TN
Part C

FFY2015
State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

Executive Summary:

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part C requirements are met, e.g., monitoring systems, dispute resolution systems.

The Lead Agency in Tennessee for Part C, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is the State Department of Education (DOE). Tennessee's Early Intervention System (TEIS) is administered through the Division of Special Populations and Student Support.

Early Intervention Service (EIS) programs are defined as the nine TEIS Point of Entry Offices (TEIS POEs). Staff in these offices are state employees. Each POE has a district administrator who reports directly to the state's Part C Coordinator and has oversight for the operations of the POE office. State personnel in these offices are responsible for referrals into the system through exit from the system: 1) Part C eligibility determination and 2) all service coordination activities which include IFSP development, oversight of service delivery, and transition. TEIS POEs utilize the TEIS Operations Manual and TEIS Policy Manual as resources for daily operations. Staff performance is measured through individual performance plans using **S**pecific **M**easurable **A**chievable **R**ealistic **T**imely (SMART) goals built upon responsibilities from federal compliance and from improving child results.

In Tennessee the child's official educational record is housed in a real-time, web-based data system. Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) contains demographic information; evaluation/eligibility information; Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP), including the transition plan; contact logs; service logs for delivered services; and an accounts payable section for reimbursement of delivered services.

Monitoring activities are conducted through the following three avenues:

1. Annual Monitoring: Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) enables the Lead Agency to track through desk audits the existence of noncompliance and the verification for the correction of child-level noncompliance. Full fiscal year census data from TEIDS are utilized annually for the monitoring of federal compliance Indicators 1, 7, and 8C. Compliance with Indicator 8A is maintained through a TEIDS validation. Compliance with Indicator 8B is addressed through monthly data sharing at the state level between Part C and Part B, 619 preschool (SEA) and Local Education Agencies (LEAs). Compliance monitoring and the issuing of written findings, when warranted, occur during September-October for the previous fiscal year.
2. Dispute Resolution: Findings of noncompliance may be issued as an outcome of one of the three dispute resolution processes (i.e., administrative complaint, mediation, due process). Identifying noncompliance and issuing a written finding may occur at any time during the year.
3. Focused Monitoring Activities: Activities may be either planned or conducted as needed. Planned focused monitoring activities typically arise from possible IDEA or operational issues identified from TEIS state leadership which need further investigation. If warranted, focused monitoring can also be initiated when a particular concern is expressed by someone outside of TEIS. Focused monitoring activities may occur at any time during the year.

A finding of noncompliance can be issued to an EIS program (TEIS POE) through any of the monitoring activities described above. When this occurs TEIS issues a written letter of finding along with supporting data and a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) template. The Lead Agency utilizes direction from the federal Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP) 09-02 Memorandum and OSEP's (9-8-08) Frequently Asked Questions (FAQS) Regarding Identification and Correction of Noncompliance and Reporting on Correction in the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report when determining correction of noncompliance. When correction has been achieved, TEIS issues a written letter confirming correction to the program. The Lead Agency adheres to the OSEP's definition for timely correction—as soon as possible, but not more than one year from the date the written finding was issued.

The 09-02 Memorandum identifies a "two-prong approach" when determining correction. The Lead agency uses the following steps when determining correction as part of its system of general supervision:

1. Child-level correction (prong 1). When child-level noncompliance is discovered (e.g., a child has yet to receive an IFSP service [Indicator 1], have a meeting [Indicators 7 or 8C]), the child's TEIDS identification number is recorded within the TEIS POE's Corrective Action Plan (CAP) template prepared by the Part C Monitoring Coordinator. Immediate attention and correction to any child-level noncompliance is expected. The Part C Monitoring Coordinator verifies correction by reviewing a child's record where noncompliance was identified.
2. Correct implementation of regulatory requirements (prong 2). A subsequent review of data is made relative to the finding for the Part C Monitoring Coordinator to verify that the TEIS POE is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. This entails a review of monthly, census data in TEIDS until 100% compliance is achieved.
3. Pre-finding correction. The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) allows for the correction of noncompliance discovered prior to the issuance of a written letter of finding. If an incident occurs, and when appropriate, the Lead Agency does not issue a finding. Pre-finding correction occurs through a verification of subsequent monthly, census data in TEIDS demonstrating 100% compliance and the correction of any previous child-level noncompliance prior to the issuance of a written finding.
4. Completion of Corrective Action Plans (CAPs). The Lead Agency additionally utilizes a Corrective Action Plan as part of its system of general supervision. The CAP provides the vehicle for the EIS program (TEIS POE) to identify systemic issues impacting noncompliance; addressing those issues through the development and implementation of a plan of correction. As part of CAP development, the POE conducts a Root Cause Analysis (RCA) on system issues across all children which led to the noncompliance. Based on the results of the RCA, corrective action steps are developed which include information regarding timelines and the identification of responsibility for each action step. The Part C Monitoring Coordinator provides technical assistance to the POE for the development of the CAP. The CAP template becomes a monthly reporting and communication tool between the POE and the Part C Monitoring Coordinator. It is used to document progress status until corrective actions/ measures have been implemented. The Lead Agency uses this

third step in the correction process to ensure the TEIS POE leadership have identified and addressed local systemic issues which impact both POE status and state-level compliance.

The Lead Agency also has a mechanism for improvement planning using annual letters of determination issued to EIS programs (TEIS POEs). Since spring 2013, program determination algorithms have included both compliance and results indicator data. A rubric is used to calculate determinations: Meets Requirements, Needs Assistance, Needs Intervention, and Needs Substantial Intervention. The Program Monitor provides technical assistance to any POE falling outside "Meets Requirements" for the development of an improvement plan. As the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) implementation strategies link with data for APR results indicators, beginning FFY 2015-16 improvement planning has become integrated with SSIP work at the local POE level.

Working with the Department of Education's (DOE) legal office, the Lead Agency has processes in place to track, investigate, and resolve disputes filed on behalf of infants and toddlers in TEIS. Part C State Regulations have adopted Part B procedures and timelines for processing all disputes filed. With support from the Part C Coordinator, TEIS POEs are encouraged to resolve concerns locally through the IFSP process. Administrative complaints filed are investigated and resolved by TEIS personnel with guidance from DOE legal personnel. Requests for mediation and due process are handled by DOE legal personnel, working with the TEIS Executive Director and Part C Coordinator. Data regarding disputes are reported annually to the federal Office of Special Education (OSEP) through the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS).

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to early intervention service (EIS) programs.

The Lead Agency's technical assistance efforts are led by the TEIS Quality Improvement Manager and staff. The Quality Improvement Team utilizes a professional development calendar that outlines all required training for TEIS Point of Entry Offices (TEIS POEs) staff, including:

- Annual conference to provide training and support to TEIS-POE staff, topics selected based on needs assessment and monitoring data
- Quarterly trainings on Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO), TEIS Operations Manual, and Routines-Based Interview (RBI)

In addition to the professional development calendar, the following training/technical assistance activities are provided by the Quality Improvement Team:

- New Hire Training Packet used by TEIS POE leadership, with the support of the Quality Improvement Team, to provide onboarding training to all new hires
- Online resources available to TEIS-POE leadership, called "Debriefs" on the following topics:
    - Early Childhood Outcomes
    - TEIS Operations Manual
    - Routines Based Interview - Functional Goal Development
    - Transition (Steps to Success and TEIS Transition [C to B)
    - Targeted Case Management (TCM)
    - Family-Centered Early Intervention Services
    - Contact Log Entry
    - Online BDI-2 training for all new hires, which is an addition to the one specifically for the staff (Developmental Specialists) who will be completing developmental evaluations

The Quality Improvement Team is currently developing the following new training/technical assistance resources for TEIS POE staff:

- Job embedded training to address specific concerns of individual POE staff
- Topics identified by POE leadership during staff meetings
- Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System (AEPS) Family Report

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

The Lead Agency's professional development system is led by the TEIS Quality Improvement Manager and staff. The Quality Improvement Team is responsible for providing training, support, and technical assistance to ensure staff at Early Intervention Resource Agencies (EIRAs) who provide developmental therapy services complete professional development activities required by their contracts.

These activities, outlined below, are designed to support early interventionists (EIs) in providing evidence-based quality services to infants and toddlers and their families receiving early intervention services through TEIS.

- Annual Building Best Practices Conference for EIRA staff. Content is developed by a committee consisting of both TEIS staff and EIRA representatives and is based on latest research in the field of early intervention
- Online Professional Educational and Enrichment Resources (PEER) activities for EIRA staff to learn best practice techniques within the field of early intervention
- Online trainings, topics as follows:
    - Family-Centered Early Intervention
    - Guidelines for Tennessee's data management system Service Log entries
- Contract requirement of 42 hours of training per full time equivalent (FTE) early interventionists (EIs). Training time is pro-rated for staff less than full time.
- EIRA Directors are required to observe one home visit per quarter for each EI working within their agency. The observation is documented on a TEIS developed questionnaire and entered into an online system (Survey Monkey).
- EIRA Directors are required to review EI staff Service Log entries monthly and entering review results into Survey Monkey for monitoring

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part C results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

Tennessee's State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) is the primary stakeholder group for Tennessee's Early Intervention System (TEIS). Stakeholders consist of SICC members and also of visitors in attendance at quarterly meeting (i.e., TEIS staff, Early Intervention Resource Agency [EIRA] representatives [service providers], and TEIS vendors [service providers]).

SICC membership and visitors were actively engaged in reviewing, considering, and providing input for Annual Performance Report (APR) results indicator targets which were set for the six-year State Performance Plan (SPP)/ APR, FFY 2013-14 through FFY 2018-19. During the January SICC meeting, the APR data and information is annually reviewed with stakeholders. Feedback/input is solicited before the report is finalized. Feedback may include revisiting results indicator targets if warranted.

The APR was reviewed with the TEIS Executive Director, Part C Coordinator and SICC Chairperson, January 19th and with all SICC membership and visitors present on January 24th. See attached for a signed copy of the *Annual Report Certification of the Interagency Coordinating Council under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities* Education Act (IDEA).

In FFY 2015-16, TEIS state leadership established representative stakeholder groups to periodically access for feedback and/or input on various projects (e.g., TEIS operational procedure development, professional training development, State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) work). Groups were established through a self-nomination process with TEIS ensuring statewide coverage across several factors such as rural/urban and program size. Review committees which represent EIRAs and TEIS POEs were established and met during the fiscal year. In FFY 2016-17, a review committee for Vendors was established in November.

The Lead Agency continues to solicit input from families. In the fall of 2016 (FFY 2016-17) three regional parent focus groups were held to obtain feedback on the following topics: 1) family survey dissemination and collection process, 2) report formats used with the Battelle Developmental Inventory–2 (BDI-2) evaluation for eligibility determination and the Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System (AEPS) for Infants and Children used for ongoing developmental progress reporting, and 3) how information about early childhood outcomes (ECO) is shared with families.

Another avenue used by the Lead Agency to keep stakeholders informed is the monthly TEIS newsletter entitled, *TEIS Update*. The newsletter was established in FFY 2014-15 and is disseminated electronically to EIRAs (service providers), vendors (service providers), TEIS POEs, SICC membership, the Assistant Commissioner of Special Populations and Student Support, Part B, 619 state staff, Tennessee's Part C federal OSEP contact, and other stakeholders. The newsletter contains key updates from the TEIS central office and provides information about upcoming meetings or training.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
ffy 2015-16_apr certification form-signed 20170119.pdf	Catherine Goodwin		Remove

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2014 performance of each EIS Program or Provider located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2014 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2014 APR in 2016, is available.

Federal report requirements for the performance of each Early Intervention Service (EIS) program (TEIS POEs) against the state's SPP/ APR targets are completed and posted on the State's website no later than 120 day following the State's submission of the APR on February. This report is entitled, *Report to the Public*. The State's APR is also posted at the same location after the close of the federal period of clarification. An email is sent to Tennessee's Part C federal OSEP contact and TEIS POE leadership informing them of the posting and the website link. The TEIS monthly newsletter (*TEIS Update*) informs stakeholders of the postings. Currently, the *2016 Report to the Public* and the *2014-15 Annual Performance Report* are available on the State's website under "Reports" at http://www.tennessee.gov/education/article/teis-reports-and-data

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Indicator 1: Timely provision of services

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Compliance indicator: 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)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		90.96%	94.98%	89.05%	91.95%	97.26%	97.50%	98.38%	97.81%	97.22%	96.90%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
5049	5658	96.90%	100%	97.67%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner)	477

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- ○ **State monitoring**
- ◉ **State database**

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

July 1, 2015–June 30, 2016

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Data account for the timely receipt of all services for a child rather than individual services. For example, if a child had three new services initiated on an IFSP and any one of the services were delivered untimely, the child had untimely service delivery. Tennessee defines "timely services" as no longer than 30 days from the date of parent consent on the IFSP for a service."

Data from the Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) included full census data for all Part C eligible infants and toddlers across all IFSP types (i.e., initial, six-month, annual, review change).

Annual data were pulled by the nine Tennessee Early Intervention System Point of Entry (TEIS POE) Data Managers and were reviewed by TEIS POE Leadership prior to submission to the TEIS Monitoring Team (i.e., Part C Monitoring Coordinator and Program Monitor). POE data reports accounted for reasons of untimely IFSP service delivery (i.e., exceptional family circumstances or system). A subsequent review of data was completed by the TEIS Monitoring Team in order to verify reasons for untimely service delivery.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
3	3	null	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

There were three findings of noncompliance issued in 2014 (FFY 2014-15), monitoring cycle FFY 2013-14, through annual monitoring. For the six EIS programs not reporting 100% compliance and which did not have a finding, the Monitoring Team verified that all noncompliance was corrected through a subsequent verification of data prior to the issuance of a written finding of noncompliance (i.e., pre-finding correction).

For three EIS programs with a finding of noncompliance, a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) was developed and monthly data verifications were completed by the Monitoring Team until 100% correction was achieved; thus the programs were correctly implementing indicator regulatory requirements. All three findings were corrected timely (i.e., as soon as possible but no in no case later than one year from the written notice of finding).

Refer to APR Introduction: General Supervision System regarding how TEIS ensures EIS programs are correctly implementing regulatory requirements and for information on pre-finding correction.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

There was no child-level noncompliance found in the EIS programs, both in fiscal year data for annual monitoring and in subsequent monthly data verified. All children had IFSP services delivered, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of TEIS.

Refer to APR Introduction: General Supervision System regarding how TEIS ensures there is no child-level noncompliance and measures taken for correction should child-level noncompliance be found.

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			75.68%	78.02%	80.36%	82.70%	85.04%	85.04%	85.04%	85.04%	85.04%
Data		76.00%	77.70%	87.98%	90.03%	86.21%	84.11%	83.85%	82.45%	80.35%	80.55%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	85.04%	85.04%	85.04%	85.04%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Tennessee's State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) is the primary stakeholder group for Tennessee's Early Intervention System (TEIS). Other stakeholders include TEIS state leadership, TEIS Point of Entry (POE) District Administrators and staff, Early Intervention Resource Agency (EIRA) representatives (service providers) and TEIS vendors (service providers) who attend SICC meetings.

Status of FFY 2015-16 data compared to the state target was shared with the SICC membership and attending visitors during the January 2017 SICC meeting. Modifications to state targets were determined unnecessary for the upcoming fiscal year.

Stakeholder input is further detailed the Annual Performance Report (APR) *Introduction* under the section entitled, *Stakeholder Involvement*.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	4,186	
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	5,018	

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
4,186	5,018	80.55%	85.04%	83.42%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: 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)

Does your State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? No

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2008	Target ≥						74.40%	74.90%	74.90%	74.90%	74.90%	74.90%
		Data					73.90%	76.70%	75.10%	84.80%	70.99%	74.61%	74.15%
A2	2008	Target ≥						46.90%	47.40%	47.40%	47.40%	47.40%	47.40%
		Data					46.40%	41.50%	37.80%	42.50%	34.13%	41.82%	35.66%
B1	2008	Target ≥						77.90%	78.40%	78.40%	78.40%	78.40%	78.40%
		Data					77.40%	74.80%	77.30%	86.20%	74.62%	78.69%	74.61%
B2	2008	Target ≥						44.70%	45.20%	45.20%	45.20%	45.20%	45.20%
		Data					44.20%	34.40%	36.20%	42.10%	35.46%	39.83%	29.62%
C1	2008	Target ≥						76.40%	76.90%	76.90%	76.90%	76.90%	76.90%
		Data					75.90%	76.90%	79.30%	89.00%	77.44%	80.51%	78.70%
C2	2008	Target ≥						48.90%	49.40%	49.40%	49.40%	49.40%	49.40%
		Data					48.40%	37.70%	39.60%	40.30%	34.68%	37.64%	31.26%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	74.90%	74.90%	74.90%	74.90%
Target A2 ≥	47.40%	47.40%	47.40%	47.40%
Target B1 ≥	78.40%	78.40%	78.40%	78.40%
Target B2 ≥	45.50%	46.00%	46.50%	47.00%
Target C1 ≥	76.90%	76.90%	76.90%	76.90%
Target C2 ≥	49.40%	49.40%	49.40%	49.40%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Tennessee's State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) is the primary stakeholder group for Tennessee's Early Intervention System (TEIS). Other stakeholders include TEIS state leadership, TEIS Point of Entry (POE) District Administrators and staff, Early Intervention Resource Agency (EIRA) representatives (service providers) and TEIS vendors (service providers) who attend SICC meetings.

Status of FFY 2015-16 data compared to state targets was shared with the SICC membership and attending visitors during the January 2017 SICC meeting. Modifications to state targets were determined unnecessary for the upcoming fiscal year. Modifications are anticipated in FFY 2017-18 when changes to data collection processes have had time to normalize. Stakeholder feedback will be solicited when this occurs.

Stakeholder input is further detailed the Annual Performance Report (APR) *Introduction* under the section entitled, *Stakeholder Involvement*.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	2868.00

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	6.00	0.21%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	744.00	25.94%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	858.00	29.92%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	766.00	26.71%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	494.00	17.22%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	1624.00	2374.00	74.15%	74.90%	68.41%
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	1260.00	2868.00	35.66%	47.40%	43.93%

Explanation of A1 Slippage

The Lead Agency continues to experience year-to-year fluctuations. These fluctuations are expected, due to ongoing improvements in collecting Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) data. To improve data quality, Tennessee's Early Intervention System (TEIS) has been modifying ECO collection methods based on guidance from the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), information shared by other states, and national technical assistance (TA) centers. Variance in ECO data is expected as TEIS continues to recalibrate its processes.

Prior to FFY 2014-15, ECO entrance and exit ratings were collected by service coordinators using professional judgement along with discussions with families and assessment information gathered from early intervention service providers. Providers self-selected developmental assessment instruments used prior to FFY 2014-15.

In FFY 2014-15 service coordinators were trained to use the Battelle Developmental Inventory, Second Edition (BDI-2) and the corresponding BDI-2 z-scores to anchor ECO entrance discussions with families. The BDI-2 is the evaluation instrument used in Tennessee to determine a child's eligibility for services. BDI-2 is not required to be administered at exit, so there was not an instrument with which to anchor exit scores. For exit ratings, service coordinators determined ratings using professional judgement along with discussions with families and ongoing assessment information gathered from providers who utilized various developmental assessment instruments.

In October 2015, the Lead Agency implemented use of the Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System for Infants and Children (AEPS) to gather developmental assessment data every six-months, beginning six-months after the initial Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). For FFY 2015-16, TEIS continued to use BDI-2 z-scores to anchor entrance ECO data collection, and AEPS was used to anchor ECO data collection at each subsequent six-month and annual IFSP meeting.

Through the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) process, the Lead Agency has identified ECO data quality as both a root cause for low performance and an improvement strategy. This change will require the Lead Agency to review and possibly establish new baselines in FFY 2017-18. By FFY 2019-2020, all children assessed prior to the AEPS at entrance will have exited early intervention services.

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	3.00	0.10%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	757.00	26.39%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1273.00	44.39%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	682.00	23.78%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	153.00	5.33%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	1955.00	2715.00	74.61%	78.40%	72.01%
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	835.00	2868.00	29.62%	45.50%	29.11%

Explanation of B1 Slippage

The Lead Agency continues to experience year-to-year fluctuations. These fluctuations are expected, due to ongoing improvements in collecting Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) data. To improve data quality, Tennessee's Early Intervention System (TEIS) has been modifying ECO collection methods based on guidance from the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), information shared by other states, and national technical assistance (TA) centers. Variance in ECO data is expected as TEIS continues to recalibrate its processes.

Prior to FFY 2014-15, ECO entrance and exit ratings were collected by service coordinators using professional judgement along with discussions with families and assessment information gathered from early intervention service providers. Providers self-selected developmental assessment instruments used prior to FFY

2014-15.

In FFY 2014-15 service coordinators were trained to use the Battelle Developmental Inventory, Second Edition (BDI-2) and the corresponding BDI-2 z-scores to anchor ECO entrance discussions with families. The BDI-2 is the evaluation instrument used in Tennessee to determine a child's eligibility for services. BDI-2 is not required to be administered at exit, so there was not an instrument with which to anchor exit scores. For exit ratings, service coordinators determined ratings using professional judgement along with discussions with families and ongoing assessment information gathered from providers who utilized various developmental assessment instruments.

In October 2015, the Lead Agency implemented use of the Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System for Infants and Children (AEPS) to gather developmental assessment data every six-months, beginning six-months after the initial Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). For FFY 2015-16, TEIS continued to use BDI-2 z-scores to anchor entrance ECO data collection, and AEPS was used to anchor ECO data collection at each subsequent six-month and annual IFSP meeting.

Through the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) process, the Lead Agency has identified ECO data quality as both a root cause for low performance and an improvement strategy. This change will require the Lead Agency to review and possibly establish new baselines in FFY 2017-18. By FFY 2019-2020, all children assessed prior to the AEPS at entrance will have exited early intervention services.

The knowledge and skills sub-indicator is the focus of Tennessee's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) is to increase to the percentage of children exiting TEIS at the level of same-age peers in their acquisition and use of knowledge and skills. Refer to APR indicator 11, which is the SSIP, for additional information. The report for Phase III of the SSIP submission is due April, 1, 2017.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	5.00	0.17%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	617.00	21.51%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1173.00	40.90%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	831.00	28.97%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	242.00	8.44%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	2004.00	2626.00	78.70%	76.90%	76.31%
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	1073.00	2868.00	31.26%	49.40%	37.41%

Explanation of C1 Slippage

The Lead Agency continues to experience year-to-year fluctuations. These fluctuations are expected, due to ongoing improvements in collecting Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) data. To improve data quality, Tennessee's Early Intervention System (TEIS) has been modifying ECO collection methods based on guidance from the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), information shared by other states, and national technical assistance (TA) centers. Variance in ECO data is expected as TEIS continues to recalibrate its processes.

Prior to FFY 2014-15, ECO entrance and exit ratings were collected by service coordinators using professional judgement along with discussions with families and assessment information gathered from early intervention service providers. Providers self-selected developmental assessment instruments used prior to FFY 2014-15.

In FFY 2014-15 service coordinators were trained to use the Battelle Developmental Inventory, Second Edition (BDI-2) and the corresponding BDI-2 z-scores to anchor ECO entrance discussions with families. The BDI-2 is the evaluation instrument used in Tennessee to determine a child's eligibility for services. BDI-2 is not required to be administered at exit, so there was not an instrument with which to anchor exit scores. For exit ratings, service coordinators determined ratings using professional judgement along with discussions with families and ongoing assessment information gathered from providers who utilized various developmental assessment instruments.

In October 2015, the Lead Agency implemented use of the Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System for Infants and Children (AEPS) to gather developmental assessment data every six-months, beginning six-months after the initial Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). For FFY 2015-16, TEIS continued to use BDI-2 z-scores to anchor entrance ECO data collection, and AEPS was used to anchor ECO data collection at each subsequent six-month and annual IFSP meeting.

Through the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) process, the Lead Agency has identified ECO data quality as both a root cause for low performance and an improvement strategy. This change will require the Lead Agency to review and possibly establish new baselines in FFY 2017-18. By FFY 2019-2020, all children assessed prior to the AEPS at entrance will have exited early intervention services.

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? Yes

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Of the 4434 children who exited TEIS in FFY 2015-16, 2868 had usable data (i.e., both entrance and exit ratings) for all three sub-outcomes. The 1349 children who exited without usable ECO data where children who did not have the required minimum of six-months of service between ECO entrance and exit ratings.

The Lead Agency reports that missing ECO entrance data were eliminated this fiscal year due to a Tennessee Early Data System (TEIDS) validation wherein all initial IFSPs cannot be finalized in TEIDS without an ECO entrance rating. Missing exit ECO data were eliminated as ECO progress ratings are collected every six months—when a child exits after only six months of service, the progress rating becomes the ECO exit rating.

Beginning July 1, 2016 (FFY 2016-17) TEIS began using the Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System for Infants and Children (AEPS) to collect ECO entrance ratings. ECO data are now anchored to a single developmental assessment instrument for every collection point (i.e., entrance, ongoing, exiting). The AEPS was selected as the single assessment instrument because: 1) it is the only development assessment tool that has been cross-walked with OSEP child outcomes, 2) it contains a curriculum component for program planning, and 3) it is aligned with the Department of Education's Tennessee–Early Learning Developmental Standards (TN-ELDS) which provide a continuum of research-based developmental milestones from birth through age five.

EIRA, early intervention service providers now collect all ECO ratings using the AEPS. The role of the service coordinator is focused on reviewing developmental progress with families every six-months based on the developmental assessment information provided by EIRAs. Potential variance in ECO data are anticipated as early intervention service providers become more confident in using the AEPS and as ECO ratings data are generated now from one, consistent assessment instrument (i.e., AEPS exclusively versus a combination of BDI-2 and AEPS or other assessment instruments). It will take several years for all children served by TEIS to have both ECO entrance and exit ratings generated solely by the AEPS.

In 2015-16 training was provided for all TEIS service coordinators for their understanding of the AEPS developmental assessment instrument and how to use its reports to explain developmental progress to families. Regional trainings were provided by an AEPS master trainer.

The Lead Agency provided training for train-the-trainer in November 2016 for EIRAs. Trainings were provided by an AEPS master trainer based on training developed specific to Tennessee. There is a mechanism in place for refresher training to be provided for staff and for new hires.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: 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)

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2013	Target ≥			90.00%	90.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.01%	95.01%	95.01%	90.00%	90.20%
		Data			94.70%	93.91%	94.47%	94.44%	96.56%	96.42%	95.22%	75.42%	91.75%
B	2013	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.01%	90.01%	90.01%	93.00%	93.20%
		Data			90.28%	89.38%	92.86%	92.16%	94.24%	93.44%	94.06%	78.45%	91.63%
C	2013	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	94.00%	94.00%	94.01%	94.01%	94.01%	90.00%	90.20%
		Data			94.10%	94.16%	95.77%	95.58%	97.25%	96.23%	96.82%	74.58%	87.56%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	90.40%	90.60%	90.80%	91.00%
Target B ≥	93.40%	93.60%	93.80%	94.00%
Target C ≥	90.40%	90.60%	90.80%	91.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Tennessee's State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) is the primary stakeholder group for Tennessee's Early Intervention System (TEIS). Other stakeholders include TEIS state leadership, TEIS Point of Entry (POE) District Administrators and staff, Early Intervention Resource Agency (EIRA) representatives (service providers) and TEIS vendors (service providers) who attend SICC meetings.

Status of FFY 2015-16 data compared to state targets was shared with the SICC membership and attending visitors during the January 2017 SICC meeting. Modifications to state targets were determined unnecessary for the upcoming fiscal year.

Stakeholder input is further detailed the Annual Performance Report (APR) *Introduction* under the section entitled, *Stakeholder Involvement*.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent families participating in Part C	649.00
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	593.00
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	649.00
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	602.00
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	649.00
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	597.00
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	649.00

	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	91.75%	90.40%	91.37%
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	91.63%	93.40%	92.76%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	87.56%	90.40%	91.99%

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

The Lead Agency administers a census-based survey to all families with active Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs) who have been in Tennessee's Early Intervention System (TEIS) for a minimum of six-months. In FFY 2013-14, the survey instrument was changed to the Early Childhood Outcomes Family Outcomes Survey Revised (ECO FOS-R) side B and new baselines and targets were established. TEIS uses the calculation methodology recommended by the ECO Center whereby a family must have a mean score of four or higher on all of the items associated with the sub-indicator in order to be considered as having met the criteria for that sub-indicator.

Prior to FFY 2014-15, survey data were collected via a point-in-time mailing for all families with active IFSPs who had been in the TEIS system for a minimum of six-months. Two options to complete the survey were provided: online and paper copy sent through the mail. Both options included English and Spanish formats.

Beginning July 2014, survey administration was modified. Service coordinators were instructed to print and take the survey and cover letter to each six-month and annual IFSP meeting, thus hand delivering the survey to the family instead of the survey being sent through mail. Both paper and online surveys were available in English and Spanish.

Beginning July 2015, survey dissemination was modified again with the expectation of improving family response rates above FFY 2014-15. During an IFSP meeting, service coordinators were instructed to show families a copy of the survey and inform them that they would receive the survey, along with a letter, and business reply envelope when they received a copy of their IFSP in the mail. Survey dissemination continued at six-month at annual IFSP meetings. Both paper and online surveys were available in English and Spanish. East Tennessee State University continued to collect and prepare survey data.

The modification of sending the family a survey at the time a copy of their IFSP was mailed did not prove to be successful in improving family response rates. The total number of families meeting criteria to receive the survey in FFY 2015-16 was 7,042. Responses were received from 649 families, representing a 22.4% decrease in the actual number of surveys received the previous FFY 2014-15 which was 836.

Due to the smaller numbers of potential respondents and actual responses by minority race/ethnicities (American Indian, Asian, Black, Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, and Multiple Races) these groups were combined and compared to the majority race/ethnicity (White). The response rate of the combined minority population was 8.41%, which is comparable to the 9.59% rate for the majority population. This gap of 1.18% is an improvement over the previous year's gap of 2.8%.

The level of agreement for White respondents and combined minority populations was nearly identical for sub-indicators B

(communicating your child's needs) and C (helping your child develop and learn). The combined minority population related sub-indicator A (know your rights) was slightly lower than the White population.

Levels of confidence were run to compare results of the White and the combined minority population. Across sub-indicators A, B, C White respondents had margins of error (at 95% confidence level) ranging from 2.24 – 2.6, compared with margins of error for the combined minority population from 3.59 – 4.22. A smaller margin of error translates to higher confidence in the data. The margins of error for both the White and combined minority populations degraded primarily due to the change in survey dissemination.

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes
Is it a new or revised collection tool? No

- (●) **Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State**
- ( ) **No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State**

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Three regional family focus groups were held September 2016 to solicit input on a number of topics, one of which was related to family survey process. Feedback proved to be insightful regarding the survey dissemination process. The majority of parents indicated they could not recall ever seeing the survey. There were comments made such as:
"I'm not sure. My wife handled the paperwork—she may have completed the survey."
"If it is in the mail and looks optional, it goes into my recycle bin."
"I get so many of the envelopes with IFSPs that I don't really open anymore."
Families attending the focus groups recommended the service coordinator give them the survey to complete during the meeting.
Survey response rates along with family feedback were presented during the October 2016 State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) meeting. Further input on family survey methodology was solicited. The Lead Agency is currently working to adjust its survey dissemination process for FFY 2017-18. In the interim for FFY 2016-17, the former process utilized prior to FFY 2014-15 will be instituted in addition to the process initiated July 2015. Refer to the previous section above for a description of these two processes.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			0.80%	0.85%	0.89%	0.89%	0.89%	0.89%	0.89%	0.89%	0.89%
Data		0.74%	0.71%	0.71%	0.71%	0.69%	0.65%	0.75%	0.74%	0.79%	0.76%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	0.89%	0.89%	0.89%	0.89%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Tennessee's State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) is the primary stakeholder group for Tennessee's Early Intervention System (TEIS). Other stakeholders include TEIS state leadership, TEIS Point of Entry (POE) District Administrators and staff, Early Intervention Resource Agency (EIRA) representatives (service providers) and TEIS vendors (service providers) who attend SICC meetings.

Status of FFY 2015-16 data compared to the state target was shared with the SICC membership and attending visitors during the January 2017 SICC meeting. Modifications to state targets were determined unnecessary for the upcoming fiscal year.

Stakeholder input is further detailed the Annual Performance Report (APR) *Introduction* under the section entitled, *Stakeholder Involvement*.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	743	null
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2015	6/30/2016	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	80,549	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
743	80,549	0.76%	0.89%	0.92%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2015 was the first year Tennessee met its state target since FFY 2005 for numbers of infants served through TEIS. FFY 2005 was the beginning of the State Performance Plan (SPP)/ Annual Performance Report (APR) reporting process.

It is believed that State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) work with the improvement strategy on eligibility procedures is beginning to have an impact on numbers of infants served. Refer to APR indicator 11, which is the SSIP, for additional information. The report for Phase III of the SSIP submission is due April, 1, 2017.

States are required to compare their child count data to the national average for this indicator. The national average is calculated each year based on Dec. 1 Federal 618 Child Count Data for the number of children served in 50 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico divided by U.S. Census population estimates for the same age group.

The national average for FFY 2015-16 for this indicator is 1.20%. While progress was made for number of infants served from FFY 2014-15, the Lead Agency

did not meet the national average.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			2.00%	2.07%	2.24%	2.37%	2.37%	2.37%	2.37%	2.37%	2.37%
Data		1.80%	1.68%	1.80%	1.72%	1.65%	1.67%	1.68%	1.66%	1.73%	1.83%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	2.37%	2.37%	2.37%	2.37%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Tennessee's State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) is the primary stakeholder group for Tennessee's Early Intervention System (TEIS). Other stakeholders include TEIS state leadership, TEIS Point of Entry (POE) District Administrators and staff, Early Intervention Resource Agency (EIRA) representatives (service providers) and TEIS vendors (service providers) who attend SICC meetings.

Status of FFY 2015-16 data compared to the state target was shared with the SICC membership and attending visitors during the January 2017 SICC meeting. Modifications to state targets were determined unnecessary for the upcoming fiscal year.

Stakeholder input is further detailed the Annual Performance Report (APR) *Introduction* under the section entitled, *Stakeholder Involvement*.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	5,018	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2015	6/30/2016	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	240,919	

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
5,018	240,919	1.83%	2.37%	2.08%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The Lead Agency did not meet its state target for FFY 2015, however, the number of the number of infants and toddlers served through TEIS has continued to increase since FFY 2013.

It is believed that State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) work with the improvement strategy on eligibility procedures is beginning to have an impact on numbers of infants and toddlers served. Refer to APR indicator 11, which is the SSIP, for additional information. The report for Phase III of the SSIP submission is due April, 1, 2017.

States are required to compare their count data to the national average for this indicator. The national average is calculated each year based on Dec. 1 Federal 618 Child Count Data for the number of children served in 50 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico divided by U.S. Census population estimates for the same age group.

The national average for FFY 2015-16 for this indicator is 3.00%. While progress was made for the number of infants and toddlers served, the Lead Agency did

not meet the national average.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial 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)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		86.00%	90.02%	84.61%	92.44%	91.73%	96.29%	98.30%	98.40%	95.11%	97.06%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
4,429	4,918	97.06%	100%	98.78%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances *This number will be added to the "Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.*	429

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

July 1, 2015–June 30, 2016

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Data from Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) included full census data to determine the percent of Part C eligible infants and toddlers who had eligibility determination and initial IFSP development within 45 days of referral into Tennessee's Early Intervention System (TEIS). Delays due to exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record were included in both the numerator and the denominator.

Annual data were pulled by the nine Tennessee Early Intervention System Point of Entry (TEIS POE) Data Managers and were reviewed by TEIS POE Leadership prior to submission to the TEIS Monitoring Team (i.e., Part C Monitoring Coordinator, Program Monitor). POE data reports accounted for reasons of untimely initial IFSP development (i.e., exceptional family circumstances or system). A subsequent review of data was completed by the Monitoring Team in order to verify reasons for untimely initial IFSP development.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	2	null	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

There were two findings of noncompliance were issued in 2014 (FFY 2014-15), monitoring cycle FFY 2013-14, through annual monitoring. For the seven EIS programs not reporting 100% compliance and which did not have a finding, the Monitoring Team verified that all noncompliance was corrected through a subsequent verification of data prior to the issuance of a written finding of noncompliance (i.e., pre-finding correction).

For two EIS program with a finding of noncompliance, a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) was developed and monthly data verifications were completed by the Monitoring Team until 100% correction was achieved; thus the programs were correctly implementing indicator regulatory requirements. The two findings were corrected timely (i.e., as soon as possible but no in no case later than one year from the written notice of finding).

Refer to APR Introduction: General Supervision System regarding how TEIS ensures EIS programs are correctly implementing regulatory requirements and for information on pre-finding correction.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

There was no child-level noncompliance found in the EIS programs, both in the fiscal year data for annual monitoring and in subsequent data verified. All children had eligibility determination and initial IFSP development, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of TEIS.

Refer to APR Introduction: General Supervision System regarding how TEIS ensures there is no child-level noncompliance and measures taken for correction should child-level noncompliance be found.

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

A. **Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;**
B. **Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and**
C. **Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.**

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		100%	99.22%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday.

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
4,434	4,434	100%	100%	100%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances *This number will be added to the "Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.*	0

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- ( ) State monitoring
- (●) State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

July 1,2015–June 30,2016

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

The Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) contains a validation that assures all initial Individual Family Service Plans (IFSPs) are developed with a transition outcome/goal, including steps and services. This transition goal must be in place before an initial IFSP can be saved as final in the child's educational record. The transition goal is reviewed and updated at subsequent IFSP meeting including the formal Local education agency (LEA) transition planning conference.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
null	null	null	0

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

A. **Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;**
B. **Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and**
C. **Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.**

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		81.18%	99.77%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	89.35%	99.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
2,677	2,678	99.00%	100%	99.96%

Number of parents who opted out *This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.*	null

Describe the method used to collect these data

Monthly data are pulled from the Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) in the state central office and shared with Local Education Agencies (LEAs) and the State Education Agency (SEA) for the notification of all children served by TEIS who reach the age of transition (i.e., nine months to not fewer than 90 days prior to third birthday) and are potentially eligible for Part B, 619 special education preschool services. Contact information on these children was sent to the LEA where the child resides so the LEA can contact and make preparations for toddlers who may be potentially eligible for Part B preschool service.

Do you have a written opt-out policy? No

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- ( ) State monitoring
- (●) State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

July 1, 2015–June 30, 2016

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

For FFY 2015 (2015-16) the monthly notification process was found sufficient in implementing requirements for SEA/LEA notification. It was discovered, however, that notification was not sent for one child due to an error by central office personnel for a child whose parents refused a formal transition planning conference with the LEA. The misunderstanding of indicator measurements for both 8B and 8C was addressed. The child for which notification was not completed has been corrected—a non-LEA transition meeting was held and the child exited TEIS at age three years (i.e., no longer under the jurisdiction of TEIS). There were no findings of noncompliance issued relative to this one system error.

Refer to the Lead Agency's FFY 2013-14 and FFY 2014-15 Annual Performance Reports (APRs) for details about deficiencies found after a general supervision system review and analysis related to the process used for notifying the SEA and LEAs of potentially eligible toddlers for Part B preschool services. A new monthly notification process was implemented January 2015 replacing the former quarterly notifications.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
9	9	null	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Although responsibility for SEA/LEA notification is function within the TEIS central office, nine findings of noncompliance were issued in January 2015 (FFY 2014-15) as a result of the general supervision system analysis. This action was taken to ensure correction could be tracked for each of the nine EIS programs.

In January 2015 (FFY 2014-15), monthly notifications were instituted replacing former quarterly notifications. January–April 2015 data were pulled to verify that the new process was correctly implementing notification for all children. Data were verified again at the end of the fiscal year. Both reviews resulted in 100% compliance across all nine EIS programs; thus programs were correctly implementing indicator regulatory requirements.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

There was no child-level noncompliance found in the EIS programs in FFY 2014-15. All children had SEA/LEA notification unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of TEIS.

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

A. **Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;**
B. **Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and**
C. **Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.**

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		88.08%	87.34%	88.05%	95.03%	94.09%	96.02%	98.76%	98.31%	98.06%	98.05%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
2,175	2,678	98.05%	100%	98.66%

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference (this number will be subtracted from the number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B when calculating the FFY 2014 Data)	295

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B)	176

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- ○ State monitoring
- ◉ State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

July 1, 2015–June 30, 2016

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Data account for the timely Local Education Agency (LEA) transition planning conferences for which there was parent consent. Data from the Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) included full census data for all Part C eligible toddlers who reached the age of transition (i.e., at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday).

Annual data were pulled by the nine Tennessee Early Intervention System Point of Entry (TEIS POE) Data Managers and were reviewed by TEIS POE Leadership prior to submission to the TEIS Monitoring Team (i.e., Part C Monitoring Coordinator and Program Monitor). POE data reports accounted for reasons of untimely LEA transition planning conferences (i.e., exceptional family circumstances or system). A subsequent review of data was completed by the Monitoring Team in order to verify reasons for untimely conferences.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	null	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

There was one finding of noncompliance were issued in 2014 (FFY 2014-15), monitoring cycle FFY 2013-14, through annual monitoring. One EIS program had 100% compliance for the fiscal year. For the seven programs not reporting 100% compliance and which did not have a finding, the Monitoring Team verified that all noncompliance was corrected prior to the issuance of a written finding (i.e., pre-finding correction).

For the one EIS program with a finding of noncompliance, a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) was developed and monthly data verifications were completed by the Monitoring Team until 100% correction was achieved; thus the program was correctly implementing indicator regulatory requirements. The one finding was corrected timely (i.e., as soon as possible but no in no case later than one year from the written notice of finding).

Refer to APR Introduction: General Supervision System regarding how TEIS ensures EIS programs are correctly implementing regulatory requirements and for information on pre-finding correction.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

There was no child-level noncompliance found in other seven EIS programs both in the fiscal year data for annual monitoring and in subsequent data verified. All children had LEA transition planning conferences, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of TEIS.

Refer to APR Introduction: General Supervision System regarding how TEIS ensures there is no child-level noncompliance and measures taken for correction should child-level noncompliance be found.

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: 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)

Historical Data

Baseline Data:

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥											
Data											

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥				

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. Information regarding resolution sessions was shared with the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) membership and visitors, January 2017. There were no resolution sessions held during FFY 2015-16.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/2/2016	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/2/2016	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	n	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0			

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Indicator 10: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥											
Data				50.00%	100%	100%			100%		

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥				

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. Information regarding mediations was shared with the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) membership and visitors, January 2017. There were no mediations held during FFY 2015-16.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1 Mediations held	n	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0	0			

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014	2015
Target		45.20%	45.50%
Data	39.83%	29.62%	29.11%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline
Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	46.00%	46.50%	47.00%

Key:

Description of Measure

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Overview

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., EIS program and/or EIS provider, geographic region, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, etc.) As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in EIS programs and/or EIS providers to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and other early learning initiatives, such as Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge and the Home Visiting program and describe the extent that these new initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and Their Families

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure

Analyses and must be a child- or family-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increase the rate of growth in infants and toddlers demonstrating positive social-emotional skills) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increase the percentage reported under child outcome B under Indicator 3 of the SPP/APR (knowledge and skills) and increase the percentage trend reported for families under Indicator 4 (helping their child develop and learn)).

Statement

Description

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families. The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support EIS program and/or EIS provider implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified result(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build EIS program and/or EIS provider capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in EIS programs and/or EIS providers, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Infrastructure Development

(a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
(b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
(c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
(d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

(a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
(b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
(c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

Evaluation

(a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
(b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
(c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
(d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

I certify that I am the Director of the State's Lead Agency under Part C of the IDEA, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Selected: Lead Agency Director

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Linda Hartbarger

Title: TEIS Executive Director

Email: linda.hartbarger@tn.gov

Phone: 615-253-5032