to Vendor process in October 2007. Each early intervention service included a standard "in clinic" rate as well as a higher "natural environment" or "enhanced" rate (including travel). On October 1, 2008, a second incentive rate increase was implemented for vendors who provide services in the home or community setting. The Lead Agency believes that this incentive rate positively impacted the increase in services delivered in the natural environment.

FFY 2008-2009 Updates for Improvement Activities

Determining a family’s resources, priorities, and concerns is a critical component of early intervention program planning. By assessing family daily routines, the information gathered is more likely to be used in IFSP development with implementation in the context of the natural environment. The accumulation of this information is used to develop functional IFSP goals that sustain support-based intervention through integrated services and supports. The State of

Tennessee Part C System, through its Operations Manual procedures, has chosen the Routines Based Interview (RBI) as the process for gathering family assessment information for IFSP development.

Dr. Robin McWilliam, the developer of the RBI, has trained/certified the DSE Training and Workforce Development Coordinator as a trainer in this process. During the FFY 2008-2009, all POE Service Coordination Managers (SCM) and DSE Trainers/Mentors were trained in Functional Outcomes and Action Step Development during Statewide Mandatory Training in April and May 2009. Teams in each POE office are responsible for follow-up on progress toward RBI completion and training. Those Service Coordinators who have yet to be phased into using the RBI process participated and were trained to use the Daily Activities Discussion Worksheet to obtain goals which can be written in a functional manner. Early Interventionists and Early Intervention Resource Agency (EIRA) personnel were trained on their responsibilities during the family assessment process during the TEIS Summer Institute in 2009. The purpose of the training was to provide education for early intervention personnel in writing family focused outcomes into the IFSP and the early intervention process.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-2009:

The state reviewed the effectiveness of SPP/APR Targets and Improvement Activities, including Timelines and Resources, and determined revisions were not warranted at this time. Tennessee exceeded the target and believes the initiatives undertaken will lead to further progress. The state will continue to implement activities outlined in the State Performance Plan (SPP) and 2/2/09 Annual Performance Report (APR).

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008-2009

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The February 2010 required submission for this indicator is reported in the Tennessee's State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2008-2009. See Attachment 1 for the SPP report for Indicator 3. Report information contained in Attachment 1 is also recorded in the State's SPP – Revised 2008-2009 document.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 3: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:
- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
 - b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
 - c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
 - d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
 - e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-2009	Targets will be set in 2010

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008-2009:

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2008-2009:

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008-2009:

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to Overview, page 3.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 4: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

- 4A. 94% = 649/687 x 100**
- 4B. 93% = 637/686 x 100 → Exceeded State Target**
- 4C. 96% = 656/685 x 100 → Exceeded State Target**

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-2009	A. 95% B. 90% C. 94%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008-2009:

- 4A. Family survey results revealed 94% of families participating in Part C report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights. The State did not meet its target for this indicator measurement; however, the resulting percentage remained the same from FFY 2007-2008.
- 4B. Family survey results revealed 93% of families participating in Part C report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs. The State exceeded its target for this indicator measurement.
- 4C. Family survey results revealed 96% of families participating in Part C report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn. The State exceeded its target for this indicator measurement.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2008-2009:

For FFY 2008-2009, Tennessee utilized a condensed version of the Part C Family Survey developed through the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM). The Lead Agency reduced the number of survey questions from 47 to 25. This was a planned effort as the Lead Agency believed a more focused survey might increase the overall response rate. A systematic approach was taken to focus the questions while maintaining the integrity of the survey. DSE personnel individually prioritized questions based on relevancy to the Lead Agency while at the same time ensuring all sections of the NCSEAM survey were represented. Individual responses were then tabulated for comparison. The Lead Agency was pleased to find that there was a high level of agreement in the selection process. Consensus was reached for the final determination of questions. See Attachment 4 for a copy of the survey.

All families of Part C eligible infants and toddlers in Tennessee with active IFSPs were used for the collection of data. Point in time data were pulled on April 30, 2009. Family address information was pulled from Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) for all nine TEIS-POEs. Two options for survey completion were provided to families for the first time this year – online and hard copy through mail. Options included English and Spanish formats. Families for whom TEIDS contained an email address were notified to complete the survey online. Two reminders regarding the online survey option were sent. Surveys were then mailed to remaining families – those without email addresses and those who had email addresses but had not responded to the online survey. The online option for survey completion was made available when the hard copy survey was mailed. A total of 2370 NCSEAM surveys were delivered with 692 responding (29.20%). Of the 692 respondents, 191 (28%) responded online and 510 (72%) responded through mail.

East Tennessee State University (ETSU) personnel disseminated and collected family survey data. Utilizing ETSU resources for centralized data collection was done to ensure consistent, valid, and reliable data statewide. A contact phone number and email address were provided should families have questions. There were a few incidences where families made contact for assistance. When surveys were returned undeliverable but with a forwarding address, surveys were resent.

As anticipated, providing two options for the completion of the family survey and a more focused survey format increased the response rate for this year. There was a 12.31% increase in the survey response rate for FFY 2008-2009 (29.20%) when compared to FFY 2007-2008 (16.89%).

Resources through the Lead Agency's contract with East Tennessee State University (ETSU) will continue to be utilized for survey dissemination via online and mail utilizing the NCSEAM survey for FFY 2009-2010.

Based on the survey response rate compared with December 1, 2008 Child Count Data, the Lead Agency determined that survey results are representative of the Part C population size (birth to three years of age) served for FFY 2008-2009. The response rate allows the State to have a 95% confidence level with 3.14% confidence interval. These results were confirmed by using the "Sample Size Calculator" at <http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm>.

For FFY 2008-2009, the Lead Agency also reviewed family survey results against two additional variables when looking at representativeness of results. The two variables in addition to the Part C population size served were: 1) community type – rural, suburban, and urban; and 2) race/ethnicity – American Indian, Asian, Black, Hispanic, and White.

Survey results for community type revealed a representative response rate across rural, suburban, and urban communities when compared with 618 Child Count Data for those community types. The most statistically significant change was noted for the urban community type response rate. This response rate saw an increased percentage when compared to FFY 2007-2008. The response rate for urban communities improved from FFY 2007-2008, 15.35% to FFY 2008-2009, 49.42%. This increased percentage is believed to be linked to offering the two options for the completion of the family survey and a more focused survey format. Urban is the largest community type relative to infants and toddlers served in Tennessee.

Results based on the variable of race/ethnicity revealed a comparable response rate among all race/ethnicity groups – White, Black, American Indian, Asian, and Hispanic populations when compared to 618 Child Count Data for these populations. An important change was noted in the Black population. This response rate saw an increased percentage when compared to FFY 2007-2008. The response rate in the Black population improved from FFY 2007-2008, 10.50% to FFY 2008-2009, 17.34%. This increased percentage is believed to be linked to offering the two

APR – Part C (4)**tn-apr-2009c**

options for the completion of the family survey and a more focused survey format. As a result of this improvement, the response rates of all race/ethnicity groups are comparable to Child Count Data.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008-2009:

The state reviewed the effectiveness of SPP/APR Targets and Improvement Activities, including Timelines and Resources outlined in the State Performance Plan (SPP). The state developed and completed the following improvement activities to help ensure families know their rights (4A). The Lead Agency will continue to implement activities already specified in the SPP along with the new activities. The SPP has been updated to reflect the addition of these activities.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources established FFY 2008 (2008-2009)

Activity/ Action	Timelines	Resources
Develop required training for all TEIS Point of Entry Offices (POEs) on the following topics: family focused IFSP development; goal and action step development; procedural safeguards; and policies and procedures.	February-March 2009	DSE Training Workforce Development Coordinator, DSE Trainer/ Mentors, Part C Monitoring Team
Provide two-day training to all TEIS POE personnel.	April-May 2009	DSE Training Workforce Development Coordinator, DSE Trainer/ Mentors, Part C Monitoring Coordinator

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008-2009

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to Overview, page 3.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 5: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared to National data.

.71% = 602/85191 x 100 compared to National Baseline of 1.04%

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-2009	.89%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008-2009:

The U.S. Census Bureau’s population estimate for infants and toddlers in Tennessee under the age of one was 85,191 for FFY 2008-2009. The total number of infants and toddlers in Tennessee under the age of one with IFSPs on December 1, 2008, was 602. 618 Child Count Data reports Tennessee at .71% as compared to the national baseline of 1.04%. The state did not meet its target for FFY 2008-2009.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2008-2009:

Tennessee retained the same percentage (.71%) as in FFY 2007-2008 relative to the national baseline, which had an increase of .03%. While the percentage of infants and toddlers served (birth to one year) remained the same, the Lead Agency reports progress as there was an increase in number by 12 children from the previous fiscal year – FFY 2008, 602 for .71% and FFY 2007, 590 for .71%.

Tennessee is considered a state with a narrow eligibility definition. Because of this, it is difficult to meaningfully compare Tennessee’s data for Indicator 5 with the national baseline. The national baseline is determined annually from the average across 52 states (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico). These states have eligibility criteria that range from broad to moderate to narrow.

FFY 2008-2009 Updates for Improvement Activities

Because physicians remain a primary source of referrals to TEIS, an ongoing activity of the Lead Agency is its collaborative efforts with the Tennessee Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (TNAAP) who offers Screening Tools and Referral Training (START) to physicians interested in providing developmental/behavioral services early in an infant or toddler’s life. The START Program offers pediatricians, family physicians, nurse practitioners, nurses, and other primary care providers the knowledge, skills, and strategies to make routine developmental and behavioral screening a part of their health care protocol for all children, especially the very young. The START Program is delivered by pediatricians and family physicians who have been trained to teach this program. START’s Medical Director is a board-certified developmental behavioral pediatrician and one of the program’s facilitators. The Medical Director is also a member of the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). Funded through Tennessee’s Medicaid Program (i.e., TennCare), statewide regional training programs are offered free of charge to medical personnel. A TEIS-POE representative is present at all regional trainings to deliver a portion of the training specific to TEIS. For practices that choose to have an abbreviated office-based training, the POE contacts those practices after training is delivered.

APR – Part C (4)

tn-apr-2009c

START updates for FFY 2008-2009, 105 physicians, 17 staff, and 22 others (guests) were trained with 67 practices participating in the training. Two additional pediatricians were trained as facilitators to deliver START training. More information on the START program can be found on their website at:

www.tnaap.org/developmental/developmental.asp.

The Lead Agency has ongoing collaboration with the State Department of Children's Services (DCS) and provides training to the Department's nursing specialists and education specialists to ensure a timely referral to early intervention.

Public Awareness Plan updates FFY 2008-2009. The Lead Agency implemented its formal Public Awareness Plan June of 2008. The first annual review of the Plan was conducted in June, 2009. The focus for FFY 2008 was continued efforts to ensure physicians and health departments had information and materials regarding TEIS. POE Eligibility Coordinators are the primary point of contact with physician offices and health departments within their districts. As part of the leadership role, they are in frequent contact with medical personnel and the community at large (i.e., Childcare Resource and Referral Centers [CCR&Rs], LEAs, local childcare centers, conferences such as Tennessee Association for Young Children [TAYC], etc.) to educate the public about TEIS and disseminate public awareness materials. When invited, DSE Central Office and POE personnel regularly avail themselves to present information about TEIS (such as, history, eligibility requirements, IFSP process, and how to make referrals, etc) at civic groups and university classes.

Diagnoses and Conditions List updates for FFY 2008-2009: The Lead Agency is currently in process of updating this List used in the determination of eligibility based on Part B of the definition for developmental delay. This list was first implemented in November 2007 and is posted on the State website http://tennessee.gov/education/teis/reports_data.shtml. The START Medical Director (mentioned above) and others in the medical community are assisting in these efforts and have also been a significant resource to the DSE regarding eligibility questions.

New initiatives for FFY 2009-2010

The Lead Agency has begun development work to include International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems Codes (ICD-9 Codes) relative to TN's approved TEIS Diagnoses and Conditions List. It is expected that this effort will assist: 1) improved communication with medical personnel regarding TEIS and the program's eligibility standards 2) POE Eligibility Coordinators in the determination of eligibility consistent with the List, 3) in streamlining the DSE Central Reimbursement Office (CRO) approval of provider billing, and 4) the DSE Monitoring Team in more efficiently monitoring compliance of the Part B definition for eligibility for Part C. TEIDS will be upgraded to include reporting capabilities for diagnoses by ICD-9 Codes.

While mental health diagnoses are rare in children under the age of three years, the Lead Agency wants to further define the mental health section of the TEIS Diagnoses and Conditions List. It is expected that this work will assist: 1) in clarifying information used by POE Eligibility Coordinators when determining eligibility and to better facilitate their communications with physicians regarding a child's possible eligibility, and 2) Service Coordinators with developing IFSP outcomes for this population of infants and toddlers. The Lead Agency will utilize assistance for this initiative from START's Medical Director and Vanderbilt University.

START's Medical Director and physician representative on the SICC presented a proposal to the Lead Agency to investigate the purchasing and use of cutting edge vision screener technology. A partnership with Vanderbilt Children's Hospital will be pursued to identify the best available technology for photo refractive vision screeners. The Lead Agency believes that purchasing such technology will provide more valid and reliable vision screening results for the POE Developmental Specialists when assessing vision needs in infants and toddlers.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008-2009:

The state reviewed the effectiveness of SPP/APR Targets and Improvement Activities, including Timelines and Resources outlined in the State Performance Plan (SPP). In an effort to achieve compliance, this review resulted in the development of the additional activities below. The Lead Agency will continue to implement activities already specified in the SPP along with the new activities. The SPP has been updated to reflect the addition of these activities.

APR – Part C (4)

tn-apr-2009c

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources established FFY 2008 (2008-2009)

Activity/ Action	Timelines	Resources
Research photo refractive vision screening technology options.	Summer 2009	DSE personnel, START Medical Director, Vanderbilt University
Purchase photo refractive vision screeners.	Fall 2009	DSE personnel
Train and implement POE Developmental Specialists in the use of photo refractive vision screeners.	Fall 2009	DSE personnel, Contract personnel, POE Eligibility Coordinators, POE Developmental Specialists
Consider revising state target for next SPP/APR (FFY 2010-2011) submission due February, 1, 2011.	Spring 2010	DSE personnel, State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC)
Develop Public Service Announcements (PSAs) to be utilized statewide as an avenue for program and referral information about TEIS.	June 2010	Part C Coordinator, DSE Training Workforce Development Coordinator, POE Trainer/ Mentors
Initiate PSAs statewide for program and referral information about TEIS.	Fall 2010	Part C Coordinator, DSE Training Workforce Development Coordinator, POE Trainer/ Mentors
Update the TEIS Diagnoses and Conditions List to include the codes for International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems (ICD-9 Codes).	June 2010	DSE personnel, START Medical Director and additional stakeholders including medical, agency personnel, and parents
Upgrade Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) to contain a drop-down list of approved diagnoses along with ICD-9 Codes.	Fall 2010	DSE Data Manager and other DSE personnel, Yahasoft, Inc. Contractor
Further define the mental health section of the TEIS Diagnoses and Conditions List.	Fall 2010	DSE personnel, START Medical Director and additional stakeholders including medical, agency personnel, and parents

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to Overview, page 3.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 6: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100 compared to National data.

1.72% = 4362/253429 x 100 compared to the National Baseline of 2.66%

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-2009	2.24%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008-2009:

The U.S. Census Bureau’s population estimate for infants and toddlers birth through two years of age was 253429 for FFY 2008-2009. The total number of infants and toddlers in Tennessee birth through 2 years of age with IFSPs on December 1, 2008, was 4362. 618 Child Count Data reports Tennessee at 1.72% as compared to the national baseline of 2.66%. The state did not meet its target for FFY 2008-2009.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2008-2009:

Tennessee experienced slippage from FFY 2007-2008 relative to the national baseline, which had an increase of .59%. Overall, the State experienced a decrease in number of infants and toddlers served birth through 2 years from the previous fiscal year – FFY 2008, 4362 for 1.72% and FFY 2007, 4461 for 1.80%.

When reviewing 618, Child Count Data for the past two fiscal years the number of children reported on December 1 decreased by more than 10 but the percentage of decrease was only 2%. This change does not represent a significant change.

Tennessee is considered a state with a narrow eligibility definition. Because of this, it is difficult to meaningfully compare Tennessee’s data for Indicator 6 with the national baseline. The national baseline is determined annually from the average across 52 states (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico). These states have eligibility criteria that range from broad to moderate to narrow.

When providing information within the state (i.e., Legislators, other state departments, SICC, etc.) regarding the number of infants/toddlers served birth through two years of age the Lead Agency utilizes the Federal 618 Data from both the December 1 Child Count and Exiting. December 1 Child Count is a “snapshot” of the number of children with IFSPs on that particular day. Exiting data provides the number of children who had an IFSP at some point during the course of the full fiscal year. The Lead Agency believes that the combination of these two numbers is a more accurate reflection of actual numbers of infants/toddlers served during a fiscal year. For FFY year 2008-2009 the combined number was 8008 infants and toddlers served birth through age two years – 4362, December 1 Child Count and 3646, Exiting.

FFY 2008-2009 Updates for Improvement Activities

Because physicians remain a primary source of referrals to TEIS, an ongoing activity of the Lead Agency is its collaborative efforts with the Tennessee Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (TNAAP) who offers Screening Tools and Referral Training (START) to physicians interested in providing developmental/behavioral services early in an infant or toddler's life. The START Program offers pediatricians, family physicians, nurse practitioners, nurses, and other primary care providers the knowledge, skills, and strategies to make routine developmental and behavioral screening a part of their health care protocol for all children, especially the very young. The START Program is delivered by pediatricians and family physicians who have been trained to teach this program. START's Medical Director is a board-certified developmental behavioral pediatrician and one of the program's facilitators. The Medical Director is also a member of the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). Funded through Tennessee's Medicaid Program (i.e., TennCare), statewide regional training programs are offered free of charge to medical personnel. A TEIS-POE representative is present at all regional trainings to deliver a portion of the training specific to TEIS. For practices that choose to have an abbreviated office-based training, the POE contacts those practices after training is delivered.

START updates for FFY 2008-2009, 105 physicians, 17 staff, and 22 others (guests) were trained with 67 practices participating in the training. Two additional pediatricians were trained as facilitators to deliver START training. More information on the START program can be found on their website at: www.tnaap.org/developmental/developmental.asp.

The Lead Agency has ongoing collaboration with the State Department of Children's Services (DCS) and provides training to the Department's nursing specialists and education specialists to ensure a timely referral to early intervention.

Public Awareness Plan updates FFY 2008-2009. The Lead Agency implemented its formal Public Awareness Plan June of 2008. The first annual review of the Plan was conducted in June, 2009. The focus for FFY 2008 was continued efforts to ensure physicians and health departments had information and materials regarding TEIS. POE Eligibility Coordinators are the primary point of contact with physician offices and health departments within their districts. As part of the leadership role, they are in frequent contact with medical personnel and the community at large (i.e., Childcare Resource and Referral Centers [CCR&Rs], LEAs, local childcare centers, conferences such as Tennessee Association for Young Children [TAYC], etc.) to educate the public about TEIS and disseminate public awareness materials. When invited, DSE Central Office and POE personnel regularly avail themselves to present information about TEIS (such as, history, eligibility requirements, IFSP process, and how to make referrals, etc) at civic groups and university classes.

Diagnoses and Conditions List updates for FFY 2008-2009: The Lead Agency is currently in process of updating this List used in the determination of eligibility based on Part B of the definition for developmental delay. This list was first implemented in November 2007 and is posted on the State website http://tennessee.gov/education/teis/reports_data.shtml. The START Medical Director (mentioned above) and others in the medical community are assisting in these efforts and have also been a significant resource to the DSE regarding eligibility questions.

New initiatives for FFY 2009-2010

The Lead Agency has begun development work to include International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems Codes (ICD-9 Codes) relative to TN's approved TEIS Diagnoses and Conditions List. It is expected that this effort will assist: 1) improved communication with medical personnel regarding TEIS and the program's eligibility standards 2) POE Eligibility Coordinators in the determination of eligibility consistent with the List, 3) in streamlining the DSE Central Reimbursement Office (CRO) approval of provider billing, and 4) the DSE Monitoring Team in more efficiently monitoring compliance of the Part B definition for eligibility for Part C. TEIDS will be upgraded to include reporting capabilities for diagnoses by ICD-9 Codes.

While mental health diagnoses are rare in children under the age of three years, the Lead Agency wants to further define the mental health section of the TEIS Diagnoses and Conditions List. It is expected that this work will assist: 1) in clarifying information used by POE Eligibility Coordinators when determining eligibility and to better facilitate their communications with physicians regarding a child's possible eligibility, and 2) Service Coordinators with developing IFSP outcomes for this population of infants and toddlers. The Lead Agency will utilize assistance for this initiative from START's Medical Director and Vanderbilt University.

APR – Part C (4)**tn-apr-2009c**

START's Medical Director and physician representative on the SICC presented a proposal to the Lead Agency to investigate the purchasing and use of cutting edge vision screener technology. A partnership with Vanderbilt Children's Hospital will be pursued to identify the best available technology for photo refractive vision screeners. The Lead Agency believes that purchasing such technology will provide more valid and reliable vision screening results for the POE Developmental Specialists when assessing vision needs in infants and toddlers.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008-2009:

The state reviewed the effectiveness of SPP/APR Targets and Improvement Activities, including Timelines and Resources outlined in the State Performance Plan (SPP). In an effort to achieve compliance, this review resulted in the development of the additional activities below. The Lead Agency will continue to implement activities already specified in the SPP along with the new activities. The SPP has been updated to reflect the addition of these activities.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources established FFY 2008 (2008-2009)

Activity/ Action	Timelines	Resources
Research photo refractive vision screening technology options.	Summer 2009	DSE personnel, START Medical Director, Vanderbilt University
Purchase photo refractive vision screeners.	Fall 2009	DSE personnel
Train and implement POE Developmental Specialists in the use of photo refractive vision screeners.	Fall 2009	DSE personnel, Contract personnel, POE Eligibility Coordinators, POE Developmental Specialists
Consider revising state target for next SPP/APR (FFY 2010-2011) submission due February, 1, 2011.	Spring 2010	DSE personnel, State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC)
Develop Public Service Announcements (PSAs) to be utilized statewide as an avenue for program and referral information about TEIS.	June 2010	Part C Coordinator, DSE Training Workforce Development Coordinator, POE Trainer/ Mentors
Initiate PSAs statewide for program and referral information about TEIS.	Fall 2010	Part C Coordinator, DSE Training Workforce Development Coordinator, POE Trainer/ Mentors
Update the TEIS Diagnoses and Conditions List to include the codes for International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems (ICD-9 Codes).	June 2010	DSE personnel, START Medical Director and additional stakeholders including medical, agency personnel, and parents
Upgrade Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) to contain a drop-down list of approved diagnoses along with ICD-9 Codes.	Fall 2010	DSE Data Manager and other DSE personnel, Yahasoft, Inc. Contractor
Further define the mental health section of the TEIS Diagnoses and Conditions List.	Fall 2010	DSE personnel, START Medical Director and additional stakeholders including medical, agency personnel, and parents

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to Overview, page 3.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted)] times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations/assessments and initial IFSP meetings.

98% = 3485/3570 x 100 – timely eligibility determination

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances = 269

92% = 3300/3570 x 100 – timely initial IFSP meetings

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances = 700

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-2009	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008-2009:

Timely eligibility determination: 97.62% - based on 3485 infants and toddlers with timely eligibility determination out of 3570 infants and toddlers with initial IFSP development.

Timely initial IFSP development: 92.44% - based on 3300 infants and toddlers with timely initial IFSP meetings out of 3570 infants and toddlers with initial IFSP development.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2008-2009:

FFY 2008-2009, data were reported entirely from the Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) – **full census data** for Part C eligible infants and toddlers who had eligibility determination and initial IFSP development. Data were reviewed by the TEIS-POE leadership team with a subsequent review by DSE monitoring personnel in order to ensure accuracy and to identify reasons for untimeliness.

Delays due to exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record were included in both the numerator and denominator when determining compliance for timely eligibility determination.

Total # Eligibility Determination for Infants/Toddlers with Initial IFSPs	# Timely	# Untimely due to exceptional family circumstances	Total # Timely Eligibility Determination for Infants/Toddlers with Initial IFSPs
3570	3216	269	3485

APR – Part C (4)

tn-apr-2009c

Measurement:

- Number of Timely Eligibility Determination for Infants/Toddlers with Initial IFSPs (3485) = # Timely (3216) + # Untimely Due to Exceptional Family Circumstances (269).
- Percent of timely eligibility determination for children with initial IFSPs (98%) = Total # of Timely Eligibility Determination for children with Initial IFSPs (3485) / Total # of Eligibility Determination for Children with Initial IFSPs (3570).

The Lead Agency reports progress from FFY 2007-2008 for Indicator 7 relative to timely eligibility determination. Data for FFY 2008-2009 reveals that 98% of infants/toddlers had timely eligibility determination where in FFY 2007-2008 the percentage was 93%. This represents a 5% improvement from FFY 2007-2008.

Delays due to exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record were included in both the numerator and denominator when determining compliance for timely initial IFSP development.

<u>Total # Initial IFSPs</u>	# Timely	# Untimely due to exceptional family circumstances	<u>Total # Timely Initial IFSPs</u>
3570	2600	700	3300

Measurement:

- Number of timely Initial IFSPs (3300) = # Timely (2600) + # Untimely Due to Exceptional Family Circumstances (700)
- Percent of timely Initial IFSPs (92%) = Total # of Timely Initial IFSPs (3300) / Total # Initial IFSPs (3570).

The Lead Agency reports progress from FFY 2007-2008 for Indicator 7 relative to timely initial IFSP development. Data for FFY 2008-2009 reveals 92% of children had timely Initial IFSP development where in FFY 2007-2008 the percentage was 85%. This represents a 7% improvement from FFY 2007-2008.

Status of FFY 2007-2008 Findings

All nine EIS programs were monitored during FFY 2007-2008. The DSE Monitoring Team reviewed subsequent monthly child-level data for all nine POEs prior to the issuance of findings and validated the correction of all noncompliance. There were no findings of noncompliance issued relative to annual monitoring activities for Indicator 7. This information is also referenced in the Indicator 9 Worksheet.

DSE personnel have verified that all nine EIS programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, and have conducted the initial evaluation and IFSP meetings for each infant and toddler, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of TEIS. The Lead Agency utilized direction from both OSEP’s FAQ Regarding Identification and Correction of Noncompliance and Reporting on Correction in the State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report (9-3-08) and OSEP’s Memorandum 09-02.

One finding of noncompliance was found through the dispute resolution process (administrative complaint) for FFY 2007-2008 related to Indicator 7. This finding was corrected timely.

Correction of FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance Timely Corrected (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance.

1. Number of findings of noncompliance that state made during FFY 2007 (the period from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008)	1
2. Number of findings the state verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS programs of the finding)	1
3. Number of findings not verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Additional note: The state reports all five findings of noncompliance relative to Indicator 7 made in FFY 2006-2007 were corrected. Four EIS programs achieved timely correction and one achieved correction, however, it was untimely. Correction of noncompliance for FFY 2006-2007 is 100%. Refer to the FFY-2007-2008 APR submitted February 2, 2009 for further details.

FFY 2008-2009 Findings of Noncompliance

All nine EIS programs were monitored during FFY 2008-2009. One finding (MD) of noncompliance was made relative to Indicator 7. Of important note, DSE personnel verified that this finding was corrected timely. This information will be reported in Indicator 9 of the February 2011 APR.

FFY 2008-2009 Updates for Improvement Activities

The Lead Agency believes that progress towards compliance this year was significantly impacted by the Point of Entry (POE) Offices implementing internal monitoring practices in the following principle ways:

1. POE Leadership Teams utilize the TEIDS Upcoming Meeting Report in regularly scheduled staff meetings and in individual consultations to stay abreast of Initial IFSP timelines. The report information enables the Leadership Team to assist Service Coordinators in problem solving when specific issues arise which could impact timely meetings.
2. POE Leadership Teams utilize data obtained from the TEIDS Active Child Report to evaluate district performance on a monthly basis. These data are used to identify and correct system issues relative to timely eligibility determination and/ or initial IFSP development.

Data from the two above avenues are also utilized in regular employee performance evaluations conducted by the Part C Coordinator, POE District Administrators, POE Eligibility Coordinators, and POE Service Coordination Managers. Data provide the basis for individual performance goal setting and identifying training and mentoring needs. Data also enable the Leadership Team to assess and ensure appropriate Service Coordinator caseload distribution.

In Tennessee, the Battelle Developmental Inventory-2 (BDI-2) is the evaluation tool utilized as a component of Part C eligibility determination. With the October 2007 TEIS reforms, eligibility teams were established within each TEIS-POE. A BDI-2 training module is being developed by DSE training personnel to be used as a future resource for new administrative personnel. The projected completion date for module development is spring of 2010. Riverside Publishing, publisher of the BDI-2, is providing all PowerPoint information as well as any other assistance needed by the State Training Team upon request.

Determining a family's resources, priorities, and concerns is a critical component of early intervention program planning. By assessing family daily routines, the information gathered is likely to be used in IFSP development with implementation in the context of the natural environment. The accumulation of this information is used to develop functional IFSP goals that sustain support-based intervention through integrated services and supports. The State of Tennessee Part C System, through its Operations Manual procedures, has chosen the Routines Based Interview (RBI) as the process for gathering family assessment information for IFSP development.

Dr. Robin McWilliam, the developer of the RBI, has trained/certified the DSE Training and Workforce Development Coordinator as a trainer in this process. During the FFY 2008-2009, all POE Service Coordination Managers (SCM) and DSE Trainers/Mentors were trained in Functional Outcomes and Action Step Development during statewide Mandatory Training in April and May 2009. Teams in each POE office are responsible for follow-up on progress toward RBI completion and training. Those Service Coordinators who have yet to be phased into using the RBI process participated and were trained to use the Daily Activities Discussion Worksheet to obtain goals which can be written in a functional manner. Early Interventionists and Early Intervention Resource Agency (EIRA) personnel were trained on their responsibilities during the family assessment process during the TEIS Summer Institute in 2009. The purpose of the training was to provide education for early intervention personnel in writing family focused outcomes into the IFSP and the early intervention process.

During FFY 2008-2009 Tennessee was in year two of a five year TEIDS *Plus* Project which is a web based quality assurance system designed to monitor and improve Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) development and implementation. The system includes five components for helping providers and families make data-based decisions when developing the IFSP. TEIDS serves as the platform for the Project with an enhancement of a quality assurance system - TEIDS *Plus*. This system includes procedures for assessing IFSP quality, fidelity of IFSP implementation, and frequency of use of the IFSP.

New initiatives for FFY 2009-2010

As TEIDS is a web-based data system which houses the child's IFSP, information can be entered into the child's record in any location where there is internet availability. In order to improve timelines for eligibility determination and initial IFSP development, the Lead Agency will purchase laptop computers and wireless internet cards for POE

APR – Part C (4)**tn-apr-2009c**

Developmental Specialists and Service Coordinators. Providing personnel who work in the field with this equipment will eliminate current duplication by enabling evaluations to be entered into TEIDS and IFSPs to be developed on-site. It is believed that this will further improve compliance with timelines.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008-2009:

The state reviewed the effectiveness of SPP/APR Targets and Improvement Activities, including Timelines and Resources outlined in the State Performance Plan (SPP). In an effort to achieve compliance, this review resulted in the development of the additional activities below. The Lead Agency will continue to implement activities already specified in the SPP along with the new activities. The SPP has been updated to reflect the addition of these activities.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources established FFY 2008 (2008-2009)

Activity/ Action	Timelines	Resources
Develop required training for all TEIS Point of Entry Offices (POEs) on the following topics: family focused IFSP development; goal and action step development; procedural safeguards; and policies and procedures.	February-March 2009	DSE Training Workforce Development Coordinator, DSE Trainer/ Mentors, Part C Monitoring Team
Provide two-day training to all TEIS POE personnel.	April-May 2009	DSE Training Workforce Development Coordinator, DSE Trainer/ Mentors, Part C Monitoring Coordinator
Purchase laptop computers and wireless internet cards for POE Developmental Specialist and Service Coordinators.	July 2009	DSE personnel, DSE Information Technology personnel, DOE fiscal personnel, Department of Finance and Administration
Distribute laptop computers and wireless internet cards to POE Developmental Specialist and Service Coordinators.	September 2009	DSE personnel, DSE Information Technology personnel
Phase into the primary use of laptops statewide where internet connectivity is available.	April 2010	POE District Administrators, Developmental Specialists, Service Coordinators

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to Overview, page 3.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Indicator 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:

- A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;
- B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and
- C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

A. 100% = 3570/3570 x 100 → Compliance with Federal Target

B. 100% = 3570/3570 x 100 → Compliance with Federal Target

C. 95% = 1855/1952 x 100

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances = 191

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-2009	A. 100% B. 100% C. 100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008-2009:

8A. IFSPs with Transition Steps and Services

100% - 3570 infants and toddlers had initial IFSP development in FFY 2008-2009. Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) contains a validation which assures compliance for this component of indicator 8. The Lead Agency met the Federal Target for component A of the indicator.

8B. LEA Notifications

100% - based on 3570 infants and toddlers had initial IFSP development in FFY 2008-2009 from quarterly data from TEIDS pulled and shared with LEAs. The Lead Agency met the Federal Target for component B of the indicator.

8C. Transition Conferences

95.03% - based on 1855 children who had timely LEA transition conferences out of 1952 children with conferences due.

APR – Part C (4)**tn-apr-2009c****Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2008-2009:**

As reported for **8A** in the 2/1/08 APR (FFY 2006-2007), TEIDS contains a validation that assures every child has a transition goal before an Initial IFSP can be saved as final. The Lead Agency reports progress from FFY 2006-2007 as TEIDS now has the mechanism to ensure there are transition steps and services in place for all infants and toddlers. For FFY 08-09, the Lead Agency reports maintenance of compliance utilizing the current TEIDS validation.

As reported for **8B** in the 2/1/08 APR (FFY 2006-2007), the Lead Agency now has a process for data sharing between the Part C system and LEAs at the Division of Special Education (DSE) central office level. Quarterly directory information (including contact information) is pulled for children who had initial IFSP development. The DSE Part C Data Manager separates data by each LEA and sends to the appropriate LEA Special Education Supervisor for their dissemination to preschool personnel for use in planning. For FFY 08-09, the Lead Agency reports maintenance of compliance utilizing the current process for LEA notification.

For **8C**, FFY 2008-2009 full census data were collected from the Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) for Part C children who had an LEA transition conference unless a conference was refused by the family. Data were reviewed by the TEIS-POE leadership team with a subsequent review by DSE monitoring personnel in order to ensure accuracy and to identify reasons for untimeliness.

A review of records where children did not receive a timely LEA transition conference was conducted. Although untimely, the Lead Agency reports all children who remained under the jurisdiction of the Part C system and for whom parent consent was obtained did have an LEA transition conference in FFY 2008-2009 – all child-level noncompliance has been corrected.

Delays due to exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record were included in both the numerator and denominator when determining compliance for timely LEA Transition Conferences.

Total # LEA Conferences	# Timely	# Untimely Due to Exceptional Family Circumstances	Total # Timely LEA Conferences
1952	1591	264	1855

Measurement:

Number of Timely LEA Transition Conferences (1855) = # Timely (1591) + # Untimely Due to Exceptional Family Circumstances (264)

Percentage of Timely LEA Transition Conferences (95%) = Total # of Timely Conferences (1855) / Total # of Conferences (1952).

The Lead Agency reports progress from FFY 2007-2008 for Indicator 8C. Data for FFY 2008-2009 reveals that 95% of children had timely LEA transition conferences where in FFY 2007-2008 the percentage was 88%. This represents a 7% improvement from FFY 2007-2008.

Status of FFY 2007-2008 Findings

All nine EIS programs were monitored during FFY 2007-2008. The DSE Monitoring Team reviewed subsequent monthly child-level data for all nine POEs prior to the issuance of findings and validated the correction of all noncompliance. There were no findings of noncompliance issued relative to Indicator 8C. This information is also referenced in the Indicator 9 Worksheet.

DSE personnel have verified that all nine EIS programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, and have conducted a transition conference for each infant and toddler potentially eligible for Part B, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of TEIS. The Lead Agency utilized direction from both OSEP’s FAQ Regarding Identification and Correction of Noncompliance and Reporting on Correction in the State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report (9-3-08) and OSEP’s Memorandum 09-02.

Correction of FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance Timely Corrected (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance).

1. Number of findings of noncompliance that state made during FFY 2007 (the period from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008)	0
2. Number of findings the state verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS programs of the finding)	0
3. Number of findings not verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Additional note: The state reports all five findings relative to Indicator 8C made in FFY 2006-2007 were corrected. Four EIS programs achieved timely correction and one achieved correction less than one month after the expected correction date. Correction of noncompliance for FFY 2006-2007 is 100%. Refer to the FFY-2007-2008 APR submitted February 2, 2009 for further details.

FFY 2008-2009 Findings of Noncompliance

All nine EIS programs were monitored during FFY 2008-2009. One finding (MD) of noncompliance was made relative to Indicator 8C. Of important note, DSE personnel verified that this finding was also corrected timely. This information will be reported in Indicator 9 of the February 2011 APR.

FFY 2008-2009 Updates for Improvement Activities

In order to better assure a smooth transition for children from the Part C system into the Part B preschool special education, Tennessee is utilizing a web-based curriculum "Early Childhood Transition: Connecting the Dots", developed by the North Central Regional Resource Center. Online training was made available to Part C personnel in January 2009. LEAs were provided information on the curriculum at the TN Special Education Conference in February 2009. The curriculum was also made available to LEAs in March 2009. The curriculum is self paced with test based competencies after each module. A certificate is provided to all participants upon successful completion of all three modules. The curriculum is a tool used by Part C (TEIS) and Part B (LEA) personnel as a first wave of transition training for all staff directly involved in early childhood transition planning. Data are collected by TEIS districts and LEAs to be used to determine the need for additional district and/or LEA specific transition training. Each TEIS district office manages the log-in and questions for their district. The Office of Early Childhood has the ability to compile data from all districts and LEAs to aid compliance and future training development. Additionally, Early Intervention Resource Agencies (EIRAs) were also required to complete the training by July 1, 2009.

The Lead Agency continues to utilize the brochure which was initially developed from the recommendation of a State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) member representing TN’s Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council). This brochure provides families with basic written information regarding the transition process from Part C at age three years. The transition brochure is posted on the State’s website at http://tennessee.gov/education/teis/reports_data.shtml.

The Lead Agency believes that the web-based training and brochures have further educated Part C and Part B personnel regarding transition requirements resulting in a positive impact on compliance improvement for FFY 2008-2009.

New initiatives for FFY 2009-2010

The Lead Agency identified a need to provide consistent statewide support and guidance relative to transition discussions. The DSE personnel will develop a transition booklet with families as the target audience to be used during home visits. Web-based training will also be developed as a resource to the booklet for Service Coordinators and Early Interventionists. This training will consist of modules that include information and activities to educate families about transition timelines, steps, and expectations for Part C/ Part B personnel and families during the transition process. The web-based training allows for individual tailoring by each district to include specific LEA requirements. It is expected that this initiative will further improve progress toward compliance.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008-2009:

The state reviewed the effectiveness of SPP/APR Targets and Improvement Activities, including Timelines and Resources outlined in the State Performance Plan (SPP). In an effort to achieve compliance, this review resulted in the development of the additional activities below. The Lead Agency will continue to implement activities already specified in the SPP along with the new activities. The SPP has been updated to reflect the addition of these activities.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources established FFY 2008 (2008-2009)

Activity/ Action	Timelines	Resources
Develop Transition booklet and web-based training modules.	January 2010	DSE Training Workforce Development Coordinator, POE Training/ Mentors
Present information about the new initiative to LEAs at Annual Special Education Conference – Presentation of booklet and web-based training.	February 2010	DSE Training Workforce Development Coordinator, POE Training/ Mentors
Full implementation of Transition booklet and the use of web-based training.	April 2010	DSE Training Workforce Development Coordinator, POE Training/ Mentors, TEIS Service Coordinators, Early Interventionists (EIRAs, Vendors, and State part-time personnel)

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to Overview, page 3.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.

100% = 1/1 x 100 → Met Federal Target

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-2009	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008-2009:

The reader is referred to the following notes when reviewing content for indicator 9:

1. EIS Programs. Since FFY 2006-2007, the Lead Agency has defined EIS programs as the district (9) Tennessee Early Intervention System Point of Entry Offices (TEIS-POE). Each POE has a leadership team structure with direct oversight provided by a District Administrator. State personnel in these offices are responsible for: 1) eligibility determination through a developmental evaluation team supervised by an Eligibility Coordinator; and 2) all service coordination activities, supervised by a Service Coordination Manager. This includes IFSP development, oversight of service delivery, and transition. The leadership team structure also includes the position of a Direct Services Manager, who works with State and contracted early interventionists, and a Data Manager.
2. Monitoring Activities. The Lead Agency monitors EIS programs and when warranted issues a finding of noncompliance through the following avenues:
 - Annual Monitoring: Full fiscal data from Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) is utilized annually for the monitoring of federal compliance indicators 1, 7, and 8C. Compliance with indicators 8A and 8B are maintained through TEIDS validations. TEIDS allows for web-based tracking of compliance at the individual child level. Identifying noncompliance occurs during September-October for the previous fiscal year.
 - Dispute Resolution: Findings of noncompliance may be made as an outcome of one of the particular dispute processes (i.e., administrative complaint, mediation, due process). Identifying noncompliance may occur at any point during the fiscal year.

APR – Part C (4)

tn-apr-2009c

- Focused Monitoring Activities:** Activities are planned based on the Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP) related requirements and/or the implementation of the TEIS Operations Manual and TEIS policies. Focused monitoring may also be initiated based upon a particular concern which warrants investigation. Identifying noncompliance may occur at any point during the fiscal year.

OSEP Indicator 9 Worksheet

The worksheet below reports monitoring results for FFY 2007-2008.

Timely correction of noncompliance within one year of identification

Indicator	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings of Noncompliance from (a) for which Correction was Verified no Later than One Year from Identification
1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	1	1	1
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	N/A ^A		
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0		
3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved outcomes	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	N/A ^B		
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0		
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	N/A ^C		

Indicator	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings of Noncompliance from (a) for which Correction was Verified no Later than One Year from Identification
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0		
5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	N/A ^D		
6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0		
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	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	1	1	1
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: A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0

APR – Part C (4)

tn-apr-2009c

Indicator	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings of Noncompliance from (a) for which Correction was Verified no Later than One Year from Identification
appropriate community services by their third birthday including: B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B:	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
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:	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b		2	2	2

Footnotes for Indicator 9 Worksheet:

- A. Indicator 2 – Primary Settings. OSEP defines this Federal indicator as a results indicator. For this indicator, the state is compared to the annual state target utilizing annual 618 Data for settings (Table 2). These data are made available to the early intervention community on the State’s website under “TN Child Count Data” at http://tennessee.gov/education/teis/reports_data.shtml. Data are shared specifically with district EIS programs and the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). In the *Annual Report to the Public* posted on the State’s website under “Reports” at http://tennessee.gov/education/teis/reports_data.shtml, data for each EIS program is provided as a comparison with the annual State target.
- B. Indicator 3 – Child Outcomes. OSEP defines this Federal indicator as a results indicator. The results of child outcomes data are collected and reported in the State Performance Plan (SPP) – See Attachment 1 in this report. Results are shared with EIS programs who collected data and with the SICC.
- C. Indicator 4 – Family Outcomes. OSEP defines this Federal indicator as a results indicator. The results of family survey data are collected and shared specifically with the EIS programs and the SICC. In the *Annual Report to the Public* posted on the State’s website under “Reports” at http://tennessee.gov/education/teis/reports_data.shtml, data for each EIS program is provided as a comparison with the annual State target.
- D. Indicators 5 and 6 – Children served birth to age one year (Indicator 5) and children served birth to three years of age (Indicator 6). OSEP defines this Federal indicator as a results indicator. For this indicator, the state is compared to the national baseline utilizing annual 618 Data (Table 1, Section A). These data are made available to the early intervention community on the State’s website under “TN Child Count Data” at http://tennessee.gov/education/teis/reports_data.shtml. Data are shared specifically with district EIS programs and the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). In the *Annual Report to the Public* posted on the State’s website under “Reports” at http://tennessee.gov/education/teis/reports_data.shtml, data for each EIS program is provided as a comparison with the annual state target.

Indicator 9 Worksheet Summary

FFY 2007-2008 Monitoring Results for Correction of Noncompliance:

In FFY 2007-2008, all nine EIS programs were monitored. One finding (FT) was identified through annual monitoring. There was one finding (GN) identified through dispute resolution related an administrative complaint. Focused monitoring activities were completed with no findings issued. Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification was 100% (column b sum (2) divided by column a sum (2) times 100).

The DSE Monitoring Team reviewed subsequent monthly child-level data for all nine POEs prior to the issuance of annual monitoring findings and validated the correction of all noncompliance for eight of the nine POEs. The eight EIS programs implemented local corrective actions immediately upon identifying issues with this Indicator. The DSE Monitoring Team verified the correction of 23 issues prior to the issuance of findings. One finding (FT) of noncompliance was made relative to Indicator 1. The Monitoring Team has verified that correction for the one finding occurred in a timely manner (i.e., within one year from date written finding was issued).

DSE personnel have verified that all nine EIS programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, and have initiated services for each infant and toddler, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of TEIS. The Lead Agency utilized direction from both OSEP’s FAQ Regarding Identification and Correction of Noncompliance and Reporting on Correction in the State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report (9-3-08) and OSEP’s Memorandum 09-02.

Correction of FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance Timely Corrected (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance.

1.	Number of findings of noncompliance that state made during FFY 2007 (the period from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008) (Sum of Column a on the Indicator 9 Worksheet)	2
2.	Number of findings the state verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS programs of the finding) (Sum of Column b on the Indicator 9 Worksheet)	2
3.	Number of findings not verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Additional note: The state reports all 15 findings relative to Indicator 9 made in FFY 2006-2007 were corrected. Thirteen findings were corrected timely with the additional two findings corrected, however, untimely. Correction of noncompliance for FFY 2006-2007 is 100%. Refer to the FFY-2007-2008 APR submitted February 2, 2009 for further details.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2008-2009:

The Lead Agency reports significant progress when comparing timely correction data from the current year versus the previous year. Current year’s data reveals 100% timely correction of noncompliance as compared with 87% from the previous year. This is a 13% improvement and the Lead Agency achieved compliance regarding timely correction.

Monitoring Activities Completed in FFY 2008-2009:

Annual Monitoring:

The Lead Agency Annual Monitoring activities are aligned with Federal indicators of compliance (i.e., 1, 7, and 8). All nine EIS programs are monitored annually on these indicators. In FFY 2008-2009, three findings of noncompliance were issued relative to annual monitoring activities. One finding each (MD) was issued for Indicator 1, 7, and 8C. Of important note, DSE personnel verified that all three findings were corrected in FFY 2008-2009. This information will be reported in Indicator 9 worksheet of the February 2011 APR.

Dispute Resolution Processes:

In FFY 2008-2009, one finding of noncompliance was issued relative to dispute resolution processes. This finding (SC) was issued relative to procedural safeguards. Of important note, DSE personnel verified that this finding was corrected in FFY 2008-2009. This information will be reported in Indicator 9 worksheet of the February 2011 APR.

Focused Monitoring:

In FFY 2008-2009, three findings of noncompliance were issued relative to focused monitoring activities. One finding was issued for three EIS programs (ET, UC, and GN) relative to IDEA Related Requirements. Of important note, DSE

APR – Part C (4)**tn-apr-2009c**

personnel verified that all three findings were corrected as of the date of this report. This information will be reported in Indicator 9 Worksheet of the February 2011 APR.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008-2009:

The state reviewed the effectiveness of SPP/APR Targets and Improvement Activities, including Timelines and Resources, and determined revisions were not warranted at this time. As the State achieved compliance on this Indicator, the Lead Agency will continue to implement activities outlined in the State Performance Plan (SPP).

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

Refer to Overview, page 3.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

100% = 9 +1/10 x 100

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-2009	100%

Actual Target Data for 2008-2009:

100% - Thirteen administrative complaints were filed. Of the 13 filed, one was dismissed and two were withdrawn by the parent. Of the 10 administrative complaints with written reports, one had an extended timeline.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-2009:

For FFY 2008-2009, the Lead Agency reports maintenance of compliance for Indicator 10.

FFY 2008-2009 Update to New Initiatives during FFY 2007-2008

The Division of Special Education (DSE) Training and Workforce Development Coordinator in conjunction with the DSE Staff Attorney developed a dispute resolution training in March 2009. The focus audience is Service Coordinators, State and contracted early interventionists, and vendors. Training was provided during the statewide Mandatory Training in April – May 2009 to all nine POE office personnel. The training was also made available on CD for use in training new POE personnel. Dispute resolution training was provided to Early Interventionists and Early Intervention Resource Agencies (EIRAs) during the TEIS Summer Institute of 2009.

The Part C Coordinator and Part C Monitoring Coordinator initiated the development of a written protocol related to outcomes pertaining to dispute resolutions to better determine when possible monitoring actions/follow-up are warranted.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-2009:

The state reviewed the effectiveness of SPP/APR Targets and Improvement Activities, including Timelines and Resources, and determined revisions were not warranted at this time. As Tennessee maintained compliance, the state will continue to implement activities outlined in the State Performance Plan (SPP) and 2/2/09 Annual Performance Report (APR).

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to Overview, page 3.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 11: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.
0% = 0+0/0 x 100

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-2009	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008-2009:

100% - Four due process hearing requests were filed. One of the four requests was settled in mediation, and the other three were settled without a hearing. No due process hearings were held.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-2009:

For FFY 2008-2009, the Lead Agency reports maintenance of compliance for Indicator 11.

FFY 2008-2009 Update to New Initiatives during FFY 2007-2008

The Division of Special Education (DSE) Training and Workforce Development Coordinator in conjunction with the DSE Staff Attorney developed a dispute resolution training in March 2009. The focus audience is Service Coordinators, State and contracted early interventionists, and vendors. Training was provided during the statewide Mandatory Training in April – May 2009 to all nine POE office personnel. The training was also made available on CD for use in training new POE personnel. Dispute resolution training was provided to Early Interventionists and Early Intervention Resource Agencies (EIRAs) during the TEIS Summer Institute of 2009.

The Part C Coordinator and Part C Monitoring Coordinator initiated the development of a written protocol related to outcomes pertaining to dispute resolutions to better determine when possible monitoring actions/follow-up are warranted.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-2009:

The state reviewed the effectiveness of SPP/APR Targets and Improvement Activities, including Timelines and Resources, and determined revisions were not warranted at this time. As Tennessee maintained compliance, the state will continue to implement activities outlined in the State Performance Plan (SPP) and 2/2/09 Annual Performance Report (APR).

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

Refer to Overview, page 3.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 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).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-2009	The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which 10 or more resolution sessions were conducted.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008-2009:

No incidences occurred for this reporting period.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-2009:

N/A

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-2009:

N/A

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to Overview, page 3.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 13: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

100% = 1+0/1 x 100

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-2009	The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which 10 or more mediations were conducted.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008-2009:

100% - One request for mediation was filed which resulted in an agreement.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-2009:

For FFY 2008-2009, the Lead Agency reports maintenance of compliance for Indicator 13.

FFY 2008-2009 Update to New Initiatives during FFY 2007-2008

The Division of Special Education (DSE) Training and Workforce Development Coordinator in conjunction with the DSE Staff Attorney developed a dispute resolution training in March 2009. The focus audience is Service Coordinators, State and contracted early interventionists, and vendors. Training was provided during the statewide Mandatory Training in April – May 2009 to all nine POE office personnel. The training was also made available on CD for use in training new POE personnel. Dispute resolution training was provided to Early Interventionists and Early Intervention Resource Agencies (EIRAs) during the TEIS Summer Institute of 2009.

The Part C Coordinator and Part C Monitoring Coordinator initiated the development of a written protocol related to outcomes pertaining to dispute resolutions to better determine when possible monitoring actions/follow-up are warranted.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-2009:

The state reviewed the effectiveness of SPP/APR Targets and Improvement Activities, including Timelines and Resources, and determined revisions were not warranted at this time. As Tennessee maintained compliance, the state will continue to implement activities outlined in the State Performance Plan (SPP) and 2/2/09 Annual Performance Report (APR).

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to Overview, page 3.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 14: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

(20 U.S.C 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: State reported data, including 618 data, State performance plan, and annual performance reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, settings and November 1 for exiting, personnel, dispute resolution); and
- b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring error-free, consistent, valid, and reliable data and evidence that these standards are met).

A. 100% = Annual Performance Report and 618 Child Count Data → submitted timely

B. Assurance of accurate data – provided

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-2009	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008-2009:

100% - All State reported data were submitted on time; and to the best knowledge of the Lead Agency, data were accurate given the definitions at the time. There are multiple information and data verification checks built into the submission of the APR/SPP and 618 Data.

Part C Indicator 14 Data Rubric

Indicator 14 - SPP/APR Data			
APR Indicator	Valid and reliable	Correct calculation	Total
1	1	1	2
2	1	1	2
3	1	1	2
4	1	1	2
5	1	1	2
6	1	1	2
7	1	1	2
8A	1	1	2
8B	1	1	2
8C	1	1	2
9	1	1	2
10	1	1	2
11	1	1	2
12	1	1	2
13	1	1	2
		Subtotal	30

APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points (5 pts for submission of APR/SPP by February 1, 2010)	5
	Grand Total	35 out of a possible 35

Indicator 14 - 618 Data					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Date Note Requests	Total
Table 1 – Child Count Due Date: 2/1/08	1	1	1	1	4
Table 2 – Settings Due Date: 2/1/08	1	1	1	1	4
Table 3 – Exiting Due Date: 11/1/09	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 4 – Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/1/09	1	1	1	N/A	3
				Subtotal	14 out of a possible 14
				Weighted Total (subtotal X 2.5; round ≤ .49 down and ≥ .50 up to whole number)	35

Indicator # 14 Calculation				
			A. APR Total	35
			B. 618 Total	35
			C. Grand Total	70
Percent of timely and accurate data = (C divided by 70 times 100)			$(70) / (70) \times 100 = 100\%$	

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2008-2009:

For FFY 2008-2009, the Lead Agency reports maintenance of compliance for Indicator 14.

Annual Performance Report and State Performance Plan

Refer to the APR Overview on page 3, regarding process for information and data verification in report development. See Attachment 5 for Tennessee Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) Certification.

Federal 618 Data

All Federal 618 Data were pulled from the Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) for all required tables. The DSE Part C Data Manager and Monitoring Coordinator verified that data were error-free, consistent, valid, and reliable. Data were reported on the required Westat DTS forms and submitted timely.

Tennessee's Annual Report to the Public

Federal 616 report requirements were completed for FFY 2007-2008. The report was posted in March 2009, one month after the APR due date. An email was sent to OSEP State Contact informing of the posting and with website link. The FFY 2008-2009 Report will be posted in March 2010 on the State's website under "Reports" at http://tennessee.gov/education/teis/reports_data.shtml.

APR – Part C (4)

tn-apr-2009c

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008-2009:

The state reviewed the effectiveness of SPP/APR Targets and Improvement Activities, including Timelines and Resources, and determined revisions were not warranted at this time. As Tennessee maintained compliance, the state will continue to implement activities outlined in the State Performance Plan (SPP) and 2/2/09 Annual Performance Report (APR).

2008-2009 Annual Performance Report (APR)

Attachments

Indicator	Attachments
Indicator 3	1 State Performance Plan (SPP) Report
	2 Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO): Entrance Data Collection Form
	3 Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO): Exit Data Collection Form
Indicator 4	4 Family Survey Form
Tennessee ICC Certification	5 Interagency Coordination Council (ICC) Certification

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to Overview in located in the Annual Performance Report, page 3.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 3: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 USC 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement:

- | |
|---|
| <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$. b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$. c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$. d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$. e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$. <p>A. (a) 0% + (b) 11% +(c) 34% + (d) 32% + (e) 23% = 100%</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$. b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$. c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$. d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$. e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$. |
|---|

B. (a) 1% + (b) 9% + (c) 43% + (d) 28% + (e) 19% = 100%

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.

C. (a) 0% + (b) 9% + (c) 36% + (d) 31% + (e) 24% = 100%

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Tennessee formed an Early Childhood Outcome (ECO) Committee in the fall of 2004, composed of key stakeholders from the birth-to-five community around the state, including families, program administrators, practitioners, university personnel, State Education Agency personnel, and State Interagency Coordinating Council representatives. This committee began addressing issues related to identifying Early Childhood Outcomes for Part C and 619 programs and ensuring these outcomes would align with TN Early Learning Developmental Standards (TN-ELDS). The results provided the direction for the Early Childhood Outcome plan that has been put in place in Tennessee.

Tennessee's ECO core committee, in consultation with Dr. Patricia Snyder, Vanderbilt University, and Mr. Jim Henson, Mid-South Regional Resource Regional Center, formulated the state's plan for this indicator. Tennessee's Early Childhood Outcomes Plan is a birth-through-five plan, with the same parameters, process, and forms being used in Part C, and Part B 619. Entrance data was gathered for all children in Part C or Part B 619 who received an initial IFSP or IEP from August 15, 2006, to November 15, 2006. Once a district begins collecting Early Childhood Outcomes data information, it will continue the process with all entering and exiting children. As the plan is refined and established and the data verified, a collection system will be added directly to the state's data collection system. This will allow more Tennessee Early Intervention Point of Entries (TEIS POEs) and Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to be added to the process with the intent of all systems participating as soon as possible. All Tennessee's TEIS POEs and LEAs will be collecting Early Childhood Outcome Data for every child by 2010.

- By July 1st 2008, a minimum of 1/3 of Tennessee TEIS POEs will be trained and collecting data in the Early Childhood Outcome Process
- By July 1st 2009, a minimum of 2/3 of Tennessee TEIS POEs will be trained and collecting data in the Early Childhood Outcome Process
- By July 1st 2010, all Tennessee TEIS POEs will be trained and collecting data in the Early Childhood Outcome Process

The initial TEIS-POEs chosen to participate in the Early Childhood Outcomes reporting are representative of the state in the following factors:

- Varied sized districts representing large, medium and small. The three TEIS-POE districts are:
 - East Tennessee
 - Greater Nashville
 - Northwest

Part C - SPP

tn-spprev-2009c

The initial LEAs chosen to participate in the Early Childhood Outcomes reporting are representative of the state in the following factors:

- Various sized districts representing large, medium and small; including all Tennessee school districts with average daily membership greater than 50,000. These districts are:
 - Metro Nashville
 - Memphis
 - Knox County

Outcomes decisions are made by the Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) team and Individualized Education Plan (IEP), using current assessment/evaluation/eligibility information, including observations and parent information, at the initial IFSP/IEP. Evaluation/assessment information for infant and toddlers birth to age three years is obtained from the Battelle Developmental Inventory-2 (BDI-2). All information used to determine outcome ratings is documented on the present levels of development/performance area of the IFSP/IEP. Signatures of participants on the IFSP/IEP are also documentation as having participated in determining child outcomes. Parents are given a copy of the ECO form.

Data are gathered using a slightly modified ECO summary form for all children. The form was modified into a separate entrance and exit document to facilitate ease of administration and reporting. Present levels of development/performance constitute the documentation of information, and signatures on the IFSP/IEP document those participating in the outcomes determination. The entrance and exit forms contain all of the other information as the sample ECO forms, and are included in this submission. Scores of 6 and 7 represent a child's functioning "comparable to same aged peers." See Attachments 2 and 3 for a copy of the entrance and exit forms.

All TEIS POE and LEA districts in the initial collection were trained on policies and procedures related to determining, collecting, and reporting Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) data. Half-day trainings were held for all participating districts, using training materials produced by the ECO Center, which were slightly modified to match Tennessee forms. Participants had an opportunity to practice using the Tennessee Early Childhood Outcomes Form. All participants received information about a sample child, and then participated in small group mock IEP meetings where they completed the entrance form, using ECO materials, including the ECO decision tree. Ratings were compared, and in all trainings, the many groups generally rated the sample child within one numeral of the mean.

As entrance and exit data are collected, children who have been in their respective programs for six months or longer will have their scores used to establish percentiles of children in each category of the three outcome questions. Initially all entrance information was sent to a central state location to be entered into an excel format. Populated Excel documents were returned to districts for their exit information to be added. These data have been collected and collated. Currently, districts are maintaining entrance and exit data using this format.

Baseline Data for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

Six of nine TEIS POEs were collecting entrance and exit data utilizing the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form. Sixty-nine LEAs were collecting entrance and exit data utilizing the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form. Division of Special Education (DSE) personnel delivered four regional ECO trainings. This included three TEIS POEs and the final 69 LEAs. As of June 30, 2009, all LEAs have been trained on the ECO data collection process. Additionally, the Tennessee Part B database (Easy IEP) collects ECO data as well as houses web-based training materials. ECO training was developed for use via DVD to train new and existing service coordination staff. DVDs were provided to the six TEIS POEs which have been trained to collect entrance and exit data.

For Part C, Early Childhood Outcomes Data (entrance and exit) have been collected for 457 children between July 1, 2008 and June 30, 2009. Data were collected from three TEIS POEs (ET, GN, and NW). Beginning spring of 2009 three additional TEIS POEs (FT, UC, and SW) began collecting entrance and exit data. These three programs did not have the six months necessary to report exit data for this reporting period. The tables below report data for the 457 children.

3A: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships).	# of Infants and Toddlers	% of Infants and Toddlers
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning.	11	2.4%

Part C - SPP

tn-spprev-2009c

b. Percent infants and toddlers who improved functioning, but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	89	19.5%
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers, but did not reach it.	145	31.7%
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved function to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	138	30.2%
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	74	16.2%
Total	N = 457	100%

3B: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge skills (including early language).	# of Infants and Toddlers	% of Infants and Toddlers
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning.	8	1.7%
b. Percent infants and toddlers who improved functioning, but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	84	18.4%
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers, but did not reach it.	163	35.7%
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved function to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	152	33.3%
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	50	10.9%
Total	N= 457	100%

3C: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.	# of Infants and Toddlers	% of Infants and Toddlers
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning.	10	2.2%
b. Percent infants and toddlers who improved functioning, but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	85	18.6%
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers, but did not reach it.	141	30.8%
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved function to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	159	34.8%
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	62	13.6%
Total	N = 457	100%

Discussion of Baseline Data for FFY 2008-2009:

Current progress data reported above for FFY 2008-2009 are considered baseline data.

DSE reports that children in category **a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning** for all three outcomes represent only 2% of children measured.

Summary Statement 1:

DSE reports that infants and toddlers who improved functioning [combined categories of c and d divided by (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) times 100] are seen at the following percentage by outcome:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) = **73.9%**
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy) = **77.4%**
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs = **75.9%**

Summary Statement 2:

DSE reports that infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations [combined categories of d and e divided by (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e) times 100] are seen at the following percentage by outcome:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) = **46.4%**

- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy) = 44.2%
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs = 48.4%

All data, targets, and activities for Indicator 3 were reviewed with the Part C State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) prior to the final report submission.

FFY	Measureable and Rigorous Targets
2009-2010	See Target Tables below.
2010-2011	See Target Tables below.

Target Tables for FFY 2009-2010 and FFY 2010-2011

Outcome 3A: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships).	FFY 2009-2010 Targets	FFY 2010-2011 Targets
<u>Summary Statement 1.</u> Of those children who enter or exit the program below age expectations in Outcome 3A, the percent who substantially increase their rate of growth by the time they turn three years of age or exit the program.	74.4%	74.9%
<u>Summary Statement 2.</u> The percent of children who are functioning within age expectations in Outcome 3A by the time they turn three years of age or exit the program.	46.9%	47.4%

Outcome 3B: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge skills (including early language).	FFY 2009-2010 Targets	FFY 2010-2011 Targets
<u>Summary Statement 1.</u> Of those children who enter or exit the program below age expectations in Outcome 3B, the percent who substantially increase their rate of growth by the time they turn three years of age or exit the program.	77.9%	78.4%
<u>Summary Statement 2.</u> The percent of children who are functioning within age expectations in Outcome 3B by the time they turn three years of age or exit the program.	44.7%	45.2%

Outcome 3C: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.	FFY 2009-2010 Targets	FFY 2010-2011 Targets
<u>Summary Statement 1.</u> Of those children who enter or exit the program below age expectations in Outcome 3C, the percent who substantially increase their rate of growth by the time they turn three years of age or exit the program.	76.4%	76.9%
<u>Summary Statement 2.</u> The percent of children who are functioning within age expectations in Outcome 3C by the time they turn three years of age or exit the program.	48.9%	49.4%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2009-2010:

Three additional TEIS POEs (SE, SC, and MD) will begin to collect entrance and exit data for early childhood outcomes in FFY 2009-2010. Training will be provided to these POEs by the Part C Training Workforce Development Coordinator in April/May 2010 in order to begin collecting early childhood outcomes data by July 1, 2010.

TENNESSEE CHILD OUTCOMES SUMMARY FORM at ENTRANCE

Complete this form for every child birth through five at the initial IFSP or IEP meeting.

TEIS/LEA _____
 Program/School _____
 Child's Name _____
 DOB _____

Initial IFSP/IEP Date _____
 SC/Teacher _____
 Eligibility _____ RACE _____ M _____ F _____

1. POSITIVE SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL SKILLS (INCLUDING SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS)

Think about the child's functioning in these and closely related areas (as indicated by assessments and based on observations from individuals in close contact with the child):

- Relating with adults
- Relating with other children
- Following rules related to groups or interacting with others (if older than 18 months)

1a. To what extent does this child show age-appropriate functioning, across a variety of settings and situations, on this outcome? (Circle one number)

Not Yet		Emerging		Somewhat		Completely	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

2. ACQUIRING AND USING KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

Think about the child's functioning in these and closely related areas (as indicated by assessments and based on observations from individuals in close contact with the child):

- Thinking, reasoning, remembering, and problem solving
- Understanding symbols
- Understanding the physical and social worlds

2a. To what extent does this child show age-appropriate functioning, across a variety of settings and situations, on this outcome? (Circle one number)

Not Yet		Emerging		Somewhat		Completely	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

3. TAKING APPROPRIATE ACTION TO MEET NEEDS

Think about the child's functioning in these and closely related areas (as indicated by assessments and based on observations from individuals in close contact with the child):

- Taking care of basic needs (e.g., showing hunger, dressing, feeding, toileting, etc.)
- Contributing to own health and safety (e.g., follows rules, assists with hand washing avoids inedible objects) (if older than 24 months)
- Getting from place to place (mobility) and using tools (e.g., forks, strings attached to objects)

3a. To what extent does this child show age-appropriate functioning, across a variety of settings and situations, on this outcome? (Circle one number)

Not Yet		Emerging		Somewhat		Completely	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

TENNESSEE CHILD OUTCOMES SUMMARY FORM at EXIT

TEIS/LEA _____
 Program/School _____
 Child's Name _____
 DOB _____

Initial IFSP/IEP Date _____
 SC/Teacher _____
 Eligibility _____ Race _____ M ___ F ___
 Exit IFSP/IEP Date _____

1. POSITIVE SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL SKILLS (INCLUDING SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS)

Think about the child's functioning in these and closely related areas (as indicated by assessments and based on observations from individuals in close contact with the child): • Relating with adults • Relating with other children
 • Following rules related to groups or interacting with others (if older than 18 months)

1a. To what extent does this child show age-appropriate functioning, across a variety of settings and situations, on this outcome? (Circle one number 1-7) **1b. Has the child shown any new skills or behaviors since the last outcomes summary? Circle yes or no, and if yes describe progress.**

1a

Not Yet		Emerging		Somewhat		Completely	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

1b

Yes	Describe progress:
No	

2. ACQUIRING AND USING KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

Think about the child's functioning in these and closely related areas (as indicated by assessments and based on observations from individuals in close contact with the child): • Thinking, reasoning, remembering, and problem solving
 • Understanding symbols • Understanding the physical and social worlds

2a. To what extent does this child show age-appropriate functioning, across a variety of settings and situations, on this outcome? (Circle one number 1-7) **2b. Has the child shown any new skills or behaviors since the last outcomes summary? Circle yes or no, and if yes describe progress.**

2a

Not Yet		Emerging		Somewhat		Completely	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

2b

Yes	Describe progress:
No	

3. TAKING APPROPRIATE ACTION TO MEET NEEDS

Think about the child's functioning in these and closely related areas (as indicated by assessments and based on observations from individuals in close contact with the child): • Taking care of basic needs (e.g., showing hunger, dressing, feeding, toileting, etc.) • Contributing to own health and safety (e.g., follows rules, assists with hand washing, avoids inedible objects) (if older than 24 months) • Getting from place to place (mobility) and using tools.)

3a. To what extent does this child show age-appropriate functioning, across a variety of settings and situations, on this outcome? (Circle one number 1-7) **3b. Has the child shown any new skills or behaviors since the last outcomes summary? Circle yes or no, and if yes describe progress.**

3a

Not Yet		Emerging		Somewhat		Completely	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

3b

Yes	Describe progress:
No	

2009 Parent Survey
TN DOE/Division of Special Education

No. 00,000

6-Very Strongly agree 5-Strongly Agree 4-Agree 3-Disagree 2-Strongly Disagree 1-Very Strongly Disagree

CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE TO EACH QUESTION

1. I was given choices concerning my family's services and supports.....6 5 4 3 2 1
2. My family's daily routines were considered when planning for my child's services.....6 5 4 3 2 1
3. I have felt part of the team when meeting to discuss my child.....6 5 4 3 2 1
4. The services on our IFSP have been provided in a timely way.....6 5 4 3 2 1
5. My family was given information about who to call if I am not satisfied with the services my child receives.....6 5 4 3 2 1
6. Someone from the Early Intervention program asked whether the services my family was receiving were meeting our needs.6 5 4 3 2 1
7. The Early Intervention service provider(s) that work with my child are dependable.....6 5 4 3 2 1
8. The Early Intervention service provider(s) that work with my child are easy for me to talk to about my child and my family.6 5 4 3 2 1
9. My service coordinator is available to speak with me on a regular basis.....6 5 4 3 2 1
10. My service coordinator is knowledgeable and professional.....6 5 4 3 2 1
11. I was given information to help me prepare for my child's transition.....6 5 4 3 2 1

Over the past year, Early Intervention services have helped me and/or my family:

12. know about services in the community.....6 5 4 3 2 1
13. know where to go for support to meet my child's needs.....6 5 4 3 2 1
14. know where to go for support to meet my family's needs.....6 5 4 3 2 1
15. get the services that my child and family need.....6 5 4 3 2 1
16. feel more confident in my skills as a parent.....6 5 4 3 2 1
17. make changes in family routines that will benefit my child with special needs.6 5 4 3 2 1
18. understand how the Early Intervention system works.6 5 4 3 2 1
19. be able to evaluate how much progress my child is making.6 5 4 3 2 1
20. communicate more effectively with the people who work with my child and family.6 5 4 3 2 1
21. understand the roles of the people who work with my child and family.6 5 4 3 2 1
22. know about my child's and family's rights concerning Early Intervention services.6 5 4 3 2 1
23. do things with and for my child that are good for my child's development.....6 5 4 3 2 1
24. understand my child's special needs.....6 5 4 3 2 1
25. feel that my efforts are helping my child.....6 5 4 3 2 1

**ANNUAL REPORT CERTIFICATION OF THE
INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COUNCIL
UNDER PART C OF THE
INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT (IDEA)**

Under IDEA Section 641(e)(1)(D) and 34 CFR §303.654, the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) of each jurisdiction that receives funds under Part C of the IDEA must prepare and submit to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education (Department) and to the Governor of its jurisdiction an annual report on the status of the early intervention programs for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families operated within the State. The ICC may either: (1) prepare and submit its own annual report to the Department and the Governor, or (2) provide this certification with the State lead agency's Annual Performance Report (APR)¹ under Part C of the IDEA. This certification (including the annual report or APR) is due no later than February 1, 2010.

On behalf of the ICC of the State/jurisdiction of Tennessee, I hereby certify that the ICC is: [please check one]

1. [] Submitting its own annual report (which is attached); or
2. [X] Using the State's Part C APR for FFY 2008 in lieu of submitting the ICC's own annual report. By completing this certification, the ICC confirms that it has reviewed the State's Part C APR for accuracy and completeness.²

I hereby further confirm that a copy of this Annual Report Certification and the annual report or APR has been provided to our Governor.

Maitha Herndon
Signature of ICC Chairperson

1-26-10
Date

mherndon@utm.edu
Address or e-mail

731-881-7112
Daytime telephone number

¹ Under IDEA Sections 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(II) and 642 and under 34 CFR §80.40, the lead agency's APR must report on the State's performance under its State performance plan and contain information about the activities and accomplishments of the grant period for a particular Federal fiscal year (FFY).

² If the ICC is using the State's Part C APR and it disagrees with data or other information presented in the State's Part C APR, the ICC must attach to this certification an explanation of the ICC's disagreement and submit the certification and explanation no later than February 1, 2010.