

Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

General Supervision System:

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

To ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are being met, Tennessee utilizes a general supervision structure that entails multiple systems working in concert with one another. These systems include: monitoring, local determinations for local educational agencies (LEAs) based on indicators in the SPP/APR, and dispute resolution. Further details about each of the systems are delineated below.

Monitoring System

Over the last two years there has been a shift in responsibility of monitoring IDEA Part B within the Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE). While the TDOE's Division of Special Populations still monitors specific indicators from the SPP/APR (4A, 4B, 9, and 10) through reviews of policies, procedures, and practices, all other monitoring is completed by the recently established Office of Consolidated Planning and Monitoring (CPM). The new monitoring system developed by CPM for IDEA Part B entails annually completing file reviews of randomly selected Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) via desktop auditing for every LEA in the state. This is in contrast to the previous cyclical model of monitoring in which districts were only monitored either on-site or through desktop auditing every four years.

Under this new system, monitoring has evolved from being primarily compliance-driven to include results and student performance in the process. In light of this shift, the TDOE anticipates having richer conversations with LEAs that go beyond legal requirements and include analysis of the quality and integrity of education to improve outcomes for Tennessee students. In response to this new focus on performance, CPM has developed a results-based monitoring process which provides a framework for best practices and can be used as a self-assessment instrument for any LEA or school.

This results-based monitoring process is intended for those LEAs of greatest need and CPM assesses various indicators of risk to identify LEAs where such results-based monitoring will be need to be conducted. Determining whether LEAs require this further monitoring involves various steps, including:

- Gathering assessment and growth data on LEAs and their schools by proficiency levels, subjects, and subgroups.
- Reviewing LEAs' consolidated applications and budgets for IDEA and ESEA; reviewing LEAs' strategic plans.
- Developing a measurement/assessment of risk for LEAs based on identified indicators (not referring solely to SPP/APR indicators). Such indicators might be tied to (but are certainly not limited to) finance, teacher results, rates of graduation, and subgroup performance. It is important to note that some of the IDEA Part B indicators selected to measure risk are developed by CPM in conjunction with the Division of Special Populations. This ensures that the priorities of the Division of Special Populations are clearly aligned with these risk indicators and that a common message is being delivered to LEAs from all divisions within the TDOE. Some of the IDEA Part B risk indicators to be used in the risk measurement/assessment include: timely submission of Child Count reporting packets, percentages of students in the general education setting 80% or more of the day (Indicator 5A), and identification of disproportionate representation of the students with disabilities by race/ethnicity (Indicators 9 and 10).

Once LEAs are selected for results-based monitoring predicated on the aforementioned criteria, they are subject to more intensive monitoring in various areas, including IDEA Part B. On-site monitoring of IEPs and thorough file reviews are required for these flagged districts and at least two schools will be visited for a minimum of two hours. A proportionate number of IEPs are pulled for monitoring for every identified LEA based on the demographics of SWDs in LEAs, including students' disability categories, students' age/grade, the number of students with transition plans in place, and other factors as specified. The IEPs reviewed are intended to reflect the actual makeup of SWDs within LEAs.

These IEPs are not just evaluated for compliance (e.g., documents were completed within an appropriate timeframe, paperwork was provided to family, and meetings were held with necessary parties in attendance) but also for the quality of the plan. The Instructional Programming team within the Division of Special Populations assesses narratives, present levels, and goals in the IEPs to ensure that they are thorough, supported by current data, and measurable, respectively. Careful analysis of the quality of the IEPs can help ensure that SWDs are receiving instructionally appropriate services that address their specific areas of deficit and supports are established to help improve the educational outcomes of SWDs.

The fiscal monitoring of IDEA Part B funds and grants is also completed by CPM. This monitoring entails ensuring that LEAs are appropriately spending and allocating IDEA Part B funds district-wide and at individual schools. As well, fiscal monitoring is completed for those districts awarded grants and discretionary funding coming from IDEA Part B to certify that grants and discretionary funds are being used as intended and in accordance with IDEA Part B requirements.

Local Determinations

While local determinations in many ways serve as an aspect of monitoring, the recent shift to a more robust determinations process in Tennessee warrants a dedicated section. Since the FFY 2011 APR, the TDOE has employed a local determinations process focused not only on compliance indicators but also on results. Considering both types of

indicators in the determinations process allows for a more holistic view of LEA performance on the APR. As well, this process supports not only the overall goals of the TDOE to continue redirecting focus on student performance and outcomes, but also aligns to the national shift toward results-driven accountability.

Local determinations are made using LEA specific data for almost all indicators and each indicator selected is weighted based on the TDOE priorities. The focus on student performance is manifest in the heavy weighting of results indicators 1, 3, and 5A. Other indicators that are solely compliance focused might have a lesser weight, however, the fluidity of this determinations process allows the weights to be shifted year to year rather than remain static.

The actual local determination assigned to each LEA is based on overall points allocated once the weights of each indicator are calculated as well as specific performance on key indicators (particularly Indicators 1 and 5A). Each LEA is provided a detailed table listing their actual data for each indicator included in the determinations process and the expected steps to be taken by the LEA based on the indicator data. Rather than have districts develop separate improvement activities for individual indicators and submit them piecemeal to the TDOE, those districts in “needs assistance” and “needs intervention” determination assignments must develop an improvement plan that addresses flagged indicators and can submit them through the LEA consolidated applications and plans (ePlan system). This reduces paperwork burden for districts, creates a continuum of communication throughout the entire TDOE, and ensures that improvement strategies and efforts for SWDs are included in the overall LEA improvement plans rather than being disparate and disconnected.

Dispute Resolution

The TDOE's Office of General Council is responsible for overseeing dispute resolution throughout the course of each year. This includes investigation and resolution of administrative complaints as well as mediations and due process requests and/or hearings. Signed written complaints should have reports issued and be resolved within the allotted 60-day timeline or the agreed upon extended timeline (could be due to exceptional circumstances relative to the particular complaint or because the parent/individual/organization and TDOE agree to extend the timeline to engage in mediation or alternative forms of dispute resolution). Due process requests are to be documented by the Office of General Council and if requests are fully adjudicated, this must be done within the 45-day timeline or the agreed upon extended timeline (an extension can be approved by hearing officer at the request of either party).

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 LEAs.

For the sake of continuity and prevention of redundancy both professional development and technical assistance have been combined in this section.

Identifying Initiatives

In recent years the TDOE has gone to great lengths to address the historically poor student performance in LEAs across state. Informed by data like assessment results on statewide tests and NAEP exams, graduation rates, and post-school outcomes for all students and subgroups, new initiatives and policies like College- and Career-Readiness Standards, Response to Intervention (RTI²), and Instructionally Appropriate IEPs have been put in effect. The dearth of students being appropriately prepared for the rigors of college, the number of students relegated to IEPs before actual supports and intervention are provided to address areas of need, and the writing of weak IEPs that don't even address SWDs' areas of deficit all have contributed the development of such initiatives. By using data to drive these initiatives, the TDOE can accurately pinpoint areas of concern and measure their success and viability. As well, the TDOE has sought the input of stakeholders by developing task-forces throughout the state to weigh in on initiatives and contribute to their development.

Training on Initiatives

The TDOE has gone to great lengths to increase the amount of high-quality technical assistance and professional development offered to districts throughout the state. Many of the divisions within the TDOE provide individual trainings and professional development to their specific populations relative to current policies and initiatives. For example, the Division of Curriculum and Instruction has provided no-cost training to support teachers in grades pre-K through 12 in increasing understanding of the new College- and Career-Readiness Standards. These wide-scale trainings offered in the summers of 2012, 2013, and 2014 have been attended by approximately 60,000 educators. The TDOE sought the input of teachers and LEA leaders to develop the content of these courses to ensure that they were relevant and relatable to educators throughout the state. While this training has not been special education specific, it has reached all educators who routinely work with students with disabilities

The Instructional Programming Team within the Division of Special Populations conducts the majority of instructional technical assistance and professional development for special education staff within Tennessee. This includes developing a

Special Education Framework to assist teachers in the writing of Instructionally Appropriate IEPs and collaborating with the Division of Curriculum and Instruction to provide training and support relative to RTI². Each member of the Instructional Programming Team has a particular area of expertise, ranging from speech/language therapy to high school transition, so that the team can offer a wide gamut of professional development and technical assistance to LEAs in all areas of special education. As well, the Data Services Team provides professional development and routine technical assistance to LEAs on the use of data to inform instructional decision-making and the effective use of the statewide IEP data management system (EasyIEP).

Identifying Districts for Technical Assistance/Professional Development

The TDOE also uses data to determine whether LEAs require technical assistance or professional development. In particular, the TDOE annually uses the annual local determinations as a barometer of whether LEAs are successfully improving the outcomes of SWDs and are compliant with federal and state regulations. While those LEAs in the determination category of “meets requirements” are welcome to receive technical assistance or professional development if requested, the TDOE focuses much of its resources and efforts on providing support to those districts in “needs assistance” and “needs intervention” determination categories. Those “needs assistance” LEAs are required to develop an improvement plan that may include some TDOE staff providing direct training regarding areas of need. Those “needs intervention” LEAs are required to have calls with the TDOE, discuss areas of concern relative to the APR, and complete an improvement plan in the statewide ePlan system. Of those LEAs in this “needs intervention” category, some are required to receive on-site training and technical assistance based on the initial calls.

Using the determinations as a system by which the TDOE can identify those LEAs requiring the most intensive technical assistance and professional development has been beneficial for both LEAs and the TDOE. The indicators in the APR help staff in LEAs pinpoint areas of deficit or concern and allow the TDOE to focus and localize supports in the areas of greatest need within these LEAs. For those LEAs in “needs intervention,” technical assistance is required. Initial calls with these LEAs are completed to determine areas of weakness, conduct root cause analysis of problems, and evaluate whether current improvement activities detailed in other LEA improvement plans in the ePlan system actually address areas of concern. These initial calls help to determine the level of technical assistance required by “needs intervention” LEAs and how the state will aid in developing an effective improvement plan in conjunction with the LEAs. As noted previously, for those LEAs determined in greatest need, on-site visits are scheduled to provide direct support and technical assistance in identified areas. Constant contact is kept with LEAs throughout the school year to ensure they are addressing areas of concern and that initiatives within the state are being implemented with fidelity. This may entail having regular calls with LEAs to see what training they’ve provided internally relative to initiatives, what things they have done to address flagged indicators, and what the results of these efforts have been based on available data.

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

Please see Technical Assistance System section.

Stakeholder Involvement:

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

In developing the SPP/APR, the TDOE solicits input from the governor’s Students with Disabilities Advisory Council through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholder’s represented via the Council include: individuals with disabilities; parents of students with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. The TDOE ensures that all stakeholder input is considered in the development and finalization of the full SPP/APR.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education supervisors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at the annual Special Education Supervisor’s Conference. Additionally, representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT) and parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP) are also engaged.

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2012 performance of each LEA 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 2012 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(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 2012 APR in 2014, is available.

The TDOE reports annually to the public on the performance of the State and each LEA through the State's website at: http://www.state.tn.us/education/student_support/data.shtml. Reports provided on this site include the full SPPs and APRs for the past five years, a spreadsheet with detailed data for the each LEA on every indicator as compared to state averages and targets the SPP/APR (a copy of this spreadsheet for the FFY 2012 APR has been attached for reference, entitled "2012-13_Statewide_APR_LEA_Level"), and OSEP's letter of determination for the state for the most recent APR. Specific data from individual indicators (such as Indicator 3) can be found on the Tennessee state report card at: http://tn.gov/education/data/report_card/index.shtml.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		49.20%	56.90%	60.90%	64.70%	69.40%	86.70%	68.90%
Data	47.70%	55.40%	59.40%	63.20%	67.90%	85.20%	67.40%	72.80%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	69.30%	69.30%	69.30%	69.30%	69.30%	69.30%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

NOTE: The target for FFY 2013 is the actual target graduation percentage in place for all students, including the SWDs subgroup, as per the ESEA Flexibility Waiver. There is no independent graduation rate target for SWDs. Because the Waiver's calculation for graduation targets is predicated of previous year's data, the targets for subsequent years will have to be updated annually to reflect new targets in place. In the meantime the target for FFY 2013 was entered for FFY 2014 - FFY 2018. Stakeholder input was solicited for these targets by the Division of Data and Research when developing the Waiver.

Please refer to "Stakeholder Involvement" in the General Supervision section for further information about stakeholder input.

CLARIFICATION FOR OSEP:

Tennessee apologizes for the confusion regarding graduation targets in the "Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input" box. The target of 69.30% for FFY 2013 is the actual target graduation rate for the SWDs subgroup. It was incorrectly noted that this was the target for all students. The statement "as per the ESEA Flexibility Waiver [...] [t]here is no independent graduation target for SWDs" is correct in the sense that there are no independent targets for SWDs set that are externally reported. These targets are set internally by Tennessee's accountability department but are not released publicly.

In Appendix 5, on page 15, the target graduation rates for subgroups, including SWDs, are listed; however, these targets are not accurate. These targets do not take into account the growth provision utilized by Tennessee's accountability office that was approved in an amendment to the ESEA Flexibility Waiver on July 24, 2013. Also, these targets are simply projections of what graduation targets would be were there consistent improvement in graduation rates every year based upon the 2010-11 SY baseline data. Under the business rules employed by Tennessee's accountability office, the baseline for targets is reset every year as targets are predicated on the previous year's data and growth. Graduation targets are set by the following calculation:

Graduation Target = Graduation Rate for Previous Year + Graduation Rate Growth Goal


The Graduation Rate Growth Goal is determined via the following calculation:

Graduation Rate Growth Goal = (100-Graduation Rate for Previous Year)/16

In light of the growth calculation and the resetting of baseline data annually, the figures in Appendix 5, page 15, are not correct and thus were not cited in the APR. Instead, the calculation provided by Tennessee's accountability department that was calculated based on 2012-13 SY data and included the provision of growth was submitted. Tennessee will continue to provide the graduation targets every year for the SWDs subgroup even though this is not a publicly reported target and will reset the targets every year to address growth.

Prepopulated Data

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2012-13 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/15/2014	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	5,663	5663
SY 2012-13 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/15/2014	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	8,411	8,411
SY 2012-13 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	9/23/2014	2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	67.33%	Calculate 

Explanation of Alternate Data

The data provided in the above table's "overwrite data" column was not entered by the TDOE staff. The information appeared in these columns but is identical to the auto-populated information in the "data" column which contains the figures used to calculate the graduation rate.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2012 Data	FFY 2013 Target	FFY 2013 Data
5,663	8,411	72.80%	69.30%	67.33%

Explanation of Slippage

According to the longitudinal data, the FFY 2012 graduation rate of 72.80% seems to be an anomaly. Indeed, the data from the previous years was all relatively consistent, hovering around 67% from the FFY 2009 APR through the FFY 2011 APR. The data for FFY 2013 is more in keeping with the previous graduation rates.

Graduation Conditions Field

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

The provided graduation information is based on a four-year graduation cohort rate detailed above. The rate is calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{Number of cohort members graduating with a regular high school diploma by the of the 2012-13 SY} = \mathbf{5,663}$$

$$\text{Number of first-time 9th graders in the fall of 2009} + \text{students transferring in} - \text{students transferring out} - \text{students emigrating out} - \text{students who are deceased} = \mathbf{8,411}$$

$$\mathbf{5,663 / 8,411 = 67.33\%}$$

This formula was developed by the National Governors Association (NGA) in 2005 and adopted by Tennessee in the 2011-12 SY. Previously an event exit rate for a single year, not a cohort, was utilized. This change in calculation of graduation rate for

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

all students was done in accordance with the ESEA Flexibility Waiver. Attached to this indicator is a document titled "NGA Grad Rate" that breaks down the information on the cohort graduation rate calculation process in further detail.

Graduation requirements that must be met for all students, including students with disabilities, to receive a regular high school diploma can be found at: <http://www.tn.gov/education/instruction/graduation.shtml>.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≤		18.30%	14.90%	15.40%	13.49%	1.80%	2.70%	8.10%
Data	19.80%	16.40%	16.90%	14.99%	3.30%	4.20%	9.60%	3.47%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	3.42%	3.37%	3.32%	3.27%	3.22%	3.17%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please refer to "Stakeholder Involvement" in the General Supervision section.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
1,066	31,715	3.47%	3.42%	3.36%

Use a different calculation methodology

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

The data used to calculate the dropout rate provided above did not come from data in the EdFacts file C009 but instead was based on data submitted for EdFacts file C032. The latter report comes from the statewide student information system which the TDOE uses as the system of record when calculating reports such as graduation rate and membership counts. To align with these reports, the data in EdFacts file C032 has been used consistently by the TDOE to calculate Indicator 2. The calculation is based on the annual event dropout rate for students leaving an LEA in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data. In the numerator of this dropout calculation is the number of students meeting the criteria established for dropouts as per EdFacts file C032:

"The unduplicated number of dropouts [students who were enrolled in school at some time during the school year, yet were not enrolled the following school year, but were expected to be in membership (i.e., were not reported as dropouts the year before); did not graduate from high school (graduates include students who received a GED without dropping out of school) or complete a state or district-approved educational program; and who did not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: (1) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district-approved educational program, (2) temporary school-recognized absence due to suspension or illness, or (3) death]."

The grade parameters established for Indicator 2 (only including the students in grades 9-12 who were classified as dropouts) were applied to the data in the EdFacts file C032. The denominator of this dropout calculation is the number of students with

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

disabilities in grades 9-12 enrolled during the 2012-13 SY as based on the census information collected in the EdFacts file C002. Thus, the calculation of dropouts for FFY 2013 was as follows:

Count of students with disabilities who dropped out as per EdFacts file C032 and were in grades 9-12 = 1066

Count of students with disabilities enrolled in grades 9-12 as per the EdFacts file C002 = 31,715

1066/31,715 = 3.36%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		67.30%	70.50%	73.00%	75.70%	78.10%		
Data	32.50%	51.11%	56.50%	51.00%	15.38%	19.20%		

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥						

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

NOTE: Individual targets for each test subject area could not be provided in the limited target fields available. Please consult the tables in the attached document titled "Target Data FFY 2013 - 2018" for target information. Note that because targets are based on previous year's data, complete targets cannot accurately be set for all years subsequent to FFY 2014. The projected targets for FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 will be subject to change. This is because targets have to be revised every year to reflect the new data from the previous year. In the meantime, the tentative targets for FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 will be based on the targets set for the previous year (so if the target is 27.79% in FFY 2014 then the target set for FFY 2015 will be a 6.25% increase over this previous target, which is 34.04%).

Please refer to "Stakeholder Involvement" in the General Supervision section.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Does your State have an ESEA Flexibility Waiver of determining AYP? Yes No

Are you reporting AYP or AMO? AYP AMO

Number of districts in the State	Number of districts that met the minimum "n" size	Number of districts that meet the minimum "n" size AND met AMO	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
139					

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

As per the ESEA Flexibility Waiver developed for Tennessee in 2011, there is no longer one AYP goal in place for gap closure. Under the Waiver, the State uses a gap closure metric and AMOs are set for each the following test subjects: Algebra I/II, English II/III, Math 3-8, and RLA 3-8. For each subject area, the AMO for LEAs is to decrease the performance gap between SWDs and non-SWDs who scored proficient or advanced by 6.25%. The statewide AMO used under the Waiver is to increase the percent of LEAs (meeting the appropriate "n" size of at least 30 students in both SWDs and non-SWDs subgroups) meeting gap closure targets by 6.25%. Below is a table with the FFY 2013 data. This table is disaggregated by the aforementioned test subjects with the percentages of LEA's meeting their AMOs.

FFY 2013

Subject	Number of districts that met gap AMOs (A)	Total districts that had gap targets (N>30 in each category) (B)	Percent of districts that met gap targets (A/B)	Targets
Algebra I/II	34	70	48.57%	28.97%
English II/III	23	89	25.84%	24.23%
Math 3 – 8	29	130	22.31%	18.65%
RLA 3 – 8	28	130	21.54%	26.41%

In FFY 2013 the **Algebra I/II** AMO was met. In FFY 2012 22.72% of LEAs in the state met the gap targets and in FFY 2013 48.57% of LEAs in the state met the gap targets. This increase was well over the AMO of 6.25% (actual increase was 25.85%).

In FFY 2013 the **English II/III** AMO was met. In FFY 2012 17.98% of LEAs in the state met the gap targets and in FFY 2013 25.84% of LEAs in the state met the gap targets. This increase was well over the AMO of 6.25% (actual increase was 7.86%).

In FFY 2013 the **Math 3-8** AMO was met. In FFY 2012 12.40% of LEAs in the state met the gap targets and in FFY 2013 22.31% of LEAs in the state met the gap targets. This increase was well over the AMO of 6.25% (actual increase was 9.91%).

In FFY 2013 the **RLA 3-8** AMO was not met. In FFY 2012 20.16% of LEAs in the state met the gap targets and in FFY 2013 21.54% of LEAs in the state met the gap targets. This increase did not meet the AMO of 6.25% (actual increase was 1.38%).

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Reading	A Overall	2011	Target ≥		95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data	98.00%	104.20%	99.10%	92.70%	99.20%	99.20%	99.10%	99.60%
Math	A Overall	2011	Target ≥		95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data	99.00%	95.90%	99.10%	99.40%	99.10%	99.30%	99.20%	99.70%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please refer to "Stakeholder Involvement" in the General Supervision section.

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes

Data Source: SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 12/18/2014

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	10546	10663	10823	10368	9974	9202	449	6637	944	130	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	3009	2262	1790	1632	1531	1362	156	2246	93	21	
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	4390	5070	5275	5149	4666	4097	196	4195	157	38	

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards	2311	2461	2757	2597	2740	2690	0	0	0	0	
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	772	785	939	910	933	925	70	71	650	58	

Data Source: SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 12/18/2014

Math assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	10546	10664	10823	10367	9976	9204	4216	3961	381	185	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	3013	2263	1789	1628	1534	1366	1499	1041	124	60	
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	4384	5070	5275	5145	4661	4108	1878	2733	158	57	
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards	2311	2457	2757	2594	2742	2674	0	0	0	0	
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	772	785	939	910	933	925	732	109	71	59	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Overall	69,736	69,004	99.60%	95.00%	98.95%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Overall	70,323	69,556	99.70%	95.00%	98.91%

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Assessment information for all students, including SWDs, can be found on Tennessee's State Report Card at: http://tn.gov/education/data/report_card/index.shtml. The data for the 2013-14 SY assessments is currently available on this site. Further assessment data, including achievement data for SWDs on assessments, can be found at the following site: http://www.tennessee.gov/education/student_support/data.shtml. A spreadsheet with information for RLA 3-8; English II and III End of Course Assessments; Math 3-8; and Algebra I and II End of Course Assessments has been posted on the latter site under the file name "2013-14 Students with Disabilities Participation and Performance on Assessments."

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Reading	A Overall	2011	Target ≥		74.70%	79.00%	79.40%	81.50%	83.30%	41.50%	44.40%
			Data	71.50%	77.27%	78.69%	77.96%	24.90%	38.50%	41.40%	31.80%
Math	A Overall	2011	Target ≥		61.40%	65.20%	68.60%	71.70%	74.50%	34.20%	39.80%
			Data	59.47%	58.40%	67.42%	67.74%	19.90%	31.20%	36.80%	31.30%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	34.80%	32.08%	35.08%	38.08%	41.08%	44.08%
Math	A ≥ Overall	31.30%	33.33%	36.33%	39.33%	42.33%	45.33%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

NOTE: Under the ESEA Flexibility Waiver the target established for Indicator 3C is to increase by at least 3% - 5% the average growth of SWDs scoring proficient or advanced against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards on statewide reading and mathematics assessments. Because these targets are based on previous year's data the actual targets could not accurately be set for all years subsequent to FFY 2014. The targets will have to be revised every year thereafter to reflect the new data from the previous year. In the meantime, the targets for the remaining years FFY 2015 - 2018 will be based on the targets set for the previous year (so if the target is 32.08% for Reading in FFY 2014 then the target set for FFY 2015 will be at least a 3% increase over this previous target, which is 35.08%).

Please refer to "Stakeholder Involvement" in the General Supervision section.

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes

Data Source: SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C178; Data Group: 584) **Date:** 12/18/2014

Reading proficiency data by grade

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	10482	10578	10761	10288	9870	9074	422	6512	900	117	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	977	833	629	570	422	306	19	639	10	3	
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	540	576	650	728	426	333	20	618	13	4	
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	932	685	1558	917	815	815					
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	764	769	927	904	920	915	69	70	637	56	0

Data Source: SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C175; Data Group: 583) **Date:** 12/18/2014

Math proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	10480	10575	10760	10277	9870	9073	4109	3883	353	176	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1449	869	800	462	372	287	640	190	16	4	
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	760	641	1226	534	418	402	579	430	11	5	
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	967	824	1066	978	706	351					
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	752	769	915	894	910	912	721	107	68	58	0

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Overall	69,004	20,069	31.80%	34.80%	29.08%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

In FFY 2013 there was a push in the state of Tennessee to increase the number of SWDs participating in assessments. In fact, in FFY 2013 more SWDs participated in the reading and math assessments than ever before which could have contributed to the overall decrease in SWDs scoring proficient or advanced (went from 31.80% in FFY 2012 to 29.08% in FFY 2013 for reading and 31.30% to 30.33% for math). Achievement data from previous years might have been artificially inflated by the exclusion of students with more significant disabilities who were included in the 2013-14 SY testing cycle.

As well, there was a significant decrease in the number of students taking the statewide Modified Academic Achievement Standards (MAAS) assessment; these students instead participated on the regular reading assessment which might have contributed to the slippage as well. The students that have taken the MAAS in the past have historically had more significant disabilities, so again the past achievement data may have been artificially inflated by the exclusion of these students.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Overall	69,556	21,093	31.30%	31.30%	30.33%

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Assessment information for all students, including SWDs, can be found on Tennessee's State Report Card at: http://tn.gov/education/data/report_card/index.shtml. The data for the 2013-14 SY assessments is currently available on this site. Further assessment data, including achievement data for SWDs on assessments, can be found at the following site: http://www.tennessee.gov/education/student_support/data.shtml. A spreadsheet with information for RLA 3-8; English II and III End of Course Assessments; Math 3-8; and Algebra I and II End of Course Assessments has been posted on the latter site under the file name "2013-14 Students with Disabilities Participation and Performance on Assessments."

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≤		25.50%	22.50%	25.50%	26.50%	32.80%	18.00%	1.00%
Data	30.00%	26.47%	28.00%	28.00%	33.82%	19.00%	1.90%	0.74%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	2.60%	2.40%	2.20%	2.00%	1.80%	1.60%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please refer to "Stakeholder Involvement" in the General Supervision section.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
4	54	0.74%	2.60%	7.41%

Explanation of Slippage

There has been a push within the state to report incidents of discipline with greater fidelity and accuracy within the statewide student information system (EIS). The collection of the data has become less cumbersome in recent years, and this, in conjunction with the push from the TDOE for more accurate reporting of discipline incidents likely contributed to the increase in the number of districts having significant discrepancy. This is supported by the significant increase in the districts that met the state's "n" size, which went from 38 districts in FFY 2012 to 54 in FFY 2013.

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a)):

- Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology

The TDOE utilizes a rate ratio calculation methodology for each district in the State that meets "n" size requirements. A district meets minimum “n” size requirements if 2 or more students are suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days. Significant discrepancy is determined by the TDOE in LEAs with rate ratios of 2.5 or greater for any racial/ethnic group meeting "n" size requirements. To elaborate, an LEA has a significant discrepancy when the ratio comparing its suspension/expulsion rate for students with disabilities in a specific racial/ethnic group to the state-level suspension/expulsion rate for all students with disabilities is 2.5 or greater.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

FFY 2012 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY2013 using 2012-2013 data)

Description of review

Once the TDOE compares the discrepancy rates of all LEAs, those identified as significantly discrepant (have a rate ratio of 2.5 or greater) are required to review their policies, procedures, and practices via a self-assessment. The purpose of the review is to determine if any policy, procedure, or practice is contributing to the identified significant discrepancy. If determined that any of these are contributors, revision is required.

A copy of the file review form used for LEAs to complete an evaluation of their disciplinary practices has been attached below and is entitled "TDOE 4a and 4b Review Form." Those LEAs identified for file reviews are provided this form, given a list of their data for the FFY 2013 year, and provided a list of students for whom file reviews need to be completed. This form is used for the TDOE to thoroughly review LEA's policies, procedures, and practices to ensure the appropriate development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and adherence to procedural safeguards.

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data					0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
5	0	54	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The TDOE utilizes a rate ratio calculation methodology for each district in the State that meets "n" size requirements. A district meets minimum "n" size requirements if 2 or more students are suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days. Significant discrepancy is determined by the TDOE in LEAs with rate ratios of 2.0 or greater for any racial/ethnic group meeting "n" size requirements. To elaborate, an LEA has a significant discrepancy when the ratio comparing its suspension/expulsion rate for students with disabilities in a specific racial/ethnic group to the state-level suspension/expulsion rate for all students with disabilities is 2.0 or greater.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

FFY 2012 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY2013 using 2012-2013 data)

Description of review

Once the TDOE compares the discrepancy rates of all LEAs, those identified as significantly discrepant (have a rate ratio of 2.0 or greater) are required to review their policies, procedures, and practices via a self-assessment. The purpose of the review is to determine if any policy, procedure, or practice is contributing to the identified significant discrepancy. If determined that any of these are contributors, revision is required.

A copy of the file review form used for LEAs to complete an evaluation of their disciplinary practices has been attached below and is entitled "TDOE 4a and 4b Review Form." Those LEAs identified for file reviews are provided this form, given a list of their data for the FFY 2013 year, and provided a list of students for whom file reviews need to be completed. This form is used for the TDOE to thoroughly review LEA's policies, procedures, and practices to ensure the appropriate development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and adherence to procedural safeguards.

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2005	Target ≥		53.50%	54.00%	54.50%	55.00%	55.50%	60.00%	60.50%
		Data	53.48%	63.44%	56.31%	59.15%	62.33%	63.40%	63.40%	63.41%
B	2005	Target ≤		14.50%	14.00%	13.50%	62.33%	12.50%	12.00%	11.50%
		Data	14.69%	10.90%	13.52%	13.24%	12.64%	12.40%	12.30%	11.92%
C	2005	Target ≤		4.00%	4.00%	3.71%	2.10%	2.08%	2.06%	2.04%
		Data	1.89%	1.76%	1.98%	1.77%	1.75%	1.90%	1.80%	1.80%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	65.50%	67.50%	69.50%	71.50%	73.50%	75.00%
Target B ≤	11.50%	11.40%	11.30%	11.20%	11.10%	11.00%
Target C ≤	1.70%	1.60%	1.50%	1.40%	1.30%	1.20%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please refer to "Stakeholder Involvement" in the General Supervision section.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	117,804	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	77,830	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	13,273	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	953	

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
C002; Data group 74)				
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	325	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	800	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	77,830	117,804	63.41%	65.50%	66.07%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	13,273	117,804	11.92%	11.50%	11.27%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	2,078	117,804	1.80%	1.70%	1.76%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2011	Target ≥								9.80%
		Data							9.30%	8.70%
B	2011	Target ≤								12.80%
		Data							13.30%	13.80%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥		26.50%	27.50%	28.50%	29.50%	30.50%
Target B ≤		35.60%	34.60%	33.60%	32.60%	31.60%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As reported in the FFY 2012 APR, the TDOE recognized problems with the Indicator 6 data collection system which meant measurement A and B percentages were not correct. In 2012-2013, TDOE worked with the statewide IEP data management system (EasyIEP) vendor to redesign the data collection process so valid and reliable data would be collected on early childhood environments. The TDOE utilized the following stakeholders to inform the improved data collection process: the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) staff, external LEA stakeholders, data consultants, vendors, and 619 staff from other states. On December 5, 2013, the new data collection system went live which means the FFY 2013 data reported reflect the old data collection system and are not considered valid and reliable.

CLARIFICATION FOR OSEP:

Tennessee was unable to report targets for FFY 2013 as the FFY 2014 data will serve as a baseline. There is not valid and reliable data for Indicator 6 from previous years. Accordingly, the FFY 2013 targets boxes for both measurements A and B have been left blank. The baseline data that informs the targets delineated from FFY 2014 and onward is based on the information gathered from the December 1, 2014 census pull. This data pull was completed after a full year of implementation of the new the Indicator 6 data collection process in Tennessee's statewide IEP data management system. This new collection process has improved the integrity of the data, specifically with regard to validity and reliability, and the information gathered on December 1, 2014 serves as an adequate baseline for future targets. On December 1, 2014 there were in 12,527 SWDs ages 3-5. Of these students, 3,324 of them were in an early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program. There were 4,368 students in a separate class, 90 students in a separate school, and 4 students in residential facility, for a total of 4,462 students. So for measurement A the percentage based on the December 1, 2014 census pull was at 26.5%. For measurement B the percentage based on the December 1, 2014 census pull was at 35.6%.

Prepopulated Data

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	12,583	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	1,059	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	1,730	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b2. Number of children attending separate school	143	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	2	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	1,059	12,583	8.70%		8.42%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	1,875	12,583	13.80%		14.90%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

6A: With the FFY 2013 APR, the State must submit a revised SPP that includes valid and reliable baseline data for this indicator or provide an explanation of why valid and reliable data are not yet available, along with a description of the actions being taken to collect and report valid and reliable data for this indicator.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

The data reported for FFY 2013 are not valid and reliable. A new data collection system, designed to provide valid and reliable data using a decision tree, was developed and after programming and field testing, the new system went live on December 5, 2013. In September 2014, indicator 6 data were pulled to provide initial insight into what a valid and reliable baseline might look like before data were pulled for the December 1, 2014 Child Count. The data appeared to have significantly improved and aligned much more with the national averages. Based on the information gathered from the December 1, 2014 census pull, there were in 12,527 SWDs ages 3-5. Of these students, 3,324 of them were in an early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program. There were 4,368 students in a separate class, 90 students in a separate school, and 4 students in residential facility, for a total of 4,462 students. So for measurement A the percentage based on the December 1, 2014 census pull was at 26.5%. For measurement B the percentage based on the December 1, 2014 census pull was at 35.6%.

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A1	2009	Target ≥					91.70%	92.20%	92.20%	92.70%
		Data					91.70%	90.80%	90.00%	88.00%
A2	2009	Target ≥					57.40%	57.90%	57.90%	58.40%
		Data					57.40%	61.30%	59.50%	57.80%
B1	2009	Target ≥					89.50%	90.00%	90.00%	90.50%
		Data					89.50%	89.40%	88.90%	87.00%
B2	2009	Target ≥					55.70%	56.20%	56.20%	56.70%
		Data					55.70%	59.20%	56.90%	55.50%
C1	2009	Target ≥					92.60%	93.10%	93.10%	93.60%
		Data					92.60%	91.30%	89.60%	88.60%
C2	2009	Target ≥					68.00%	68.50%	68.50%	69.00%
		Data					68.00%	71.10%	69.20%	68.30%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	92.70%	92.76%	92.82%	92.88%	92.94%	93.00%
Target A2 ≥	58.00%	58.60%	59.20%	59.80%	60.40%	61.00%
Target B1 ≥	90.50%	90.56%	90.62%	90.68%	90.74%	90.80%
Target B2 ≥	57.00%	57.60%	58.20%	58.80%	59.40%	60.00%
Target C1 ≥	93.60%	93.66%	93.72%	93.70%	93.80%	93.90%
Target C2 ≥	69.00%	69.40%	69.80%	70.20%	70.60%	71.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Early intervention stakeholders, a consultant from outside of Tennessee familiar with national Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) data, as well as IDEA 611 staff took time to review the annual data for Tennessee for each outcome. Overall, Tennessee's data has been strong and remained consistent, particularly when compared to national ECO data. While there will be continued effort to promote improvements related to ECO, the consensus has been that increasing target percentages needs to be modest to be realistic. For further information, please refer to "Stakeholder Involvement" in the General Supervision section.

CLARIFICATION FOR OSEP:

Tennessee apologizes for the incorrect entry of percentages in this field; this was a mistake and has been corrected with

the appropriate target of 58.4%.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	5,354
--	-------

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	34
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	410
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,813
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,261
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	836

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	4,074	4,518	88.00%	92.70%	90.17%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	3,097	5,354	57.80%	58.00%	57.84%

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	35
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	448
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,886
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,109
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	858

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	3,995	4,478	87.00%	90.50%	89.21%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2,967	5,336	55.50%	57.00%	55.60%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	31
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	340
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,324
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,264
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,360

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	3,588	3,959	88.60%	93.60%	90.63%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	3,624	5,319	68.30%	69.00%	68.13%

Was sampling used? No

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

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013 in the FFY 2013 APR.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013 are reported in this APR.

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? No

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		93.00%	93.00%	94.00%	96.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%
Data	92.00%	92.10%	97.00%	89.40%	91.30%	91.10%	91.00%	97.30%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	92.75%	93.00%	93.25%	93.50%	93.75%	94.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please refer to "Stakeholder Involvement" in the General Supervision section.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
4,548	5,031	97.30%	92.75%	90.40%

Explanation of Slippage

The respondent group of LEAs varies over a four year period. As such, agreement rates fluctuate in an almost unpredictable manner as evidenced over the last seven years of reporting. No major changes have been made in the *Parent Survey*, the sampling method, or the analysis of responses.

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

The surveys disseminated for pre-K students are identical to those disseminated to school age students. As well, the surveys collected for pre-K students are analyzed and collated under the same methodology employed for school age students. Thus, the validity and reliability for those in pre-K is identical to those who are school age and allows for continuity across all grade bands to ensure all the information collected is valid, reliable, and cohesive. For this reporting period, a grade level break out was completed in Excel and it was found that surveys were disseminated to: 1107 P3 (three year olds in pre-K) students with 230 responses from the family, 1493 P4 (four year olds in pre-K) students with 271 responses from the family, and 2 unidentified Pre-K classifications with 0 responses.

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

During FFY 2013 school year, the *Parent Survey* was administered to all parents of students with disabilities ages 3 through 21 in 34 LEAs selected by the OSEP-approved sampling process. Tennessee's three largest LEAs participate in this survey each year. In FFY 2013 a total of 32,035 surveys were distributed to parents. There were 5,185 survey responses with usable data for a response rate of 16.2%.

Item one on the survey queried parents regarding the LEA's facilitation of parent involvement. Of the 5,031 parents responding to item one, 92.75% (4,548/5,031) agreed that the schools facilitated their involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. The State target of 91% was met.

The TDOE contracts with East Tennessee State University (ETSU) to administer the survey through two different methods. The methods of soliciting parent surveys are described below:

1. Direct Email to Parents: parents who have email addresses are directly emailed and provided a URL to take the survey electronically. A letter from the TDOE in both English and Spanish is attached explaining the survey. Alternatively, parents can choose to print, complete and return a hard copy of the survey to ETSU by USPS mail. An email is sent two additional times to remind parents to complete the survey.

2. Mailing of Survey Packets to Special Education Directors: special education directors are mailed quantities of paper surveys with student name, LEA, school, and numeric identifier, with postage paid envelopes and letters to parents explaining the survey in English and Spanish. These are distributed to school principals who are asked to disseminate the surveys to students to take home to parents. A letter attached to the survey provides parents a URL as an alternate means of survey completion if they do not want to complete the hard copy.

Federal Fiscal Year	Parent Response Rate
Surveys Conducted by School Districts*	
2006	33.00%
2007	28.20%
Surveys Conducted by State Contractor**	
2008	15.30%
2009	18.50%
2010	17.90%
2011	18.90%
2012	18.30%
2013	16.20%

*In 2006 and 2007 surveys were conducted by LEA staff, using only paper copies and manual tabulation of results. Therefore survey findings may be slightly inflated.

**In FFY 2008 the TDOE began utilizing three methods to distribute surveys (electronic, direct US mail, and take home surveys). A sampling of students was used instead of a census method and a lower response rate resulted. From FFY 2009 through FFY 2013, electronic and take home surveys have continued to be utilized with minimal change in response rate.

The table below provides summary representativeness data on all FFY 2013 *Parent Survey* respondents. The calculation, borrowed from the National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO), compares the respondent pool of parents against the targeted group of parents. This is done to determine whether the respondents represent the entire group of parents that could have responded to the survey. The difference row compares the two proportions (target proportion against respondent proportion) by selected attributes including: child disability, child gender, and child minority race/ethnicity status. Cells in the

difference row that are > +/- 3%, indicate that the respondent group over- or underrepresents the entire group of targeted respondents. For this *Parent Survey* parents of minority students were underrepresented in the respondent group (-8.81%) as were parents of children with learning disabilities (-5.15%). Parents of students from all other (non-listed) disability groups were overrepresented by the respondents (5.36%). See respondent disaggregation in the table below:

NPSO Response Totals	Overall	LD	ED	ID	AO	Female	Minority
Target Pool Totals	32,035	11,413	788	2,137	17,697	10,643	9,822
Respondents Totals	5,185	1,580	87	376	3,142	1,874	1,133
Target Pool Representation		35.63%	2.46%	6.67%	55.24%	33.22%	30.66%
Respondent Representation		30.47%	1.68%	7.25%	60.60%	36.14%	21.85%
Difference		-5.15%	-0.78%	0.58%	5.36%	2.92%	-8.81%

The TDOE will continue working in the 2014-15 SY to ensure that the population of those surveyed is representative of the population of the state as a whole.

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No



Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State



No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

LEAs are sampled based on their locations in the state so that all regions are represented and it is ensured that every four years a district will complete the survey. This sampling is done via the *National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO) Sampling Calculator* on a four year sampling cycle. For the three LEAs with 50,000 or more students enrolled, a sampling method is utilized so that the district is surveyed each year, but that different schools within the LEA are selected every four years (similar to the process used for sampling smaller LEAs). To sample these three large LEAs, percentages of high schools, middle schools, and elementary schools are determined for each LEA. Then the number of schools in each school type category is divided by four (for the four years). Each school is given a unique code to randomize them for selection to remove bias. Once randomized, the number of high schools, middle schools, and elementary schools to be surveyed each year are predicated on the previously determined percentages (or weights) of the aforementioned school types in the district.

This sampling methodology ensures that LEAs selected for the survey are representative of the state and the application of the same survey collection process and same question regarding parent involvement certifies that the results of the survey are comparable and will yield valid and reliable estimates. By including all students in the sampled LEAs, there is no opportunity for bias in the students selected for the survey and it can be certain that the makeup of the students with disabilities population is being wholly reflected.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2013 data are from a group representative of the population, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this

issue.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

For further information and tables regarding accurate representation of the population please consult the FFY 2013 Data tab in reponse to the question "describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State." For FFY 2013 overall the data are from a group representative of the population. For those categories (SLD, minority, and all other disabilities) that were above the +/- 3% threshold based on the NPSO calculator, the TDOE will continue working with ETSU and LEAs to try and increase response rate and encourage an even more accurate representation of the population.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	1.50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
0	0	135	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define "disproportionate representation" and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

Disproportionate representation is defined as the "extent to which membership in a given group affects the probability of being placed in a specific education category" (Oswald, et al. 1999). Disproportionality is predicated on the comparison of a subgroup, such as race/ethnicity, within an LEA to the entire LEA population as a whole. Should an LEA be identifying students for special education services at a greater percentage than the rest of the students in the school population as a whole then there is disproportionate representation in the form of overrepresentation.

To determine disproportionate representation, Tennessee uses the Westat spreadsheet for calculating both Relative Risk Ratio (RRR) and Weighted Risk Ratio (WRR) based on LEA race/ethnicity data. For FFY 2013 the methodology listed below was used to calculate and examine data to measure disproportionate representation (particularly overrepresentation) in special education.

Calculation Criteria

Each of the seven race/ethnicity student subgroups in every LEA were examined to determine if the LEA's identification of

students receiving special education and related services met all of the following criteria for disproportionality:

- a. Both a RRR and a WRR of 3.00 or higher. *Note: both RRRs and WRRs were generated for all LEAs based on the number of students receiving special education and related services in each LEA within each of the seven racial/ethnic categories;*
- b. Racial/ethnic subgroup enrollment meets the minimum “n” size of 50 students ; and,
- c. Count of students with disabilities meets the minimum “n” size of 45 students. *Note: the “n” of 45 is the “n” size historically used for previous measures of adequate yearly progress (AYP) for student subgroups. This established “n” size and the reasoning for it can be found Tennessee’s initial NCLB Accountability Workbook, which states: “In calculating AYP for student subgroups, 45 or more students must be included to assure high levels of reliability.”*

Data Sources:

The October 1, 2013 Membership data (from EdFacts file C052) and December 1, 2013 IDEA Child Count data (from the statewide IEP data management system, EasyIEP) were used in the disproportionate representation calculations for each of Tennessee’s 139 school districts. If LEA’s are found disproportionate, they must complete a self-assessment and determine if policies, procedures, and or practices resulted in inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Of the 139 LEAs within Tennessee, four did not meet the minimum “n” size criteria for the state. Three of the four LEAs did have 50 or more students in a specific racial/ethnic subgroup but did not have the requisite “n” size of 45 students with disabilities. One of the four LEAs did not meet the minimum “n” size requirement for racial/ethnic groups or for students with disabilities. The counts of LEAs in the table below are those that met both of these minimum “n” size requirements disaggregated by racial/ethnic subgroups.

Racial/Ethnic Subgroup	Number of LEAs Meeting “N” Size for Both Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity and IDEA Child Count
Hispanic/Latino	99
American Indian/Alaska Native	7
Asian	29
African American	95
Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian	4
White	135
Two or More Races	48

For FFY 2013 no districts were identified with significant disproportionate representation. Should districts be identified, they are required to conduct and submit to the TDOE a self-assessment of the district’s policies, procedures, and practices. The purpose of this self-assessment is to determine if the LEA’s disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification based on the identified student racial/ethnic subgroups. Ratings of 1 through 4 (4=exemplary, 3=adequate, 2 and 1=below inadequate) are made independently by the specified TDOE team members for six items in two broad component areas. The self-assessment designed to address disproportionality in both Indicators 9 and 10 has been attached to this page and is titled “Disprop Self-Assessment_2014.”

In the table below are the detailed counts of districts found disproportionate based on the calculation criteria.

FFY 2013 LEA Count of Disproportionate Representation (based on criteria outlined for determining disproportionality)	
Racial/Ethnic Subgroup	Disproportionality (Over-representation)
Hispanic/Latino	0
American Indian/Alaska Native	0
Asian	0
African American	0
Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian	0
White	0
Two or More Races	0

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations



Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	1.50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1.47%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
36	3	136	1.47%	0%	2.21%

Explanation of Slippage

There were 36 LEAs identified as having significant disproportionate representation of students based on one or more of the seven racial/ethnic groups in one or more of the six high-incidence disability categories. These identified LEAs were required to conduct and submit to the TDOE a self-assessment of the LEAs policies, procedures, and practices. The purpose of this self-assessment is to determine if the LEAs disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification based on the identified racial/ethnic subgroups. Ratings of 1 through 4 (4=exemplary, 3=adequate, 2 and 1=below inadequate) are made independently by the specified TDOE team members for six items in two broad component areas. The self-assessment designed to address disproportionality in both Indicators 9 and 10 has been attached to this page and is titled "Disprop Self-Assessment_2014." Through an examination of disproportionate representation data and a review of policies, procedures, and practices to address child find, evaluation, and eligibility requirements, three LEAs were determined to be disproportionate. The state did not meet its target of 0%.

The slippage from FFY 2012 (1.47%) to FFY 2013 (2.21%) can likely be explained by the relatively new self-assessment used in both FFY 2012 and FFY 2013. Because FFY 2012 was the inaugural year of this self-assessment, the TDOE allowed more flexibility in district responses. Several districts had difficulty with the open-ended question format and additional technical assistance was provided on a case by case basis. This year the TDOE held the self-assessment to more rigorous standards in its second year which might explain the increase in districts identified and the subsequent slippage.

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

Disproportionate representation is defined as the “extent to which membership in a given group affects the probability of being placed in a specific education category” (Oswald, et al. 1999). Disproportionality is predicated on the comparison of a subgroup, such as race/ethnicity, within an LEA to the entire LEA population as a whole. Should an LEA be identifying students for special education services at a greater percentage than the rest of the students in the school population as a whole then there is disproportionate representation in the form of overrepresentation.

To determine disproportionate representation, Tennessee uses the Westat spreadsheet for calculating both Relative Risk Ratio (RRR) and Weighted Risk Ratio (WRR) based on LEA race/ethnicity data. For FFY 2013 the methodology listed below was used to calculate and examine data to measure disproportionate representation (particularly overrepresentation) in special education.

Calculation Criteria

Each of the seven race/ethnicity student subgroups in every LEA were examined to determine if the LEA’s identification of students receiving special education and related services in six high-incidence disability categories met all of the following criteria for disproportionality:

- a. Both a RRR and a WRR of 3.00 or higher. *Note: both RRRs and WRRs were generated for all LEAs based on the number of students receiving special education and related services in each LEA within each of the seven racial/ethnic categories;*
- b. Racial/ethnic subgroup enrollment meets the minimum “n” size of 50 students ; and,
- c. Count of students with disabilities in the specific disability category meets the minimum “n” size of 20 students.

Data Sources

The October 1, 2013 Membership data (from EdFacts file C052) and December 1, 2013 IDEA Child Count data (from the statewide IEP data management system, EasyIEP) were used in the disproportionate representation calculations for each of Tennessee’s 139 school districts. The LEAs found disproportionate were required to complete a self-assessment to determine if policies, procedures, and or practices resulted in inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Of the 139 LEAs within Tennessee, three did not meet the minimum “n” size criteria for the state. Two of the three LEAs did have 50 or more students in a specific racial/ethnic subgroup but did not have the requisite “n” size of 20 students with one of the specified disability categories. One of the three LEAs did not meet the minimum “n” size requirement for racial/ethnic groups or for students with disabilities. The counts of students in the table below are those who met both of these minimum “n” size requirements disaggregated by racial/ethnic subgroups and high-incidence disability categories.

FFY 2013 LEA Count of Disproportionate Representation						
(number of LEAs meeting “n” size requirement for both enrollment by race/ethnicity and IDEA child count)						
Race/Ethnicity	AUT	EMD	ID	OHI	SLD	SLI
Hispanic/Latino	1	0	1	0	0	0
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	2	1	1	0	1
Asian	3	0	0	0	0	0
African American	1	2	9	1	3	1

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0
White	2	0	3	4	2	1
Two or More Races	3	1	2	0	0	0

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The two LEAs found noncompliant in FFY 2012 were required to undergo site visits. Two staff members from the TDOE - the Director of Eligibility and the Federal Programs Coordinator - visited each LEA for a day and a half. During these visits there were interviews conducted with LEA staff regarding the LEA's policies and procedures and questions were asked about how practices might relate to the identified disproportionate representation. As well, schools were visited within the LEA and were observed to see the policies, procedures, and practices in effect.

The Director of Eligibility also pulled a sampling of student eligibility documents and IEPs to assess how they were written and determine if the documents reflected inappropriate policies, procedures, and practices employed in the LEA. All information and concerns gleaned from these site visits were provided to LEA staff via written communication subsequent to the visits. The two LEAs were required to develop action plans based on these site visits and had to periodically submit evidence of activities completed throughout the 2013-14 SY to address findings of noncompliance and disproportionate representation. The TDOE staff also continuously provided technical assistance as necessary and reviewed additional student IEPs and eligibility documents from the two LEAs to confirm that the correct regulatory practices were being followed regarding appropriate identification of SWDs.

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

The LEAs were required to submit an action plan addressing the findings from the site visits. Those eligibility and IEP documents flagged for noncompliance were required to be revised; after these revisions the Director of Eligibility analyzed the documents to ensure noncompliance had been rectified. Each individual instance of noncompliance was verified as corrected.

Indicator 11: Child Find

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	89.00%	82.00%	90.20%	96.00%	96.25%	95.30%	97.90%	97.90%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
29,719	28,115	97.90%	100%	94.60%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	1,604
---	-------

Explanation of Slippage

On January 29, 2014, the TDOE, per the Tennessee State Board's decision, moved from the previously established 40 school day eligibility timeline to a 60 day timeline. This shift in timelines likely contributed to the decrease in the percentage of compliance and the slippage noted from FFY 2012 to FFY 2013. The shift taking place in the middle of the school year (a requirement based on the time in which the State Board made the timeline decision) certainly complicated the process and likely had an impact on the results as well.

Additionally, the TDOE revised the acceptable reasons for delay at the time of the 60 day timeline change to align with the federal acceptable reasons for delay. These reasons include:

- More time is needed in order to collect adequate response to intervention (RTI) data for the purpose of determining the presence of a specific learning disability
- The parent repeatedly failed or refused to produce the child for the evaluation
- The child transferred from the LEA that obtained consent prior to an eligibility determination. The receiving LEA has made progress toward completing the evaluation

Previously there were additional acceptable, state-approved reasons for delay extending beyond the aforementioned three, including:

- Parent did not show up for scheduled meeting or parent cancelled scheduled meeting too late - no time to reschedule within 40 school day timeline
- Parent requested to schedule meeting outside of 40 school day timeline
- Student/parent had serious medical issues requiring postponement and/or rescheduling
- Repeated attempts to contact parents failed (minimum of three unsuccessful mailings and repeated phone calls)

The more limited acceptable reasons for delay likely contributed to the increase noncompliance and slippage.

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

From 7/1/2013 to 1/28/2014 the 40 school day timeline was in effect in Tennessee. During this timeframe there were 844 students who did not have their eligibility determinations and placement completed during the required 40 day timeline. Days beyond the timeline ranged from one to 205 days. The following were provided reasons for delay throughout this time period and were included within the statewide IEP data management system (EasyIEP) when the 40 school day timeline was not met. The reasons with asterisks denote those reasons considered acceptable from 7/1/2013 to 1/28/2014:

1. Limited access to professional staff (e.g., staff shortages, staff illness, in-service trainings, vacancies, holiday schedules, etc.)
2. Student or family language caused delays in testing/meeting (including need for interpreter)
3. *Student transferred to another district
4. Student transferred within district
5. Student turned 3 in (e.g., June), services didn't start until (e.g., August)
6. Waiting on specialist(s): reports, second assessment, observation data, review, medical data, etc.)
7. *Excessive student absences (> 8 in 40 school days) resulted in rescheduling of assessment(s)
8. *Parent did not show for scheduled meeting. Or parent cancelled scheduled meeting too late—no time to reschedule within 40 school days. Or parent requested to schedule meeting outside of timeline
9. *Student/parent serious medical issues (e.g., hospitalization, surgery recuperation) required postponement and/or rescheduling
10. *Repeated attempts to contact parents failed (minimum 3 unsuccessful mailings plus repeated phone calls)
11. Other (not listed above)

From 1/29/2014 onward the 60 day timeline took effect. During this timeframe (1/29/2014 - 6/30/2014) there were 760 students who did not have their eligibility determinations and placement completed during the required 60 day timeline. Days beyond the timeline ranged from one to 201 days. The following were considered acceptable reasons for delay during this time period and were included within EasyIEP when the 60 school day timeline was not met:

1. More time is needed in order to collect adequate response to intervention (RTI) data for the purpose of determining the presence of a specific learning disability
2. The parent repeatedly failed or refused to produce the child for the evaluation
3. The child transferred from the district that obtained consent prior to an eligibility determination. The receiving district has made progress toward completing the evaluation

When combined there was a total of 1,604 students (29,719-28,115) who did not have their eligibility determinations and placement completed within the appropriate timelines. Of the initial consents signed within the FFY 2013 period, 94.60% of them were compliant. The target of 100% compliance was not met.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The TDOE collected data on initial consents for eligibility determinations for all students with signed consent forms during FFY 2013 (July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014). Data were collected through the EasyIEP system for all of Tennessee’s 139 LEAs. The following student-level data were obtained through EasyIEP:

- Student name
- LEA
- Date of initial consent for eligibility determination
- Date of eligibility determination
- Eligibility determination (eligible or ineligible)
- Days from date of initial parent consent to date of eligibility determination

Where applicable, the following were also collected:

- Number of days over 40 school day timeline
- Reasons for the delay

FFY 2013 was the fifth year these student level data were collected through EasyIEP. Upon initial review of the data by the TDOE Director of Eligibility, some LEAs were contacted to confirm and in some cases provide what appeared to be missing data (e.g. some districts initially failed to “close” records of students found ineligible).

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1,197	1,197		0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

See information regarding Prongs 1 and 2 in the text box below.

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

Prong 1

The statewide IEP management system (EasyIEP) is used to collect the data necessary to determine timely evaluation. This system was also used to follow up on all instances of FFY 2012 student-level noncompliance instances when the eligibility determination exceeded established timelines. The TDOE initially provided LEAs with noncompliance a listing of their FFY 2012 students where initial eligibility was late and still open (eligibility not yet determined). These LEAs were required to research individual students and update EasyIEP if the eligibility determination had been completed (with the corresponding reason for delay). In the case of students who's eligibility determinations wer still pending, LEAs were required to determine eligibility as soon as possible. By assessing all LEA's instances of noncompliance on a case by case basis, the TDOE was able to ensure that all noncompliance was accounted for and have LEAs verify their own information. The response from LEAs and their completion of requisite documentation affords the TDOE the opportunity to ascertain that LEAs with noncompliance are correctly implementing regulatory requirements. In all 1,197 instances, the evaluation was completed for children whose

initial evaluation was not timely (except where a child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA). All evaluations were completed within 365 days of the notification of noncompliance.

Prong 2

For those LEAs with one or more of the 1,197 late student evaluations during FFY 2012, the TDOE staff conducted data pulls of Written Parental Permissions signed in FFY 2013 to determine 100% compliance. The TDOE looked at additional initial referrals from each of these LEAs. For LEAs with less than 500 initial referrals for eligibility in FFY 2012, the TDOE required them to demonstrate 100% compliance for initial eligibility determinations for a minimum of 30 consecutive days in FFY 2013. For LEAs with more than 500 initial referrals for eligibility in FFY 2012, the TDOE required them to demonstrate 100% compliance for initial eligibility determinations for a minimum of 10 consecutive days in FFY 2013. After the TDOE verified that the LEA was 100% compliant for at least a 30-day or 10-day time period and that all student level noncompliance from FFY 2012 had been corrected (Prong 1), the finding was closed and the LEA was notified.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.00%	47.10%	84.70%	95.00%	98.80%	98.30%	98.50%	98.71%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	2,958
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	368
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,409
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	858
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	302

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. $[c/(a-b-d-e)] \times 100$	1,409	1,430	98.71%	100%	98.53%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	21
--	----

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, or e. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

There were 21 children who were served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination who did not have eligibility determined by their third birthday or did not have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday. The range of days beyond the third birthday until eligibility was determined or an IEP was developed and implemented was four to 157 days. Reasons for delays included parent preferred schedules, inclement weather, late referrals from Part C, and LEA staff training issues related to early childhood transition policies and procedures.

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Data were pulled from the Part C State database (Tennessee’s Early Intervention Data System) and the Part B statewide IEP data management system (EasyIEP). These data were collected, merged, compared, and analyzed in a unified data table to determine if any children had an untimely IEP. Each LEA with records showing an untimely outcome were given the opportunity to verify and respond to the data matched at the individual record level.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
17	17	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Training and technical assistance on the policies, procedures, and practices for early childhood transition were available to each LEA with a finding of noncompliance as an on-site and/or electronic presentation. Regional 619 preschool consultants provided on-site training and submitted verification of LEA personnel attending the presentation to the 619 preschool coordinator. Training agendas and sign-in sheets for LEA personnel utilizing electronic training materials were submitted to the 619 preschool coordinator.

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

Prong 1
 The TDOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance for FFY 2012 developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for all 17 children for whom implementation of the IEP was untimely. The data from EasyIEP identified the date in which the IEP was developed or non-eligibility was determined. This information was reviewed and verified by the ECIP State Data Manager and the 619 preschool coordinator.

Prong 2
 The TDOE conducted a subsequent review of additional data to determine that all 10 LEAs with noncompliance for FFY 2012 were subsequently correctly implementing 34 CFR 300.124(b). Monthly data were pulled from the Part C state database (Tennessee’s Early Intervention Data System) and the Part B statewide IEP data management system (EasyIEP). These data were collected, merged, compared, and analyzed in a unified data table for the monthly report to determine if the LEA showed any children who had an untimely IEP. Through the monthly subsequent data review process, TDOE verified that all 10 LEAs achieved 100% compliance in the review of additional data and were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for Indicator 12 in a timely manner.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	60.00%	31.00%	50.00%		50.03%	73.30%	87.20%	87.60%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
48	48	87.60%	100%	100%

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

For FFY 2013 the newly established Office of Consolidated Planning and Monitoring (CPM) completed the requirements of this indicator. Analysis of IEPs was done via desktop monitoring and on-site visits to 16 LEAs determined at-risk based on a variety of factors, including: timely submission of reports, disproportionality, least restrictive environment, fiscal audits, etc. The CPM monitoring process assesses the compliance of identified LEAs across myriad areas, including secondary transition. From the 16 at-risk districts, 48 records in sum were monitored. There were seven areas assessed in the focal area of secondary transition which have been detailed in the table below. There were no findings of noncompliance in any of these 48 records so the TDOE met its target of 100% compliance.

Review Item	Total Records	Compliant	Noncompliant	Percentage
Student Invitation to Meeting	48	48	0	100.00%

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Agency Invitation to Meeting	48	48	0	100.00%
Measurable Postsecondary Goals	48	48	0	100.00%
Secondary Transition Annual IEP Goals	48	48	0	100.00%
Age-Appropriate Transition	48	48	0	100.00%
Academic and Functional Achievement	48	48	0	100.00%
Courses of Study	48	48	0	100.00%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
16	16	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

See information regarding Prongs 1 and 2 in the text box below.

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

Prong 1

TDOE conducted the following activities to verify FFY 2012 findings of noncompliance were corrected: student level corrections were made by LEA personnel and documented in the Web-Based Monitoring System (WBMS). To complete the Prong 1 verification, compliance monitors reviewed individual student corrections through a desktop audit.

Prong 2

To ensure that all LEAs with noncompliance were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements at 34 CFR §§ 300.320(b) and 300.321(b), a Prong 2 review was completed. The Prong 2 review consisted of compliance monitors pulling additional records through the statewide IEP data management system (EasyIEP) to ensure that transition requirements were being met. The recently completed IEPs showed 100% compliance with the seven transition components. All FFY 2012 compliance monitoring was closed no later than 365 days of initial findings.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2009	Target ≥						22.50%	23.00%	23.50%
		Data					22.00%	16.80%	15.00%	18.30%
B	2009	Target ≥						57.50%	58.00%	58.50%
		Data					57.00%	51.40%	50.90%	52.30%
C	2009	Target ≥						66.50%	67.00%	67.50%
		Data					65.00%	63.40%	60.30%	66.10%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	23.50%	23.75%	24.00%	24.25%	24.50%	24.75%
Target B ≥	58.50%	59.00%	59.50%	60.00%	60.50%	61.00%
Target C ≥	68.00%	68.75%	69.50%	70.25%	71.00%	71.75%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please refer to "Stakeholder Involvement" in the General Supervision section.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	644
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	137
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	221
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	39
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	39

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

		secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school			
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	137	644	18.30%	23.50%	21.27%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	358	644	52.30%	58.50%	55.59%
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	436	644	66.10%	68.00%	67.70%

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

The LEAs are sampled based on their locations in the state so that all regions are represented and it is ensured that every four years an LEA will complete the survey. This sampling is done via the *National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO) Sampling Calculator* on a four year sampling cycle. To ensure there is no potential bias or misrepresentation that can sometimes arise from student sampling, all students with disabilities within each selected LEA who exited school by (a) graduating with a regular diploma, (b) dropping out, (c) aging out of high school, or (d) who were expected to return were included. For the three LEAs with 50,000 or more students enrolled, a sampling method is utilized so that the LEA is surveyed each year, but that different schools within the LEA are selected every four years (similar to the process used for sampling smaller LEAs). To sample these three large LEAs, percentages of high schools, middle schools, and elementary schools are determined for each LEA. Then the number of schools in each school type category is divided by four (for the four years). Each school is given a unique code to randomize them for selection to remove bias. Once randomized, the number of high schools, middle schools, and elementary schools to be surveyed each year are predicated on the previously determined percentages (or weights) of the aforementioned school types in the district.

This sampling methodology ensures that LEAs selected for the survey are representative of the state and the application of the same survey collection process and same question regarding parent involvement certifies that the results of the survey are comparable and will yield valid and reliable estimates. By including all students in the sampled LEAs, there is no opportunity for bias in the students selected for the survey and it can be certain that the makeup of the students with disabilities population is being wholly reflected.

The TDOE contracts with Eastern Tennessee State University (ETSU) to disseminate, collect, and collate survey results. To complete the survey LEA staff contact students who exited by telephone. The LEA staff use an online secure website to enter the data collected through the telephone surveys. The web survey data are housed at ETSU and data are automatically compiled for analysis and reporting by ETSU to the TDOE.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Please consult the attached document "Indicator 14 Graphics of Results" for a visual disaggregation of survey results.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2013 data are from a group representative of the population, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

The table below provides summary representativeness data on all FFY 2013 *Post-Secondary Outcomes Survey* respondents. The calculation, borrowed from the National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO), compares the respondent pool of exited students against the targeted group of exited students. This is done to determine whether the respondents represent the entire

group of exited students that could have responded to the survey. The difference row compares the two proportions (target proportion against respondent proportion) by selected attributes including: student disability, student gender, child minority race/ethnicity status, English Language Learner (ELL) status, and dropout status. Cells in the difference row that are > +/- 3% indicate that the respondent group over- or underrepresents the entire group of targeted respondents. For this *Post-Secondary Outcomes Survey* exited minority students were underrepresented in the respondent group (-11.73%). No other group was under- or overrepresented. Based on respondent disaggregation (see table below) these results are representativeness of the population.

NPSO Response Totals	Overall	LD	ED	ID	AO	Female	Minority	ELL	Dropout
Target Leaver Totals	1,142	654	56	118	314	396	384	14	90
Respondents Totals	644	357	30	72	185	221	141	0	41
Target Leaver Representation		57.27%	4.90%	10.33%	27.50%	34.68%	33.63%	1.23%	7.88%
Respondent Representation		55.43%	4.66%	11.18%	28.73%	34.32%	21.89%	0.00%	6.37%
Difference		-1.83%	-0.25%	0.85%	1.23%	-0.36%	-11.73%	-1.23%	-1.51%

The TDOE will work in the 2014-15 SY to ensure that the population of those surveyed is representative of the population of the state as a whole, particularly with regard to minority students who were underrepresented in FFY 2013.

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		52.00%	3.00%	4.00%	5.00%	6.00%	7.00%	8.00%
Data	50.00%	55.00%	16.70%	60.00%	56.00%	68.42%	69.23%	56.76%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	9.00%	10.00%	11.00%	12.00%	13.00%	14.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please refer to "Stakeholder Involvement" in the General Supervision section.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	24	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	32	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
24	32	56.76%	9.00%	75.00%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

--

Indicator 16: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		52.50%	55.00%	57.50%	60.00%	62.50%	65.00%	67.50%
Data	56.00%	67.00%	73.90%	83.33%	76.20%	86.96%	73.68%	84.62%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	70.00%	71.00%	72.00%	73.00%	74.00%	75.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please refer to "Stakeholder Involvement" in the General Supervision section.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	7	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	7	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1 Mediations held	16	

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
7	7	16	84.62%	70.00%	87.50%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

--

Indicator 17: 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.

Baseline Data

FFY	2013
Data	67.33%

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	70.33%	73.33%	76.33%	79.33%	82.33%

Description of Measure

As a result of the data and infrastructure analyses, the Tennessee Department of Education has determined its state-identified measurable result will be to increase the percentage of students with Specific Learning Disabilities that score at least Basic on the state achievement test for grades 3-8 in Reading Language Arts. The department will support efforts designed to increase the number of SLD students scoring at least Basic and target an annual increase of three percent per year from the baseline score percentage. This rate of improvement constitutes an ambitious yet achievable goal that will ultimately raise the percentage of students with SLD scoring Basic or higher by 15 percent over the following five years.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As noted in the Data Analysis and Infrastructure Analysis sections, the department solicited feedback from multiple groups of stakeholders both internally and externally in selecting and narrowing the focus of the SIMR to the grade band, subject, and subpopulation of students selected. These stakeholders included: special education supervisors across the state, the Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities, external experts from the Regional Resource Centers, and internal leadership from multiple divisions. High-level department leadership, including the Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, Assistant Commissioner for Special Populations, and Assistant Commissioner for Curriculum and Instruction all met to review the data and infrastructure analyses and came to a consensus around this SIMR. Special Populations personnel presented the SIMR, potential strategies, and the theory of action to an audience of special education teachers and leaders from across the state at the annual Partners in Education (PIE) conference in January 2015 and will present it at the Advisory Council's April 2015 meeting.

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 Children with Disabilities, 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., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, 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.

Please see the pages 3-9 of the attached document "TN Phase I SSIP" for an overview of the state's data analysis and the attached spreadsheet labeled "TN SSIP Appendix" for additional charts and graphs.

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 LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. 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 initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these 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.

Please see pages 9-20 of the attached document labeled "TN Phase I SSIP" for the state's infrastructure analysis.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

As a result of the data and infrastructure analyses, the Tennessee Department of Education has determined its state-identified measurable result will be to increase the percentage of students with Specific Learning Disabilities that score at least Basic on the state achievement test for grades 3-8 in Reading Language Arts. The department will support efforts designed to increase the number of SLD students scoring at least Basic and target an annual increase of three percent per year from the baseline score percentage. This rate of improvement constitutes an ambitious yet achievable goal that will ultimately raise the percentage of students with SLD scoring Basic or higher by 15 percent over the following five years.

Description

Please see pages 20-22 of the attached document labeled "TN Phase I SSIP" for detailed information on Tennessee's SIMR.

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 result(s). 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 LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Please see pages 22-28 of the attached document labeled "TN Phase I SSIP" for the state's selection of coherent improvement strategies.

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 LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Submitted Theory of Action: [TN Theory of Action Graphic](#)

Illustration

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

Please see pages 28-29 of the attached document labeled "TN Phase I SSIP" for more information on the state's Theory of Action.

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

This indicator is not applicable.