

**Tennessee, Part C
Annual Performance Report
2007 – 2008**



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

Report Submission Date: February 2, 2009

Report Updated: April 3, 2009

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	19
Timeliness of IFSPs	
INDICATOR 8	23
Timeliness of Transitions	
INDICATOR 9	26
Statewide Monitoring of Corrections and Noncompliance	
INDICATOR 10	32
Timeliness of Written Complaints	
INDICATOR 11	33
Timeliness of Due Process Hearings	
INDICATOR 12	34
Resolution Sessions	
INDICATOR 13	35
Mediation Agreements	
INDICATOR 14	36
Timeliness and Accuracy of State Reported Data	
ATTACHMENT LIST	39
(1) State Improvement 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) TEIS Brochure: Growing Together Little by Little	
(6) TEIS Brochure: Questions & Answers	
(7) TEIS Brochure: Rights	
(8) TEIS Brochure: Transition	
(9) Part C, 618, <u>Table 4</u> : Dispute Resolution Data	
(10) Interagency Coordination Council (ICC) Certification Letter	

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, Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS), child outcomes data, family surveys, and monitoring.
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 Consultants reviewed APR utilizing the following OSEP documents: Tennessee's 2007 APR Letter and accompanying Part C FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table; Part C Indicator Measurement Table (8/20/08); Part C Indicator Support Grid (10/15/08); Part C APR Frequently Asked Questions; and the APR Checklist (10/24/07).
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 15 for an external review and feedback from Mid-South Regional Resource Center.
4. The Part C Monitoring Coordinator reviewed a final draft of the Report and obtained input from the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) Chairperson on January 7, 2009. The Chairperson presented the full review of the APR with SICC membership on January 20 at the regularly scheduled meeting. Feedback was incorporated into the final report.
5. The FFY 2007-2008 APR including the updated SPP for Indicator 3 (Attachment 1) were submitted to the Federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on January 30, 2009. In February of 2009, these report documents will be posted on the State's website located at <http://tennessee.gov/education/speced/TEIS/>. 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 2009. 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.

89% = 3431/3853 x 100

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances = 239

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-2008	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007-2008:

89.05% - based on 3431 infants and toddlers with timely services out of 3853 infants and toddlers with new services initiated during the fiscal year. Data account for the timely receipt of all services by child rather than services per child.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007-2008:

A chief improvement for Tennessee in FFY 2007-2008 was that data, for the first time, 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). Untimely data were cleaned and verified 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. Documented exceptional circumstances for delay (i.e., child/family sickness, family vacation, family’s preferred scheduling, etc.) were included in both the numerator and denominator. Identified system issues for delay included difficulty in assigning an early interventionist who fits into the family’s schedule; provider/vendor illness, vacation, or program closure; and provider assignment.

FFY 2006-2007 Monitoring Results for Correction of Noncompliance

All nine EIS programs were monitored during FFY 2006-2007. Four TEIS-POEs (ET, SE, UC, and MD) had findings of noncompliance during this period. Findings for all four POEs were corrected in a timely manner (i.e., within one year from date written finding was issued). Refer to Indicator 9 for additional information.

APR – Part C (4)

Tennessee

For comparison purposes with FFY 2006-2007, the Lead Agency cannot report progress or slippage as previous data did not sufficiently address the indicator measurement and were reported from two different sources:

- 1.) Filemaker Pro (FMP), cleaned data for initial IFSPs only, and
- 2.) TEIDS, un-cleaned data for all IFSP types from January 2007 – October 2007.

The Lead Agency does report progress in its capacity to now pull data in accordance with the indicator measurement utilizing full census data from TEIDS across all IFSP types. In future APR reporting, the Lead Agency will have greater data fidelity when comparing information for the reporting of progress or slippage from the previous year. The previous issue for reporting complete data per the indicator measurement has now been fully corrected with the implementation of TEIDS statewide January 1, 2007.

FFY 2005-2006 Monitoring Results for Correction of Noncompliance

There were three programs monitored in FFY 2005-2006. Two TEIS-POEs (GN and NW) had findings of noncompliance during this period. One TEIS-POE (NW) corrected noncompliance in a timely manner (i.e., within one year from date written finding was issued). GN achieved correction of noncompliance on June 30, 2007; however, correction was untimely. All findings of noncompliance for indicator 1 have been corrected for FFY 2005-2006.

New Initiatives during FFY 2007-2008

One significant change that occurred as part of the TEIS reform was to increase the infrastructure at the Lead Agency Central Office by establishing the Central Reimbursement Office (CRO) to improve billing processes and accountability. Beginning July 1, 2007, the newly established CRO sent standard Authorization to Vendor forms to all qualified providers of Part C services with every Part C vendor receiving the same business agreement with the same rates across the State. Included in the vendor agreement was a business rule addressing the timeline for timely delivery of services. In previous years, each TEIS-POE subcontracted with vendors for services within their district. A vendor who served multiple districts may have had differing contracts with multiple TEIS-POEs. The standardization of vendor agreements statewide through the central office for Part C early intervention services was met positively by providers. As a result of clarification and standardization of processes, the Lead Agency has seen growth in the number of providers available for early intervention services. TEIDS contains an accounts payable feature along with reporting capability which enables the CRO to track contracts and service visits on provider contracts and IFSP services rendered.

Provider training [State and contracted early interventionists, vendors] was developed in September 2008. Training content addresses: early intervention philosophy; provider role in IFSP development and implementation; including timeline for timely delivery of services; team collaboration; and TEIDS. Training was piloted for a large vendor in GN District in October 2008. The training package was distributed to two EIS programs for local use in training providers in November 2008 with training being further developed for implementation as a web-based resource statewide in January 2009.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007-2008:

Per OSEP's June 6, 2008 letter/response table, the State was requested to review its SPP improvement activities and revise if appropriate. In light of changes due to TEIS reforms initiated October 1, 2007, and the statewide implementation of TEIDS (January 2007), a root cause analysis was conducted by Lead Agency personnel. As a result, improvement activities have been revised as follows and recorded in both the SPP and APR.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources established FFY 2007 (2007-2008)

Activity/ Action	Timelines	Resources
Utilize regularly the <i>Timely Delivery of Services Report</i> generated by TEIDS to track timely service delivery in order to address possible system issues.	Began March 2008 and ongoing	TEIS POE Leadership personnel
Utilize <i>Timely Delivery of Services Report</i> generated by TEIDS for annual compliance monitoring of EIS programs.	Data pulled on August 20 th for the fiscal year	State Data Manager, Part C Monitoring Coordinator, Monitoring Consultants
Clean, validate, and analyze data which were untimely for the identification of documented exceptional circumstances impacting meeting the timeline.	August/September for the fiscal year	TEIS POE Data Manager, Leadership personnel

APR – Part C (4)**Tennessee**

Review data which were cleaned, validated, analyzed in order to verify data fidelity.	September for the fiscal year	Part C Monitoring Coordinator, Monitoring Consultants
Issue written finding where noncompliance is discovered.	September for the fiscal year	Part C Monitoring Coordinator, Director
Develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for approval when there is a written finding.	September for the fiscal year	TEIS-POE District Administrator and Leadership personnel to DSE monitoring personnel
Submit CAP progress reports.	Monthly, until correction achieved	TEIS-POE District Administrator and Leadership personnel to DSE monitoring personnel
Utilize the <i>Timely Delivery of Services Report</i> generated by TEIDS for compliance tracking relative to correction when an EIS program has a CAP.	Monthly, until correction achieved	State Data Manager, Part C Monitoring Coordinator, Monitoring Consultants
Clean, validate, and analyze data which were untimely for the identification of documented exceptional circumstances impacting meeting the timeline.	Monthly, until correction achieved	TEIS POE Data Manager, Leadership personnel
Review data which were cleaned, validated, analyzed in order to verify data fidelity.	Monthly, until correction achieved	Part C Monitoring Coordinator, Monitoring Consultants
Issue written letter of correction when compliance has been achieved.	Date correction validated	Part C Monitoring Coordinator, Director
Provide DSE technical assistance to TEIS-POEs as requested or per enforcement actions based on annual program determination.	Began FFY 2006 and ongoing	DSE monitoring personnel, other DSE personnel depending on TA needs/requirements

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 programs for typically developing children.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 programs for typically developing children) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

88% = 3925/4461 x 100 → Exceeded State Target

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-2008	78.02% Home and Community

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007-2008:

87.98% - based on 3925 infants and toddlers in home and community settings out of 4461 children reported in Table 2 of the 618 Data for program settings on December 1, 2007. 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 2007-2008:

As 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. This TEIDS validation ensures full compliance.

When comparing data from FFY 2006-2007, the Lead agency reports progress in the number of infants and toddlers who received IFSP services in home and community settings - 88% in FFY 2007-2008 as compared to 78% infants and toddlers in FFY 2006-2007.

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 this increase in services delivered in the natural environment.

New Initiatives during FFY 2007-2008

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

APR – Part C (4)**Tennessee**

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. During the FFY 2007-2008, initial training with Dr. Robin McWilliam, developer of the RBI process, was held with both TEIS-POE Service Coordination Managers (SCM) and DSE Trainers/Mentors in February and May 2008. Core teams were established in each POE office with DSE Trainers/Mentors being responsible for follow-up with each office on progress toward RBI completion and training of other personnel by office core teams. DSE Training and Workforce Development Coordinator attended the original Routines Based Interview "Train the Trainer" boot camp in August 2008. The RBI implementation strategy for the next year was communicated to TEIS-POEs during the Annual TEIS Conference in September 2008.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-2008:

Because of changes due to TEIS reforms initiated October 1, 2007, and with the statewide implementation of TEIDS (January 2007), improvement activities have been revised as follows and recorded in both the SPP and APR.

Activity/ Action	Timelines	Resources
Periodic re-assessment for vendor rate improvements relative to the provision of early intervention services in home and community settings by the Department of Education (DOE), Division of Special Education (DSE) based on resources available and comparable reimbursement rates in TN.	Began October 2007 and ongoing annually	DSE Contract Coordinator, Office of Early Childhood (OEC) Director

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007-2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The February 2009 required submission for this indicator is reported in the Tennessee's State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2007-2008. 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 2007-2008 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
2007-2008	Targets will be set in 2010

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007-2008:

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007-2008:

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007-2008:

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% = 416/443 x 100 → Exceeded State Target**
- 4B. 89% = 387/433 x 100**
- 4C. 94% = 419/445 x 100**

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-2008	A. 90% B. 95% C. 95%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007-2008:

- 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 exceeded its target for this indicator measurement.
- 4B. Family survey results revealed 89% of families participating in Part C report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs.
- 4C. Family survey results revealed 94% of families participating in Part C report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn.

APR – Part C (4)

Tennessee

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007-2008:

For FFY 2007-2008, Tennessee utilized the Part C Family Survey developed through the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM). 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 March 31, 2008. Family address information was taken from Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) for all nine TEIS-POEs. A total of 2705 NCSEAM surveys were mailed with 457 completed surveys returned (16.89%).

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 several incidences where families made contact for assistance. When surveys were returned undeliverable but with a corrected address, surveys were resent. In the letter sent to families, Hispanic families were given the opportunity to call the Language and Culture Resource Center (LCRC) at ETSU to request a survey that had been translated into Spanish. There were three requests for the translated survey, but none were returned completed. There was a .20% increase in the survey response rate for FFY 2007-2008 when compared to FFY 2006-2007 – 2007 (16.89%) and 2006 (16.69%).

Per OSEP's June 6, 2008 letter/response table, the State was requested to address the variables it considered in determining representativeness for FFY 2007-2008 data. Based on the survey response rate compared with December 1, 2007 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 2007-2008. The response rate allows the State to have a 95% confidence level with 4.18% confidence interval. These results were confirmed by using the "Sample Size Calculator" at <http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm>.

For FFY 2007-2008, 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 across rural and suburban communities when compared with 618 Child Count Data for those communities. There was a difference for urban communities – the response rate was a lower percentage than child count for this community type. 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 American Indian, Asian, and Hispanic populations. There was a difference among response rates for black and white populations – black response rates were lower and white response rates were higher in comparison with 618 Child Count Data for these populations served. White and black populations are the two largest (in that order) populations served in Tennessee.

The State Performance Plan's (SPP) improvement activity for development work relative to the addition of data elements in TEIDS to collect family outcomes has not been initiated. There are no plans for these elements to be added in the immediate future.

The Lead Agency has explored and is planning an additional avenue of survey dissemination and completion for FFY-2008-2009. Surveys will continue to be distributed via mail, but the option of completing the survey online will be explored. It is anticipated that providing these two options for the completion of the family survey will boost the overall response rate. Resources through the Lead Agency's contract with East Tennessee State University (ETSU) will continue to be utilized for survey dissemination and for the development of online survey capability utilizing the NCSEAM survey. As with FFY 2007-2008, point in time data will be pulled for all infants and toddlers who have active IFSPs in April 2009.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007-2008:

The Lead Agency has revised its State targets for this indicator to begin with FFY 2008-2009 reporting. A study and analysis was conducted by division personnel in collaboration with State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) leadership relative to targets of States which 'Meet Requirements.' To better align with other States, Tennessee has re-adjusted its targets based on the mean of these States. Revised State targets are as follows: 4A, 80%; 4B, 80%; Part C State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2007-2008
(OMB NO: 1820-0578 / Expiration Date: 12/31/2009)
[Use this document for the February 2, 2009 Submission]

APR – Part C (4)**Tennessee**

and 4C, 85%. Data from the family survey for FFY 2008-2009 based on these targets will be reported in the APR which will be submitted February 1, 2010. Revisions to these indicator targets have been recorded in the SPP.

Per OSEP's clarification, Tennessee has readjusted its targets in order to reflect improvement over FFY 2006 baseline data. Beginning April 3, 2009, revised targets are as follows:

Family Survey item	APR Targets for Indicator 4		
	FFY 2008-2009	FFY 2009-2010	FFY 2010-2011
A. Know their rights	95.00%	95.00%	95.01%
B. Effectively communicate their children's needs	90.00%	90.00%	90.01%
C. Help their children develop and learn	94.00%	94.00%	94.01%

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007-2008

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:

- A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and
- B. National data.

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

Measurement:

- A. 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 the same percent calculated for other States with similar (narrow, moderate or broad) eligibility definitions.
- B. 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.

A. .71% = 590/82984 x 100 as compared to a weighted average of .77% for other States with a narrow eligibility category

B. .71% = 590/82984 x 100 compared to National Baseline of 1.01%

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-2008	.85%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007-2008:

A. Comparison with Similar States

Tennessee’s eligibility definition for infants and toddlers with developmental delays fall under the narrow eligibility category by Federal definition. 618 Child Count Data reports Tennessee at .71% = 590/82984 x 100 as compared to a weighted average of .77% with the 16 States that fall under the narrow eligibility category for infants and toddlers birth to one year of age.

B. Comparison with National Baseline

The U.S. Census Bureau’s population estimate for infants and toddlers under the age of one was 82,984 for FFY 2006-2007. The total number of infants and toddlers in Tennessee under the age of one with IFSPs on December 1, 2007, was 590. 618 Child Count Data reports Tennessee at .71% as compared to the national baseline of 1.01%.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007-2008:

Tennessee retained the same percentage as in FFY 2006-2007 relative to the national baseline, which had a decrease of .05%. While the percentage of infants and toddlers served (birth to age one year) remained the same, the Lead Agency reports progress as there was an increase in number by 27 children from the previous fiscal year – FFY 2007, 590 for .71% and FFY 2006, 563 for .71%.

As reported in the 2/1/08 APR (FFY 2006-2007), the Lead Agency hired a Public Awareness/Child Find Coordinator who directed the development of a diagnosis list to provide statewide consistency in the determination of eligibility

APR – Part C (4)**Tennessee**

based on Part B of the definition for developmental delay. This list was implemented in November 2007 and is now posted on the State website <http://tennessee.gov/education/speced/TEIS/otherlinks.htm>

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 concerns early in an infant or toddler’s life. The START Program offers pediatricians, family physicians, nurse practitioners, nurses, and others 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 who have been trained to teach this program. START’s Medical Director, Quentin Humberd, M.D., FAAP, is a board-certified developmental behavioral pediatrician and one of the program’s facilitators. Dr. Humberd 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 trainings to deliver a portion of the training specific to TEIS. During the FFY 2007-2008, 64 physicians, 80 staff, and 8 others (guests) were trained with 48 practices participating in the training. More information on the START program can be found on their website at: www.tnaap.org/developmental/developmental.asp.

The statewide Public Awareness Plan was completed in June 2008 and disseminated to TEIS-POE Eligibility Coordinators at the Annual Early Intervention Conference in September 2008. Focus for FFY 2008-2009 is ensuring physicians and health departments are aware of and have materials to share with all families with children about early intervention including contact information to TEIS.

With the TEIS reforms implemented beginning October 1, 2007, one improvement activity was the creation of a new logo and tag line for the purpose of branding TEIS across the State. The new logo displays four children engaged in developmentally age appropriate activities and clearly connects the program to the Tennessee Department of Education. The new tag line is Growing Together...Little by Little, signifying that children develop in steps with the help of their caregivers and other supports. See Attachments 5, 6, and 7 for copies of new brochures developed. This information is also posted on the State’s website at <http://tennessee.gov/education/speced/TEIS>.

These new public awareness materials, including posters, stickers, and updated brochures, were developed and disseminated to all TEIS POEs as well as Early Intervention Resource Agencies (EIRAs). Each POE office distributes these materials when personnel engage in public awareness and child find activities particularly with focused populations (per Public Awareness Plan). Distribution of materials to public venues such as libraries where families typically frequent has also occurred. Public speaking engagements at Belmont University, Vanderbilt University, resource fairs, and Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) meetings have also supported public awareness and child find efforts.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007-2008:

Because of changes due to TEIS reforms initiated October 1, 2007, which resulted in re-organization at the State and TEIS-POE level, improvement activities have been revised as follows and recorded in both the SPP and APR.

Activity/ Action	Timelines	Resources
Review State Public Awareness Plan for possible revisions and/or targeted focus.	Begin June 2009 and annually	Division of Special Education (DSE) Public Awareness Coordinator, Part C Coordinator, Office of Early Childhood (OEC) Director
Continue collaboration with the START Program.	Began 2005 and ongoing	DSE Public Awareness Coordinator, TEIS-POE Leadership
Maintain documentation related to public awareness and child find activities.	Began October 2008 and ongoing	TEIS-POE Eligibility Coordinator
Submit documentation related to public awareness and child find activities.	Begin October 2009 and annually	TEIS-POE Eligibility Coordinator, DSE Public Awareness Coordinator

Update diagnosis condition list utilized for Part B of the definition for developmental delay.	Began June 2008, updated annually	DSE Public Awareness Coordinator, Part C Coordinator
--	-----------------------------------	--

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:

- A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and
- B. National data.

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

Measurement:

- A. 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 the same percent calculated for other States with similar (narrow, moderate or broad) eligibility definitions.
- B. 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.

A. 1.80% = 4461/247539 x 100 compared to a weighted average of 1.81% for other States with a narrow eligibility category

B. 1.80% = 4461/247539 x 100 compared to the National Baseline of 2.48%

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-2008	2.07%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007-2008:

A. Comparison with Similar States

Tennessee’s eligibility definition for infants and toddlers with developmental delays falls under the narrow eligibility category by Federal definition. 618 Child Count Data reports Tennessee at 1.80% = 4461/247539 x 100 as compared to a weighted average of 1.81% with the 16 States that fall under the narrow eligibility category for infants and toddlers birth through 2 years of age.

B. Comparison with National Baseline

The U.S. Census Bureau’s population estimate for infants and toddlers birth through two years of age was 247539 for FFY 2006-2007. The total number of infants and toddlers in Tennessee birth through 2 years of age with IFSPs on December 1, 2007, was 4461. 618 Child Count Data reports Tennessee at 1.80% as compared to the national baseline of 2.48%.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007-2008:

Tennessee experienced progress from FFY 2006-2007 relative to the national baseline, which had a slight increase of .05%. Overall, the State experienced an increase in number/percent of infants and toddlers served birth through 2 years from the previous fiscal year – FFY 2007 4461 for 1.80% and FFY 2006, 4014 for 1.68%. This is an increase of 447 or .12%. The increase in numbers of children is believed to be impacted by two factors: 1) public knowledge related to TEIS reforms, and 2) work of the START Program.

APR – Part C (4)

Tennessee

As reported in the 2/1/08 APR (FFY 2006-2007), the Lead Agency hired a Public Awareness/Child Find Coordinator who directed the development of a diagnosis list to provide statewide consistency in the determination of eligibility based on Part B of the definition for developmental delay. This list was implemented November 2007 and is now posted on State website <http://tennessee.gov/education/speced/TEIS/otherlinks.htm>

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 concerns early in an infant or toddler's life. The START Program offers pediatricians, family physicians, nurse practitioners, nurses, and others 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 who have been trained to teach this program. START's Medical Director, Quentin Humberd, M.D., FAAP, is a board-certified developmental behavioral pediatrician and one of the program's facilitators. Dr. Humberd 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 trainings to deliver a portion of the training specific to TEIS. During the FFY 2007-2008, 64 physicians, 80 staff, and 8 others (guests) were trained with 48 practices participating in the training. More information on the START program can be found on their website at: www.tnaap.org/developmental/developmental.asp.

The statewide Public Awareness Plan was completed June 2008 and disseminated to TEIS-POE Eligibility Coordinators at the Annual Early Intervention Conference in September 2008. Focus for FFY 2008-2009 is ensuring physicians and health departments are aware of and have materials to share with all families with children about early intervention including contact information to TEIS.

With the TEIS reforms implemented beginning October 1, 2007, one improvement activity was the creation of a new logo and tag line for the purpose of branding TEIS across the State. The new logo displays four children engaged in developmentally age appropriate activities and clearly connects the program to the Tennessee Department of Education. The new tag line is Growing Together...Little by Little, signifying that children develop in steps with the help of their caregivers and other supports. See Attachments 5, 6, and 7 for copies of new brochures developed. This information is also posted on the State's website at <http://tennessee.gov/education/speced/TEIS>.

These new public awareness materials, including posters, stickers, and updated brochures, were developed and disseminated to all TEIS POEs as well as Early Intervention Resource Agencies (EIRAs). Each POE office distributes these materials when personnel engage in public awareness and child find activities particularly with focused populations (per Public Awareness Plan). Distribution of materials to public venues such as libraries where families typically frequent has also occurred. Public speaking engagements at Belmont University, Vanderbilt University, resource fairs, and Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) meetings have also supported public awareness and child find efforts.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007-2008:

Because of changes due to TEIS reforms initiated October 1, 2007, which resulted in re-organization at the State and TEIS-POE level, improvement activities have been revised as follows and recorded in both the SPP and APR.

Activity/ Action	Timelines	Resources
Review State Public Awareness Plan for possible revisions and/or targeted focus.	Begin June 2009 and annually	Division of Special Education (DSE) Public Awareness Coordinator, Part C Coordinator, Office of Early Childhood (OEC) Director
Continue collaboration with the START Program.	Began 2005 and ongoing	DSE Public Awareness Coordinator, TEIS-POE Leadership
Maintain documentation related to public awareness and child find activities.	Began October 2008 and ongoing	TEIS-POE Eligibility Coordinator
Submit documentation related to public awareness and child find activities.	Begin October 2009 and annually	TEIS-POE Eligibility Coordinator, DSE Public Awareness Coordinator
Update diagnosis condition list utilized for Part B of the definition for developmental delay.	Began June 2008, updated annually	DSE Public Awareness Coordinator, Part C Coordinator

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 eligible 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 eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed)] times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations.

93% = 3687/3951 x 100 – timely eligibility determination

85% = 3343/3951 x 100 – timely initial IFSP meetings

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances = 578

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-2008	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007-2008:

Timely eligibility determination: 93.32% - based on 3687 infants and toddlers with timely eligibility determination out of 3951 infants and toddlers with initial IFSP development.

Timely initial IFSP development: 84.61% - based on 3343 infants and toddlers with timely initial IFSP meetings out of 3951 infants and toddlers with initial IFSP development.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007-2008:

In FFY 2007-2008 data were reported for the first time 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. Untimely data were cleaned and verified 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.

Documented exceptional circumstances for delay relative to eligibility determination (i.e., difficulty in locating or contacting family upon receipt of referral, child/family sickness, family’s preferred scheduling, family no shows when developmental evaluator went to the home, etc.) were included in both the numerator and denominator.

Documented exceptional circumstances for delay relative to initial IFSP development (i.e., difficulty or inability to contact family to schedule meeting, child/family sickness, family’s preferred scheduling, family vacation, family no shows when service coordinator went to the home, etc.) were included in both the numerator and denominator.

APR – Part C (4)

Tennessee

Identified system issues for delay included delay in completing intake after referral into TEIS and delay in scheduling initial IFSP meeting after eligibility had been determined.

FFY 2005-2006 Monitoring Results for Correction of Noncompliance

Per OSEP's June 6, 2008 letter/response table, the State was requested to demonstrate that all noncompliance identified in FFY 2005-2006 has been corrected in the February 2009 APR. Documentation was provided to OSEP both in preparation and during the verification visit in September 2008 which demonstrated the correction of all noncompliance found in FFY 2005. There were three programs monitored in FFY 2005-2006. All three TEIS-POEs (FT, GN, and NW) had findings of noncompliance during this period. One TEIS-POE (NW) corrected noncompliance in a timely manner (i.e., within one year from date written finding was issued). The two additional TEIS-POEs achieved correction of noncompliance; however, correction was untimely. FT achieved correction on June 30, 2007; and GN achieved correction on September 30, 2007.

FFY 2006-2007 Monitoring Results for Correction of Noncompliance

All nine EIS programs were monitored during FFY 2006-2007. Five TEIS-POEs (ET, SE, UC, SC, and MD) had findings of noncompliance. All five findings have been corrected. Four of the programs (ET, SE, SC, and MD) achieved timely correction (i.e., within one year from date written finding was issued). UC achieved correction on May 31, 2008; however, correction was untimely. Refer to Indicator 9 for additional information.

The Lead Agency reports slippage from FFY 2006-2007 when comparing data for timely eligibility determination (FFY 2007, 93% and FFY 2006, 97%) and for timely initial IFSP development (FFY 2007, 85% and FFY 2006, 90%). However, the Lead Agency does report progress in its capacity now to pull annual, full census data from TEIDS rather than data from averaged quarterly reports as was the previous practice. In future APR reporting, the Lead Agency will have greater data fidelity when comparing information for the reporting of progress or slippage from the previous year.

The two improvement activities completed by the Lead Agency addressed in the 2/1/08 APR (FFY 2006-2007) have had a positive impact on eligibility determination and initial IFSP development:

- Review procedures by TEIS-POEs regarding eligibility determination. A policy memorandum (#06-002) was issued in November 27, 2006, to clarify Part C regulations related to eligibility determination. The procedures have clarified processes and resolved inconsistencies across TEIS-POEs.
- Reform restructuring of TEIS-POEs. As of October 1, 2007, all personnel in TEIS-POEs became State employees and former contracts for these offices were eliminated. This restructuring allows for greater accountability by the State for consistent implementation of Part C procedures. All TEIS-POEs have the new positions of an Eligibility Coordinator and Service Coordination Manager which provide oversight to Developmental Evaluators and Service Coordinators. An eligibility team has been established within each TEIS-POE. The State no longer contracts for eligibility evaluations. Lastly, as part of statewide reforms, family caseload size for service coordinators is planned to not exceed 40 families. In the past, some TEIS-POEs have had average family caseloads ranging from 45 to as high as 70.

FFY 2007-2008 Update - Procedures regarding eligibility determination have been made consistent across all TEIS-POE offices as all personnel are now State employees with an Eligibility Coordinator providing oversight to an eligibility determination team. A consistent statewide diagnosis list for Part B of the definition for developmental delay was developed and implemented in November 2007. An average caseload of 40 families has been achieved in several of the TEIS-POEs.

New Initiatives during FFY 2007-2008

In Tennessee, the Battelle Developmental Inventory-2 (BDI-2) is the assessment instrument 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 2009. 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 for module development.

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

APR – Part C (4)

Tennessee

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. During the FFY 2007-2008, initial training with Dr. Robin McWilliam, developer of the RBI process, was held with both TEIS-POE Service Coordination Managers (SCM) and DSE Trainers/Mentors in February and May 2008. Core teams were established in each POE office with DSE Trainers/Mentors being responsible for follow-up with each office on progress toward RBI completion and training of other personnel by office core teams. DSE Training and Workforce Development Coordinator attended the original Routines Based Interview "Train the Trainer" boot camp in August 2008. The RBI implementation strategy for the next year was communicated to TEIS-POEs during the Annual TEIS Conference in September 2008.

Tennessee is in year one 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. In FFY 2007-2008, Phase I of the Project began in May with activities expected to result in an enhanced quality assurance system that will be fully integrated into the existing TEIDS data system and will support functional decision-making by IFSP teams.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007-2008:

Per OSEP's June 6, 2008 letter/response table, the State was requested to review its SPP improvement activities and revise if appropriate. In light of changes due to TEIS reforms initiated October 1, 2007, and the statewide implementation of TEIDS (January 2007), a root cause analysis was conducted by Lead Agency personnel. As a result, improvement activities have been revised as follows and recorded in both the SPP and APR.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources established FFY 2007 (2007-2008)

Activity/ Action	Timelines	Resources
Weekly review of all IFSP meeting types (initial, 6-month, annual, requested reviews) completed by service coordinators. The purpose of reviews is three-fold: 1) correction of TEIDS data entry errors; 2) ensuring TEIDS documentation when meetings were untimely; and 3) verification of hard documentation where family denied access to private insurance for services. Weekly review report is sent to the State central office.	Began May 2008 and ongoing weekly	TEIS POE Leadership personnel, DSE State Data Manager
Utilize TEIDS data for annual compliance monitoring of EIS programs.	Data pulled on July 31 st for the fiscal year	State Data Manager, Part C Monitoring Coordinator, Monitoring Consultants
Clean, validate, and analyze data which were untimely for the identification of documented exceptional circumstances impacting meeting the timeline.	August for the fiscal year	TEIS POE Data Manager, Leadership personnel
Review data which were cleaned, validated, analyzed in order to verify data fidelity.	August/September for the fiscal year	Part C Monitoring Coordinator, Monitoring Consultants
Issue written finding where noncompliance is discovered.	September for the fiscal year	Part C Monitoring Coordinator, Director
Develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for approval when there is a written finding.	September for the fiscal year	TEIS-POE District Administrator and Leadership personnel to DSE monitoring personnel
Submit CAP progress reports.	Monthly, until correction achieved	TEIS-POE District Administrator and Leadership personnel to DSE monitoring personnel
Utilize both TEIDS data and CAP progress reports to monitor compliance tracking relative to correction of noncompliance.	Monthly, until correction achieved	State Data Manager, Part C Monitoring Coordinator, Monitoring Consultants

APR – Part C (4)**Tennessee**

Clean, validate, and analyze data which were untimely for the identification of documented exceptional circumstances impacting meeting the timeline.	Monthly, until correction achieved	TEIS POE Data Manager, Leadership personnel
Review data which were cleaned, validated, analyzed in order to verify data fidelity.	Monthly, until correction achieved	Part C Monitoring Coordinator, Monitoring Consultants
Issue written letter of correction when compliance has been achieved.	Date correction validated	Part C Monitoring Coordinator, Director
Provide DSE technical assistance to TEIS-POEs as requested or per enforcement actions based on annual program determination.	Began FFY 2006 and ongoing	DSE monitoring personnel, other DSE personnel depending on TA needs/requirements

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% = 3951/3951 x 100 → Compliance with Federal Target

B. 100% = 3951/3951 x 100 → Compliance with Federal Target

C. 88% = 1975/2243 x 100

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances = 450

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-2008	A. 100% B. 100% C. 100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007-2008:

8A. IFSPs with Transition Steps and Services

100% - 3951 infants and toddlers had initial IFSP development in FFY 2007-2008. 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 3951 infants and toddlers had initial IFSP development in FFY 2007-2008 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

88.05% - based on 1975 children who had timely LEA transition conferences out of 2243 children with conferences due.

APR – Part C (4)

Tennessee

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007-2008:

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.

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 (limited) 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. The first two quarterly data transfers also included previous overlapping data going back to July 1, 2006, in order to assure that LEA notification occurred for all children in TEIDS. The Lead Agency reports maintenance of progress utilizing the current process for LEA notification.

For **8C**, FFY 2007-2008 was the first time data were reported entirely from the Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) – full census data for Part C children who had an LEA transition conference unless a conference was refused by the family. Untimely data were cleaned and verified 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.

Documented exceptional circumstances for delay of transition conferences (i.e., child/family sickness, family vacation, family's preferred scheduling) were included in both the numerator and denominator. 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 in the Part C system and for whom parent consent was obtained did have an LEA transition conference in FFY 2007-2008. Identified system issues for delay of transition conferences included scheduling difficulties with LEAs and delays by the service coordinator scheduling timely conferences.

The Lead Agency reports progress from FFY 2006-2007 for 8C. Data for FFY 2007-2008 reveals that 88% of children had timely LEA transition conferences where in FFY 2006-2007 the percentage was 87%. The Lead Agency also reports progress in its capacity now to pull annual, full census data from TEIDS as opposed to data from averaged quarterly reports as was the previous practice for APR reporting.

FFY 2005-2006 Monitoring Results for Correction of Noncompliance

Per OSEP's June 6, 2008 letter/response table, the State was requested to demonstrate that all noncompliance identified in FFY 2005-2006 has been corrected in the 2/2/09 APR relative to indicator 8C. Documentation was provided to OSEP both in preparation and during the verification visit in September 2008 which demonstrated the correction of all noncompliance found in FFY 2005. There were three programs monitored in FFY 2005-2006. All three TEIS-POEs (FT, GN, and NW) had findings of noncompliance during this period. One TEIS-POE (NW) corrected noncompliance in a timely manner (i.e., within one year from date written finding was issued). The two additional TEIS-POEs achieved correction of noncompliance; however, correction was untimely. FT achieved correction on July 31, 2007; and GN achieved correction on June 30, 2007.

FFY 2006-2007 Monitoring Results for Correction of Noncompliance

Five of the nine TEIS-POEs (ET, SE, UC, SC, and MD) monitored had findings of noncompliance in FFY 2006-2007. All five findings have been corrected. Four of the programs (SE, UC, SC, and MD) achieved timely correction (i.e., within one year from date written finding was issued). ET achieved correction on October 31, 2007, which was less than one month after the expected timeframe. Refer to Indicator 9 for additional information.

New Initiatives during FFY 2007-2008

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 will be available to Part C personnel in January 2009. LEAs will be provided information on the curriculum at the TN Special Education Conference in February 2009. The curriculum will also be available to LEAs at that time. 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 to be 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 will be collected by TEIS districts and LEAs and will be used to determine the need for additional district and/or LEA specific transition training.

APR – Part C (4)

Tennessee

Each TEIS district office will manage the log-in and questions for their district. The Office of Early Childhood will have the ability to compile data from all districts and LEAs to aid compliance and future training development. Upon the recommendation by a new State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) member, who represents TN's Council on Developmental Disabilities, a brochure was developed by the DSE Public Awareness Coordinator in collaboration with the Training and Workforce Development Coordinator to provide families with basic written information regarding the transition process from Part C at age three years. See Attachment 8 for a copy of the transition brochure. This information is also posted on the State's website at <http://tennessee.gov/education/speced/TEIS>.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007-2008:

Per OSEP's June 6, 2008 letter/response table, the State was requested to review its SPP improvement activities and revise if appropriate. In light of changes due to TEIS reforms initiated October 1, 2007, and the statewide implementation of TEIDS (January 2007), a root cause analysis was conducted by Lead Agency personnel. As a result, improvement activities have been revised as follows and recorded in both the SPP and APR.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources established FFY 2007 (2007-2008)

Activity/ Action	Timelines	Resources
Weekly review of all IFSP meeting types (initial, 6-month, annual, requested reviews, LEA transition conferences) completed by service coordinators. The purpose of reviews: 1) correction of TEIDS data entry errors; and 2) ensuring TEIDS documentation when meetings were untimely; Weekly review report is sent to the State central office.	Began May 2008 and ongoing weekly	TEIS POE Leadership personnel, DSE State Data Manager
Utilize regularly the <i>Upcoming Meeting Report</i> generated by TEIDS as resource for planning/scheduling transition conferences.	Began 3/08	TEIS POE Leadership personnel.
Utilize TEIDS data for annual compliance monitoring of EIS programs.	Data pulled on July 31 st for the fiscal year	State Data Manager, Part C Monitoring Coordinator, Monitoring Consultants
Clean, validate, and analyze data which were untimely for the identification of documented exceptional circumstances impacting meeting the timeline.	August for the fiscal year	TEIS POE Data Manager, Leadership personnel
Review data which were cleaned, validated, analyzed in order to verify data fidelity.	August/September for the fiscal year	Part C Monitoring Coordinator, Monitoring Consultants
Issue written finding where noncompliance is discovered.	September for the fiscal year	Part C Monitoring Coordinator, Director
Develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for approval when there is a written finding.	September for the fiscal year	TEIS-POE District Administrator and Leadership personnel to DSE monitoring personnel
Submit CAP progress reports.	Monthly, until correction achieved	TEIS-POE District Administrator and Leadership personnel to DSE monitoring personnel
Utilize both TEIDS data and CAP progress reports to monitor compliance tracking relative to correction of noncompliance.	Monthly, until correction achieved	State Data Manager, Part C Monitoring Coordinator, Monitoring Consultants
Untimely data are cleaned, validated, and analyzed related to identification of documented exceptional circumstances impacting timeline.	Monthly, until correction achieved	TEIS POE Data Manager, Leadership personnel
Review data which were cleaned, validated, analyzed in order to verify fidelity of data.	Monthly, until correction achieved	Part C Monitoring Coordinator, Monitoring Consultants
Issue written letter of correction when compliance has been achieved.	Date correction validated	Part C Monitoring Coordinator, Director
Provide DSE technical assistance to TEIS-POEs as requested or per enforcement actions based on annual program determination.	Began FFY 2006 and ongoing	DSE monitoring personnel, other DSE personnel depending on TA needs/requirements

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.

87% = 13/15 x 100

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-2008	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007-2008:

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 in the State as the nine, district 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 Indicators. Beginning with FFY 2007-2008, the Lead Agency refined Continuous Improvement Monitoring (CIMP) indicators to directly align with Federal indicators of compliance (i.e., 1, 7, 8, and dispute resolution). See *Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007-2008* below for additional information.

APR – Part C (4)

Tennessee

OSEP Indicator 9 Worksheet

The worksheet below reports monitoring results for FFY 2006-2007.

Timely correction of noncompliance within one year of identification

Indicator	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Issued Findings in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(a) # of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(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	4	4	4
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	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		
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0		

APR – Part C (4)

Tennessee

Indicator	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Issued Findings in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(a) # of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(b) # of Findings of Noncompliance from (a) for which Correction was Verified no Later than One Year from Identification
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	5	5	4
	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		
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	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: B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B:	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0		
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0		

APR – Part C (4)

Tennessee

Indicator	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Issued Findings in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(a) # of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(b) # of Findings of Noncompliance from (a) for which Correction was Verified no Later than One Year from Identification
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: C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	5	5	4
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0		
Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b			15	13

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/speced/TEIS/tools.htm>. 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/speced/TEIS/tools.htm>, 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. Outcomes data, including exiting data, have been collected from East Tennessee, Northwest, and Greater Nashville. The results of child outcomes data 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. The State performance target for this indicator will be established in FFY 2010.
- C. Indicator 4 – Family Outcomes. OSEP defines this Federal indicator as a results indicator. Family survey data are collected for all nine TEIS-POEs. The results of family survey data collected are 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/speced/TEIS/tools.htm>, 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 and to other States with similar eligibility definitions for this age population 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/speced/TEIS/tools.htm>. 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/speced/TEIS/tools.htm>, data for each EIS program is provided as a comparison with the annual State target.

Indicator 9 Worksheet Summary

FFY 2006-2007 Monitoring Results for Correction of Noncompliance:

In FFY 2006-2007, all nine EIS programs were monitored. Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification was 86.67% (column b sum (13) divided by column a sum (15) times 100). The two additional findings of noncompliance were corrected, however; correction was untimely. ET achieved correction for indicator 8C on October 31, 2007, which was less than one month after the expected timeframe. UC achieved correction for indicator 7 on May 31, 2008. All findings of noncompliance have been corrected for FFY 2006-2007.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007-2008:

With improvements in **full census data** collection implemented in January 2007 through the Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS), two components of indicator 8 (A and B) are now addressed completely through TEIDS. Compliance with these two components is maintained at 100% through TEIDS validations (8A) and State-level data sharing processes (8B). Refer to APR report for indicator 8 for further information.

The Lead Agency **reports significant progress** when comparing timely correction data from the current year versus the previous year. Current year's data reveals 87% timely correction of noncompliance as compared with 40% from the previous year. Factors which have contributed to progress include: 1) TEIS organizational reforms put in place beginning October 1, 2007, relative to the establishment of EIS programs as State employees with its leadership structure, 2) alignment of CIMP compliance indicators to Federal indicators, 3) Statewide implementation of TEIDS (began January 1, 2007), 4) additional personnel resources for the provision of technical assistance and training, and 4) implementation of new TEIS Operations Manual and policies as resources to address consistent practices statewide.

FFY 2005-2006 Monitoring Results for Correction of Noncompliance

Per OSEP's June 6, 2008 letter/response table, the State was requested to demonstrate that all noncompliance identified in FFY 2005-2006 has been corrected in the 2/2/09 APR for indicator 9. Documentation was provided to OSEP both in preparation and during the verification visit in September 2008 which demonstrated the correction of all previous noncompliance found in FFY 2005. For specific correction information refer to indicators 1, 7, and 8C under the heading entitled, FFY 2005-2006 Monitoring Results for Correction of Noncompliance.

All nine EIS programs were monitored during FFY 2007-2008. There were no findings of noncompliance issued during this period.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007-2008:

Per OSEP's June 6, 2008 letter/response table, the State was requested to review its SPP improvement activities and revise if appropriate. In light of changes due to TEIS reforms initiated October 1, 2007, and the Statewide implementation of TEIDS (January 2007), a root cause analysis was conducted by Lead Agency personnel. As a result, improvement activities have been revised as follows and recorded in both the SPP and APR.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources established FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

Activity/ Action	Timelines	Resources
Weekly review of all IFSP meeting types (initial, 6-month, annual, requested reviews, LEA transition conference) completed by service coordinators. The purpose of reviews is three-fold: 1) correction of TEIDS data entry errors; 2) ensuring TEIDS documentation when meetings were untimely; and 3) verification of hard documentation where family denied access to private insurance for services. Weekly review report is sent to the State central office.	Began May 2008 and ongoing weekly	TEIS POE Leadership personnel, DSE State Data Manager
Annual training provided prior to annual compliance monitoring.	July for the fiscal year	Part C Monitoring Coordinator, Monitoring Consultants, EIS programs

Utilize TEIDS data for annual compliance monitoring of EIS programs.	Data pulled for the fiscal year: Indicator 1, August 20 th Indicators 7 and 8C, July 31 st	State Data Manager, Part C Monitoring Coordinator, Monitoring Consultants
Clean, validate, and analyze data which were untimely for the identification of documented exceptional circumstances impacting meeting the timeline.	August/September for the fiscal year	TEIS POE Data Manager, Leadership personnel
Review data which were cleaned, validated, analyzed in order to verify fidelity of data.	August/September for the fiscal year	Part C Monitoring Coordinator, Monitoring Consultants
Issue written findings where noncompliance was discovered.	September for the fiscal year	Part C Monitoring Coordinator, Director
Letters of Determination issued to EIS programs. Enforcement actions are specified by determination category based on written document, <i>Tennessee's System of Enforcements for EIS Programs</i> .	September for the fiscal year	State Monitoring Coordinator, Office of Early Childhood (OEC) Director
Develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for approval when there is a written finding.	September for the fiscal year	TEIS-POE District Administrator and Leadership personnel to DSE monitoring personnel
Submit CAP progress reports.	Monthly, until correction achieved	TEIS-POE District Administrator and Leadership personnel to DSE monitoring personnel
Utilize both TEIDS data and CAP progress reports to monitor compliance tracking relative to correction of noncompliance.	Monthly, until correction achieved	State Data Manager, Part C Monitoring Coordinator, Monitoring Consultants
Issue letter of correction when correction of noncompliance has been achieved. This decision is based upon both TEIDS data and CAP progress reports.	Began with FFY 2007-2008 monitoring and ongoing	Part C Monitoring Coordinator, OEC Director
As appropriate, review and revise the TEIS Operations Manual.	Begin October 2009 and annually	Workforce and Development Coordinator, Part C Coordinator, DSE personnel
Modify record review document for reviewing TEIS policies to also include specific <i>Part C SPP/APR Related Requirements</i> within the TEIS Operations Manual. This document will become a focused-monitoring/audit protocol.	Begin February 2009	Part C Monitoring Coordinator, OEC Auditor, DSE monitoring personnel
Conduct focused-monitoring/audit with selected EIS Programs.	April /May 2009	Part C Monitoring Coordinator, DSE monitoring personnel
The Lead Agency requested technical assistance in order to develop a written document which describes the components and processes of Tennessee's system of general supervision.	Work began August 2008	Mid-South Regional Resource Center and other appropriate technical assistance centers, Part C Monitoring Coordinator, OEC Director, DSE personnel

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% = 7+2/9 x 100

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-2008	100%

Actual Target Data for 2007-2008:

100% - Nine administrative complaints were filed. All nine complaints were issued timely reports, two of which had extended timelines. See Attachment 9 for Table 4, 618 Data.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-2008:

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 web-based, dispute resolution training with projected implementation via internet in March 2009. The focused audience is Service Coordinators, State and contracted early interventionists, and vendors.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-2008:

Per OSEP guidance during the September 2008 verification visit, the following addition has been made to improvement activities. This addition is recorded in both the SPP and APR.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources established FFY 2007 (2007-2008)

Activity/ Action	Timelines	Resources
Develop written communication protocol related to outcomes pertaining to dispute resolutions to better inform where possible monitoring actions/follow-up is needed.	March 2009	Part C Coordinator, Director, Part C Monitoring Coordinator in conjunction with DSE legal personnel

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006-2007

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
2007-2008	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007-2008:

No incidences occurred for this reporting period. See Attachment 9 for Table 4, 618 Data.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-2008:

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 web-based, dispute resolution training with projected implementation via internet in March 2009. The focused audience is Service Coordinators, State and contracted early interventionists, and vendors.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-2008:

Per OSEP guidance during the September 2008 verification visit, the following addition has been made to improvement activities. This addition is recorded in both the SPP and APR.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources established FFY 2007 (2007-2008)

Activity/ Action	Timelines	Resources
Develop written communication protocol related to outcomes pertaining to dispute resolutions to better inform where possible monitoring actions/follow-up is needed.	March 2009	Part C Coordinator, Director, Part C Monitoring Coordinator in conjunction with DSE legal personnel

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
2007-2008	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 2007-2008:

No incidences occurred for this reporting period. See Attachment 9 for Table 4, 618 Data

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-2008:

N/A

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-2008:

N/A

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006-2007

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.

50% = 0+1/2 x 100

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-2008	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 2007-2008:

The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which 10 or more mediations were conducted. Two requests for mediation were filed with one resulting in an agreement. In the incident where mediation did not result in an agreement, a due process hearing was requested in FFY 08-09. See Attachment 9 for Table 4, 618 Data.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-2008:**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 web-based, dispute resolution training with projected implementation via internet in March 2009. The focused audience is Service Coordinators, State and contracted early interventionists, and vendors.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-2008:

Per OSEP guidance during the September 2008 verification visit, the following addition has been made to improvement activities. This addition is recorded in both the SPP and APR.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources established FFY 2007 (2007-2008)

Activity/ Action	Timelines	Resources
Develop written communication protocol related to outcomes pertaining to dispute resolutions to better inform where possible monitoring actions/follow-up is needed.	March 2009	Part C Coordinator, Director, Part C Monitoring Coordinator in conjunction with DSE legal personnel

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
2007-2008	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007-2008:

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 for 618 Data.

Part C Indicator 14 Data Rubric

APR Indicator	Indicator 14 - SPP/APR Data		Total
	Valid and reliable	Correct calculation	
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 – Part C (4)

Tennessee

APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points (5 pts for submission of APR/SPP by February 2, 2009)	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: 11/1/08	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 4 – Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/1/08	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 75 times 100)			(70) / (70) X 100 = 100%	

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007-2008:

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.

Federal 618 Data

FFY 2007-2008 was the first year that 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 was error-free, consistent, valid, and reliable. Data were analyzed related to reasons for change where data revealed “significant changes” from the previous year’s data. Findings were reported on the required Westat DTS forms and submitted along with the 618 Data submission.

Tennessee’s Annual Report to the Public

Federal 616 report requirements were completed for both FFY 2005-2006 and FFY 2006-2007. Both reports were posted in March, 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 2007-2008 Report will be posted on the State’s website under “Reports” at <http://tennessee.gov/education/speced/TEIS/tools.htm> **March 2009**.

APR – Part C (4)

Tennessee

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007-2008:

Because of the Statewide implementation of TEIDS (January 2007) and changes due to TEIS reforms initiated October 1, 2007, which resulted in re-organization at the State and TEIS-POE level, improvement activities have been revised as follows and recorded in both the SPP and APR.

Activity/ Action	Timelines	Resources
Federal 618 Data will be: 1) pulled according to required timeframes through TEIDS, 2) cleaned, verified, and analyzed when significant changes occur; and 3) submitted timely.	Annually, Westat submissions due: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dec. 1 Child Count due February 1 • Exiting Data due November 1 • Dispute Resolution Data due November 1 	State Data Manager working with Part C Monitor and OEC Director
Annual Performance Plan (APR) development and timely submission along with any revisions needed in the State Performance Plan (SPP).	Annually, due February 1	Part C Monitoring Coordinator working with State Data Manager, Monitoring Consultants, OEC Director, Part C Coordinator
APR and SPP posted on the State’s website.	Annually, February	Part C Monitoring Coordinator, Public Awareness/Child Find Coordinator
Tennessee’s Annual Report to the Public developed and posted on the State’s website.	Annually, due March	Part C Monitoring Coordinator, Monitoring Consultants, OEC Director, Part C Monitor, Public Awareness/Child Find Coordinator

2007-2008 Annual Performance Report (APR)

Attachments

Indicator	Attachment
Indicator 3	1 State Improvement Plan (SPP) Report
	2 Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO): Entrance Data Collection Form
	3 Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO): Exit Data Collection Form
Indicator 4	4 NCSEAM Family Survey Form
Indicators 5 & 6	5 TEIS Brochure: Growing Together Little by Little
	6 TEIS Brochure: Questions & Answers
	7 TEIS Brochure: Rights
Indicator 8C	8 TEIS Brochure: Transition
Indicators 10, 11, 12, and 13	9 Part C, 618 <u>Table 4</u> : Dispute Resolution Data
Certification of APR Report	10 Interagency Coordination Council (ICC) Certification Letter