

TN  
Part C

FFY2016  
State Performance Plan /  
Annual Performance Report

**Executive Summary:**

**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. 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. 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. 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 Part C Monitoring Coordinator provides the child's TEIDS identification number to the POE District Administrator who takes immediate action to correct, informing the Part C Monitoring Coordinator who then verifies correction by reviewing the child's record.
2. Correct implementation of regulatory requirements (prong 2). A subsequent review of data is made relative to the finding for the Part

## FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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). If a POE has not achieved correction within the first six months of the current fiscal year (i.e., July–December), 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 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 Strategic Planning Coordinator 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).

### 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:

1. Annual conference to provide training and support to TEIS POE staff, topics selected based on needs assessment and monitoring data
2. Quarterly trainings on Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO), TEIS Operations Manual, and Routines-Based Interview (RBI), IFSP Functional Goal Training, and Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System (AEPS) Family Report

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
- Successful completion of the Early Intervention Credential required for all staff providing home/community based developmental therapy services. The EI Credential is a competency based assessment. All Early Intervention Resource Agency (EIRA) supervisors successfully completed the credential by June 30, 2017.
- 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])

## FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- Targeted Case Management (TCM)
- Family-Centered Early Intervention Services
- Contact Log Entry
- Online Battelle Developmental Inventory–2 (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
- Professional Education and Enrichment Resources (PEERs) developed for service coordination staff. PEER activities are self-reflective learning activities required of service coordination staff as part of individual professional development:
  - Evidenced-Based Early Intervention, From Theory to Practice
  - Supervisors Shelf-Facilitating Adult Learning: How to Teach so People Learn
  - Supervisors Shelf-Supporting Programmatic Change
  - Division of Early Childhood (DEC) Recommendations Revisited Intervention that Works
  - Supervisors Shelf-PEER Topics in Staff Meetings
  - Adult Learning in Action
  - Early Intervention: How Questions Can Guide Your Practice
- 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

### 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
- Successful completion of the Early Intervention Credential required for all staff providing home/community based developmental therapy services. The EI Credential is a competency based assessment. All EIRA supervisors successfully completed the credential by June 30, 2017. EI credential addresses Division of Early Childhood (DEC) Recommended Practices and federal regulations through the following topic areas:
  - Foundations
    - Federal Law and DEC Recommended Practices
  - Supporting Children
    - Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System for Infants and Children (AEPS)
    - Tennessee Early Learning Developmental Standards (TN-ELDS)
    - Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO)
  - Supporting Families
    - Coaching and collaboration

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

- Working with the TEIS community
  - TEIS guidelines and processes

**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 during quarterly meetings (i.e., TEIS staff, Early Intervention Resource Agency [EIRA] representatives [service providers], and TEIS vendors [service providers]).

Status of FFY 2016-17 data compared to federal and state targets were shared and discussed with SICC membership and attending visitors during the January 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting. Two primary areas of discussion were held around the Lead Agency's recommendation to: 1) re-set baseline data and adjust state targets for Indicator 3 (Early Childhood Outcomes) and 2) adjust state targets for Indicator 4 (Family Survey). Refer to APR report sections for Indicator 3 and 4 for details.

The APR was reviewed with the TEIS Executive Director, Part C Coordinator, state staff and SICC Chairperson, January 17<sup>th</sup>. Additional follow-up meetings were held for finalizing the report. See attached below under this section, "Stakeholder Involvement" 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)*.

TEIS state leadership established representative stakeholder groups in FFY 2015-16 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). Committees were established through a self-nomination process with TEIS ensuring statewide coverage across several factors such as rural/urban and program size.

In 2016-17 stakeholder committees were utilized for work related to:

- TEIS POEs: revisions to TEIS Operations Manual
- EIRAs: Contract-related data collection, Early Intervention Credential
- Vendor: Assistive technology guidelines and procedures
- Combined committee (representatives from TEIS, EIRAs, and Vendors): SSIP improvement strategies for IFSP team function and family-centered services.

The Lead Agency continues to solicit input from families. In the Fall of 2016 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
<a href="#">sicc_certification_form_signed_180130.pdf</a>	Catherine Goodwin		

**Reporting to the Public:**

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2015 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 2015 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 2015 APR in 2017, 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 days following the State's submission of the APR on

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

February 1. 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 *2017 Report to the Public* and the *2015-16 Annual Performance Report* are available on the State's website under "Reports" at <https://www.tn.gov/education/early-learning/tennessee-early-intervention-system-teis/teis-reports-and-data.html>.

The following federal technical assistance was utilized during APR development:

- Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy)/ IDEA Data Center (IDC) related to Indicator 3, Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) data analyses.
- OSEP state contact reviewed Indicator 3 (ECO) and Indicator 4 (Family Involvement) draft content prior to APR finalization/ submission and provided guidance for consideration as the Lead Agency made plans to re-set baseline/ adjust remaining targets (Indicator 3) and adjust remaining targets (Indicator 4).
- National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) during fiscal year related to Indicator 3 (ECO) as it related to the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) development.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 1: Timely provision of services**

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with Individual Family Service Plans (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%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	97.67%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
		97.67%	100%	

<p><b>Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances</b>  <i>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" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i></p>	553
--	-----

Include your State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

Tennessee defines "timely services" as no longer than 30 calendar days from the date of parent consent on the Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) for a service."

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.

**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, 2016 - June 30, 2017

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

Data from the Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) included 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 and Support Specialists and were reviewed by TEIS POE Leadership prior to submission to the Part C Monitoring Coordinator. 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 Part C Monitoring Coordinator in order to verify reasons for untimely service delivery.

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In FFY 2016-17 there was one administrative complaint filed related to the service of assistive technology. A family requested reimbursement for a piece of equipment not specified on TEIS' approved list for assistive technology. The complaint was investigated and resolved within timelines. There was no finding of noncompliance issued as a result of the complaint.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

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 2015 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 issued in 2015 (FFY 2015-16) through annual monitoring (i.e., monitoring cycle FFY 2014-15). For the seven EIS programs not reporting 100% compliance and which did not have a finding, the Part C Monitoring Coordinator verified that all noncompliance was corrected through pre-finding correction. 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.

The two findings issued in FFY 2015-16 through annual monitoring were corrected timely (i.e., as soon as possible but 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 (prong 2) 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 (prong 1) 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.



**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
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%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	85.04%
Data	83.42%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	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 2016-17 data compared to the state target was shared with the SICC membership and attending visitors during the January 2018 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 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/12/2017	<a href="#">Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings</a>	4,830	
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/12/2017	<a href="#">Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs</a>	5,705	

**FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
4,830	5,705	83.42%	85.04%	84.66%

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**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	2016	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	2016	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	2016	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	2016	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	2016	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	2016	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%

	FFY	2015
A1	Target ≥	74.90%
	Data	68.41%
A2	Target ≥	47.40%
	Data	43.93%
B1	Target ≥	78.40%
	Data	72.01%
B2	Target ≥	45.50%
	Data	29.11%
C1	Target ≥	76.90%
	Data	76.31%
C2	Target ≥	49.40%
	Data	37.41%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥		59.00%	59.00%
Target A2 ≥		52.00%	52.00%
Target B1 ≥		58.00%	58.00%
Target B2 ≥		34.00%	34.00%
Target C1 ≥		67.50%	67.50%
Target C2 ≥		53.00%	53.00%

Key:

**Explanation of Changes**

When the Lead Agency re-set its baseline, state targets for FFY 2017 through 2018 were also adjusted after a review of current and historical state data and consideration of national data. Due to data fluctuations that are anticipated, the Lead Agency adjusted targets that are level, but believed to attainable within the next two years.

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

As FFY 2016-17 was the first complete year the AEPS was utilized for both entrance and exit ratings, the Lead Agency believed it an appropriate time to reset baseline data and remaining targets. Numerous modifications to the ECO data collection process the past four years is believed to be a primary contributor for data fluctuations. Moving forward, data fluctuations are expected through FFY 2018-19 as “children exit TEIS having had entrance ECO ratings collected through another method.

Data collection methodologies are summarized below:

- TEIS Service Coordinators using professional judgement along with parent discussion for both entrance and exit ratings (FFY 2014-15 and prior years).
- Service Coordinators using entrance ratings anchored with Battelle Developmental Inventory, Second Edition (BDI-2) z-scores and exit ratings using professional judgement along with parent discussion (FFY 2014-15).
- Service Coordinators using entrance ratings anchored with Battelle Developmental Inventory, Second Edition (BDI-2) z-scores and Early Intervention Resource Agency, Early Interventionists (EIs) using the AEPS for ongoing (every six months) and exit ratings (beginning October 2015).
- EIRA EIs using AEPS for entrance ratings (beginning July 2016).

FFY 2016-17 was the first full year ECO entrance and exit ratings were collected using the *Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System for Infants and Children* (AEPS) by Early Interventionists for purposes of tracking child progress, program planning, and the collection of ECO 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 developmental assessment tool that has been cross-walked with the federal Office of Special Education Programs (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.

Since Summer/Fall 2015 multiple AEPS trainings have been provided to Early Intervention Resource Agency EIs by either an AEPS master trainer or state trainers certified through a Brookes Publishing, AEPS master trainer. Training has also been provided to TEIS Service Coordinators for their understanding of the AEPS developmental assessment instrument and how to use its’ reports to explain developmental progress to families.

Moving forward, the Lead Agency is committed to using the *Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System for Infants and Children* (AEPS) for ECO data collections. Work is planned in FFY 2018 to provide further support to EIRAs for not only the administration of the AEPS, but the utilization of the AEPS curriculum a primary resource for developmental therapy program planning.

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	3467.00
--	---------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	13.00	0.38%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1198.00	34.56%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	538.00	15.52%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1058.00	30.53%

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	659.00	19.01%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 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).	1596.00	2807.00	68.41%		56.86%
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).	1717.00	3466.00	43.93%		49.54%

**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	11.00	0.32%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1434.00	41.40%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	913.00	26.36%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	927.00	26.76%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	179.00	5.17%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 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).	1840.00	3285.00	72.01%		56.01%
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).	1106.00	3464.00	29.11%		31.93%

**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	7.00	0.20%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1032.00	29.78%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	652.00	18.82%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1305.00	37.66%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	469.00	13.54%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 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).	1957.00	2996.00	76.31%		65.32%
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).	1774.00	3465.00	37.41%		51.20%

**The number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program**

The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's part C exiting 618 data	
The number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.	

Please note that this data about the number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program is optional in this FFY16 submission. It will be required in the FFY17 submission.

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? Yes

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

## FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The *Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System for Infants and Children (AEPS)* was utilized in FFY 2016-17 to collect entrance, ongoing, and exit ECO ratings. Developmental assessment data were gathered every six months, beginning with the six-month review after the initial Individualized Family Service Plan (IIFSP). Early Intervention Resource Agency (EIRA), Early Interventionists (EIs), who provide the IFSP service of developmental therapy were responsible for administering this developmental assessment. They provided the assessment progress report, including ECO ratings, to TEIS Service Coordinators who entered the ratings into the Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) which houses the child's education record.

### Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Of the 5209 children who exited TEIS in FFY 2016-17, 3467 had usable data (i.e., both entrance and exit ratings) for the three sub-outcomes. Children not accounted for within the 3467 population either exited before six months or had missing data (i.e., entrance and/or exit ratings).

FFY 2017 and FFY 2018 targets for 3A, summary statements 1 and 2; 3B, summary statements 1 and 2; and 3C, summary statements 1 and 2 were re-set based on FFY 2016 data, thus, the target field for FFY 2016 is blank. States are not required to report on sub-indicators should "FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data" report slippage.

Early Childhood Outcomes sub-indicator 3B (knowledge and skills), summary statement 2, 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 State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), for additional information. The report for Phase III, Year 2 of the SSIP is due April, 1, 2018.

FFY 2016-17 data were used when adjusting targets for FFY 2017 and FFY 2018. During the federal period of clarification all adjusted targets were reviewed and in all incidences were found to reflect improvement over baseline data. It was discovered that GRADS 360 did not maintain the adjusted target for A2 when the APR was submitted. The target for A2 was re-edited during the period of clarification in hopes the system will now maintain the target adjustment made when the APR was developed.

Attached is page 11 of the PDF printed from GRADS 360 on Feb. 1, 2018. The page reflects all adjusted targets appropriately. This information was provided to TN's OSEP state contact for the April 13<sup>th</sup> technical assistance call.

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
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%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	90.40%
	Data	91.37%
B	Target ≥	93.40%
	Data	92.76%
C	Target ≥	90.40%
	Data	91.99%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	90.60%	90.60%	90.60%
Target B ≥	93.60%	93.60%	93.60%
Target C ≥	90.60%	90.60%	90.60%

Key:

**Explanation of Changes**

The Lead Agency adjusted Indicator 4 state targets to remain level at the FFY 2016 target for the remaining 2017 and 2018 Annual Performance Report (APR) reporting cycle. It is believed that continued modifications in survey dissemination methodology, to achieve improved response rates and representativeness has impacted data the past four years when TEIS changed its family survey to the *Early Childhood Outcomes Family Outcomes Survey Revised (ECO FOS-R) side B*. Lead Agency believes it appropriate to pursue stable/level targets for the remaining two years as data collection methods have been and will continue to be modified to achieve improvements sought for response rates and representativeness.

Stakeholders at the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) meeting, January 2018, supported the Lead Agency's recommendation to level state targets. Suggestions for alternative data collection methods were made during the meeting as possible ways to improve survey collection. The Lead Agency is committed to find a process for family survey collection that results in both a higher return rate and improved representativeness from families service by TEIS.

**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 2016-17 data compared to the state target was shared with the SICC membership and attending visitors during the January 2018 SICC meeting. Stakeholders supported the Lead Agency's recommendation to level state targets for Indicator 4 for FFY 2017 and FFY 2018.

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of families to whom surveys were distributed		5692.00
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	25.91%	1475.00
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights		1298.00
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights		1475.00
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		1346.00
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs		1475.00
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		1277.00
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn		1475.00

	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	91.37%	90.60%	88.00%
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	92.76%	93.60%	91.25%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	91.99%	90.60%	86.58%

**Reasons for A Slippage**

The Lead Agency did not meet its target and reports slippage from FFY 2015 for families participating in TEIS reporting that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights. It is believed that fluctuations in data are due to continued modifications in survey dissemination methodology and corresponding survey response rates which began in FFY 2013-14. Modificaitons were made in attempts to improve overall response rates as well as representativeness. Adjustments to dissemination methodology were summarized in the FFY 2015-16 Annual Performance Report, submitted Feb. 1, 2017.

In FFY 2013-14 and in this reporting year (2016-17), response rates averaged 25%. In FFY 2014-15 and 2015-16, response rates averaged 16% and 9% respectively. In years with overall response rates averaging 25%, TEIS did not meet any of its targets. TEIS met its target for outcome 4A when overall response rates averaged 16% and 9%. The Lead Agency plans further analysis of survey repponse data by methodology, TEIS POE, and race/ethnicity to consider possible adjustments to its FFY 2017-18 family survey collection.

In FFY 2013-14 when the survey instrument was changed the *Early Childhood Outcomes Family Outcomes Survey Revised (ECO FOS-R) side B*, baseline and targets were reset. Rigorous targets were set with yearly, increasing increments. The Lead Agency ajusted state targets with stakeholder support for remaining Annual Performance Report (APR) reporting cycle (i.e., FFY 2017-18 and FFY 2018-19) as collection methods have been and will continue to be modified to achieve improvements sought for response rates and representativeness.

**Reasons for B Slippage**

The Lead Agency did not meet its target and reports slippage from FFY 2015 for families participating in TEIS reporting that early intervention services have helped the family communicate their children's needs. It is believed that fluctuations in data are due to continued modifications in survey dissemination methodology and corresponding survey response rates which began in FFY 2013-14. Modificaitons were made in attempts to improve overall response rates as well as representativeness. Adjustments to dissemination methodology were summarized in the FFY 2015-16 Annual Performance Report, submitted Feb. 1, 2017.

In FFY 2013-14 and in this reporting year (2016-17), response rates averaged 25%. In FFY 2014-15 and 2015-16, response rates averaged 16% and 9% respectively. TEIS has not met its targets for outcome 4B since FFY 2013-14. The Lead Agency plans further analysis of survey repponse data by methodology, TEIS POE, and race/ethnicity to consider possible adjustments to its FFY 2017-18 family survey collection.

In FFY 2013-14 when the survey instrument was changed the *Early Childhood Outcomes Family Outcomes Survey Revised (ECO FOS-R) side B*, baseline and targets were reset. Rigorous targets were set with yearly, increasing increments. The Lead Agency ajusted state targets with stakeholder support for remaining Annual Performance Report (APR) reporting cycle (i.e., FFY 2017-18 and FFY 2018-19) as collection methods have been and will continue to be modified to achieve improvements sought for response rates and representativeness.

**Reasons for C Slippage**



Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No

The demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.

Yes

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.

The Lead Agency administers a census 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.

The primary method for survey dissemination for FFY 2016-17 followed the same process as for FFY 2015. After every six-month and annual IFSP meetings, when the family was mailed a copy of their IFSP, the envelope also contained documents for the family survey: letter, survey, and return addressed/stamped envelope. Both paper and online surveys were available in English and Spanish. TEIS continued to contract with East Tennessee State University (ETSU) to collect and prepare survey data.

As the state return rate was 9.22% for FFY 2015, the ETSU contractor reviewed the status of returned surveys in January 2017. Due to low rates of return it was decided to supplement the process by adding a point-in-time mailing.

Point-in-time mailing was the state's practice prior to FFY 2014-15. Data were pulled in the spring of 2017 for all families with active IFSPs who had been in the TEIS system for a minimum of six months. Every family with an email address was sent a letter with an email link to access the online survey. Two reminders followed the initial email. After one month, paper surveys with return address envelopes were mailed to families without email addresses and to families with email who were sent the original email but for whom there was no response. Families had the option to complete the survey online or via paper. Paper surveys were resent when mailing was returned as undeliverable, but with a forwarding address. TEIS POEs were contacted for updated mailing addresses where paper surveys were returned as undeliverable with no forwarding address. Both options included English and Spanish formats.

One additional survey method was implemented through an interview pilot conducted, March–May 2017. The purpose of the pilot was to study statewide feasibility of service coordinators directly interviewing families as an alternative method for collecting family input and as a means for improving representativeness. Eleven Service Coordinators volunteered and were trained from three TEIS POEs, one in each grand region. Refer to APR Indicator 11, which is the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), for additional information about the interview pilot. The report for Phase III, Year 2 of the SSIP is due April, 1, 2018.

The base-denominator for family survey calculations was determined from the primary method of dissemination. Families responding through the point-in-time mailing and interview pilot, who had not already responded to the primary method were additionally included in both the numerator and denominator. Thus, the denominator was based on every family whose child had a minimum of six-months of service. Duplicate family surveys were removed, keeping only the most recent survey.

The total number of families meeting criteria to receive the survey in FFY 2016-17 was 5,692. Responses were received from 1475 families, representing a 16.69% increase in survey responses from the previous year, FFY 2015-16.

Due to the smaller numbers of potential respondents and actual responses by minority race/ethnicities (American Indian, Asian, Black,

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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 19.51% compared to 28.83% rate for the majority population.

The level of agreement for White respondents and combined minority populations was comparable for sub-indicators A (know your rights), B (communicating your child's needs), and C (helping your child develop and learn).

Levels of confidence were run to compare results of White and combined minority populations. A smaller margin of error translates to higher confidence in the data. Across sub-indicators A, B, C White respondents had margins of error (at 95% confidence level) ranging from 1.36–1.67, compared with margins of error for the combined minority population from 2.84–3.26. The margins of error for both the White and combined minority populations improved from FFY 2015-16 survey data.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

During the federal period of clarification, the lead agency received the following response for this indicator, "OSEP is unclear whether or not the response group was representative of the population. OSEP notes that the State did not include strategies or improvement activities to address this issue in the future." The lead agency was requested to provide survey representativeness data for both FFY 2016-17 and FFY 2015-16 broken out by each of the seven race/ ethnicity categories (i.e., American Indian, Asian, Black, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, Mixed Race, White).

Since the FFY 2011-12 APR the lead agency has reported representativeness by two race/ethnicity groups (White and combined minority) due to the smaller numbers of possible respondent families and actual surveys completed by minority race/ethnic groups. Every family with a minimum of six-months of service in TEIS has an opportunity to complete a family survey. The following confidence calculator has been utilized to determine representativeness at a 95% confidence interval range across the three sub-indicators (4A, 4B, and 4C): <https://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm>. As a confidence interval (CI) range increases, the level of assurance for survey results decreases for representativeness with a particular race/ ethnicity group.

In FFY 2016-17, TEIS received 1,475 completed surveys for an overall survey response/completion rate of 25.91%. When breaking data down by each race/ ethnic group, TEIS believes there was good representativeness for White (CI range, 1.36-1.67) and Hispanic (CI range, 4.00-4.92). It was believed there was fair representativeness for Black (CI range, 4.63-5.40), Mixed Race (CI range, 6.37-7.22), and Pacific Islander (CI range, 6.60 for all three sub-indicators). Representativeness was unable to be determined or was poor for Asian and American Indian groups due to the small size of possible respondent families or the low number of surveys completed from families. No survey responses were received from the American Indian group which had a total of 14 possible family respondents—representativeness unable to be ascertained. Four surveys were completed from the Asian group which had a total of 107 possible respondent families (CI range, 39.85-47.15)—representativeness poor.

In FFY 2015-16, TEIS received 649 completed surveys for an overall survey response/completion rate of 9.22%. When breaking data down by each race/ ethnic group, TEIS believes there was good representativeness for White (CI range, 2.24-2.60) and Mixed Race (CI, 4.32 for all three sub-indicators). It was believed there was fair representativeness for Black (CI range, 6.31-7.17) and Hispanic (CI range, 3.77-5.83). Representativeness was either unable to be determined or was poor for American Indian, Pacific Islander, and Asian due to the small size of potential respondent families or the low number of surveys completed from families. One survey was completed, for sub-indicator 4C only, from the American Indian group which had a total of 16 possible family respondents (CI, 19.50)—representativeness unable to be ascertained. Three surveys were completed from the Pacific Islander group which had a total of 18 possible family respondents (CI range, 10.58-50.11)—representativeness poor, unable to accurately be ascertained. The Asian group completed 12 surveys out of 141 possible respondent families (CI, 20.24 across sub-indicators A, B, C)—representativeness poor.

The Lead Agency reports that demographics for families completing the family survey is representative of the demographics of the infants and toddlers served through TEIS when data are reviewed across each race/ ethnicity group. There was good to fair representation for five of the seven groups in FFY 2016-17 with representation unable to be determined for one group. This represents improved representativeness from FFY 2015 which had good to fair representation for four of the seven groups, with representation was unable to be determined for two groups.

As reported in the FFY 2016-17 APR, TEIS has been engaged in efforts the past four years to improve not only representativeness but also to increase survey responses through various avenues of collecting information from families. Methods used for FFY 2016-17 did not adequately collect responses from all race/ ethnic sub-groups. In preparation for FFY 2018-19 survey distribution, the Lead Agency will solicit input from stakeholders for additional methods to consider to improve representativeness for sub-groups having a lower population size. Per OSEP's request, technical assistance will be sought for these continued efforts. During the period of clarification, technical assistance was used when reviewing data analysis and the response submitted for this indicator from the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy/ IDEA Data Center (IDC)).

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
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%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	0.89%
Data	0.92%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	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 2016-17 data compared to the state target was shared with the SICC membership and attending visitors during the January 2018 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 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/12/2017	<a href="#">Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs</a>	909	null
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2016	6/22/2017	<a href="#">Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1</a>	84,858	81,020
TBD			null	

**Explanation of Alternate Data**

Source data prepopulated for “U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2016” did not reflect Tennessee’s state population estimates provided through GRADS 360 under, *SPP/APR Resources: Part C Numbers and Percentages Indicators C5 & C6*. The population estimate was overwritten to reflect indicator C5 data provided to states.

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
909	81,020	0.92%	0.89%	1.12%

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Compare your results to the national data

FFY 2016 was the second year Tennessee exceeded 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 having an impact on numbers of infants served. Refer to APR indicator 11, which is the SSIP, for additional information. The report for Phase III, Year 2 of the SSIP is due April, 1, 2018.

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 2016-17 for this indicator is 1.24%. While progress was made for number of infants served from FFY 2015-16, the Lead Agency did not meet the national average.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
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%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	2.37%
Data	2.08%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	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 2016-17 data compared to the state target was shared with the SICC membership and attending visitors during the January 2018 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 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/12/2017	<a href="#">Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs</a>	5,705	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2016	6/22/2017	<a href="#">Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3</a>	244,118	244118
TBD			null	

**Explanation of Alternate Data**

Source data prepopulated for “U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2016” did not reflect Tennessee’s state population estimates provided through GRADS 360 under, *SPP/APR Resources: Part C Numbers and Percentages Indicators C5 & C6*. The population estimate was overwritten to reflect indicator C6 data provided to states.

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
5,705	244,118	2.08%	2.37%	2.34%

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Compare your results to the national data

The Lead Agency did not meet its state target for FFY 2016, 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 having 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, Year 2 of the SSIP is due April, 1, 2018.

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 2016-17 for this indicator is 3.12%. 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 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**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%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	98.78%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
5,564	6,179	98.78%	100%	99.08%

<b>Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances</b> <i>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.</i>	558
--	-----

**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, 2016-June 30, 2017

**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 census data to determine the percent of Part C eligible infants and toddlers who had eligibility determination and initial Individualized Family Service Plan (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 and Support Specialists and were reviewed by TEIS POE Leadership prior to submission to the Part C Monitoring Coordinator. 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 Part C Monitoring Coordinator in order to verify reasons for untimely initial IFSP development.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

There were no findings of noncompliance issued in 2015 (FFY 2015-16) through annual monitoring (i.e., monitoring cycle FFY 2014-15).

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Three of the nine EIS programs demonstrated 100% compliance. For the six EIS programs not reporting 100% compliance and which did not have a finding, the Part C Monitoring Coordinator verified that all noncompliance was corrected through pre-finding correction. 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.

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.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

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



**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
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 State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (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%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
5,209	5,209	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, 2016-June 30, 2017

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 meetings, including the formal Local Education Agency (LEA) transition planning conference.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

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

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
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 State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (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%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	99.96%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
2,889	2,894	99.96%	100%	99.83%

<p><b>Number of parents who opted out</b> 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.</p>	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 who are potentially eligible for Part B, 619 special education preschool services. Contact information for 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

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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, 2016–June 30, 2017

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

For FFY 2016 (2016-17) the monthly notification process was found sufficient in implementing requirements for SEA/LEA notification. There were five children who exited in FFY 2016-17 for whom notification was not sent. Each child's record was reviewed.

Two children should have had notification completed in FFY 2014-15. These children did not exit until FFY 2016-17, thus were a carry-over when the notification process was changed in January 2015 from quarterly to monthly. The monthly notification process was determined to properly meet reporting requirements for children exiting Jan. 1–June 30, 2015. Refer to the FFY 2014-15 Annual Performance Report, submitted Feb. 1, 2016 for details.

The remaining three children should have had notification completed in FFY 2015-16. These children did not exit until FFY 2016-17, so were a carry-over when the error was discovered for notification not being sent for children whose family refused an LEA transition planning conference. This oversight was discovered December 2016 and process corrected January 2017. Children exiting from Feb. 1, 2017 through June 30, 2017 all had LEA/SEA notification. Refer to the FFY 2015-16 Annual Performance Report, submitted Feb. 1, 2017 for details.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

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

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
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 State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (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%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	98.66%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
2,255	2,894	98.66%	100%	99.51%

<b>Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference</b> <i>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.</i>	432
<b>Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances</b> <i>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" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>	195

**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, 2016-June 30, 2017

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

5/7/2018

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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 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 and Support Specialists and were reviewed by TEIS POE Leadership prior to submission to the Part C Monitoring Coordinator. 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 Part C Monitoring Coordinator in order to verify reasons for untimely LEA transition conferences.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

There were no findings of noncompliance issued in 2015 (FFY 2015-16) through annual monitoring (monitoring cycle FFY 2014-15). Two of the nine EIS programs demonstrated 100% compliance. For the seven EIS programs not reporting 100% compliance and which did not have a finding, the Part C Monitoring Coordinator verified that all noncompliance was corrected through pre-finding correction. 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.

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.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

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

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
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 under section 615 of the IDEA 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											

FFY	2015
Target ≥	
Data	

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	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 2018.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	<a href="#">3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</a>	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	<a href="#">3.1 Number of resolution sessions</a>	n	null

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0			0%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

There were no resolution sessions held during FFY 2016-17.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
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%		

FFY	2015
Target ≥	
Data	

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	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 2018.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	<a href="#">2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	<a href="#">2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	<a href="#">2.1 Mediations held</a>	n	null

**FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
1	0	1			100%

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

During FFY 2016-17, one mediation was held related to a due process hearing request. The request for a due process hearing was withdrawn after mediation resulted with a signed agreement.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**



none

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
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: 2016

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016
Target		45.20%	45.50%	46.00%
Data	39.83%	29.62%	29.11%	31.93%

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target		34.00%

Key:

**Description of Measure**

See attached SSIP Phase III, Year 2 report

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

See attached SSIP Phase III, Year 2 report

**Overview**

See attached SSIP Phase III, Year 2 report

**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.

See attached SSIP Phase III, Year 2 report

**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.

See attached SSIP Phase III, Year 2 report

**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 5/7/2018

## FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

The SIMR for TEIS was identified during Phase I of the SSIP. The SIMR is the area of focus for improving child-level results for infants and toddlers with disabilities. There were no changes to the SIMR as a result of Phase III work.

TEIS' SIMR: The percent of infants and toddlers who demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills and who function within age expectation by the time they exit or turn age three will increase.

### Description

See attached SSIP Phase III, Year 2 report

## 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.

See SSIP Phase I report

## 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

- 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.
- 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.
- Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- 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

- 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.
- 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.
- 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

- 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.
- Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- 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).
- 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.

### Phase III submissions should include:

- Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
- Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
- Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

### A. Summary of Phase 3

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SIMR.
2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

See attached SSIP Phase III, Year 2 report

### B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

See attached SSIP Phase III, Year 2 report

### C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SIMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SIMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

See attached SSIP Phase III, Year 2 report

### D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SIMR

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

See attached SSIP Phase III, Year 2 report

### E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SIMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SIMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SIMR in relation to targets

See attached SSIP Phase III, Year 2 report

### F. Plans for Next Year

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

See attached SSIP Phase III, Year 2 report

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
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