STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

For reporting on
FFY 2022

Tennessee

PART B DUE February 1, 2024

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

The State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) documents and evaluates state implementation of special education on an annual basis. Every state is required to develop a plan describing how improvements will be made to special education programs, how special education programs will be assessed, and the targets for the 17 indicators of performance. These indicators focus on information specific to students with disabilities (SWDs) and can be either compliance-based or results-based.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

147

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions).

The Tennessee Department of Education ("the department") utilizes a general supervision structure with multiple systems working in concert that includes monitoring, local determinations for LEAs based on indicators in the SPP/APR, and dispute resolution.

Monitoring System

Results-Based Monitoring: Tennessee's multi-tiered monitoring framework includes three distinct levels: Level 3 (on-site review of LEA and school-level documentation with discussions), Level 2 (virtual LEA-level review and discussion), and Level 1 (review of LEA-level submissions). A multi-factor risk analysis identifies the likelihood (i.e., risk) that an LEA may not comply with certain requirements. Results from the analysis designate each LEA's risk and monitoring level: significant (Level 3 monitoring), elevated (Level 2 monitoring), or low (Level 1 monitoring). Each LEA in the state must participate in one level of Results-Based Monitoring each year through the state's grants management platform, ePlan. A random selection of one or more LEAs to participate in a Level 3 monitoring occurs prior to determining the Level 2 and 1 selections.

Individualized Education Program (IEP) Monitoring: The IEP monitoring system utilizes a four-step process that includes all LEAs in the state. All LEAs receive training and support on the process through available printed resources, office hours, webinars, or in-person training offered by the department annually.

In the first step of this monitoring process, the department provides each LEA with 6 to 28 randomly selected student records to review and evaluate for compliance, with the exact number based on a risk assessment from the previous year. An algorithm ensures that at least one file representing each of the following areas is selected: transition, pre-K, and gifted. The remaining files are representative of the SWD population in the LEA. The case manager or teacher must assess these records using the protocol in the monitoring platform. Then, the LEA-level administrator (most often the IDEA Director) reviews responses and may make revisions before submitting the final review to the department. A copy of the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2022 IEP Monitoring Protocol is available at https://eplan.tn.gov/documentlibrary/ViewDocument.aspx?DocumentKey=1918875&inline=true

Upon completion of the first two levels of review by the LEA, the department conducts a two-level review of the LEA's IEP Monitoring via the same platform. State-level monitoring specialists in the Division of Federal Programs and Oversight (FPO) conduct the third review through an audit of submitted documentation. They may agree or disagree with the LEA's responses based on the same protocol LEAs used to upload and assess the files. Their feedback and internal notes are housed in the monitoring system. Lastly, the state-wide IDEA compliance manager reviews and finalizes all decisions in the system. The system generates a final IEP Monitoring Results Report, and the compliance manager notifies all LEAs when results are available to review. The department continues to hold weekly office hours to discuss any questions that LEAs may have regarding the review process, the IEP Monitoring Results Report, or needed action steps.

Fiscal Monitoring: The fiscal monitoring of IDEA, Part B funds and grants is completed by the Office of Local Finance in collaboration with FPO as part of Results-Based Monitoring. This monitoring ensures that LEAs are appropriately budgeting and spending IDEA, Part B funds at both the LEA- and school-level. In addition, fiscal monitoring is completed for LEAs awarded grants and discretionary funds from IDEA, Part B to certify that those grants and funds are being used as intended and in accordance with IDEA, Part B requirements.

Local Determinations

Since the FFY 2011 APR, the department has employed a local determinations process focused not only on compliance indicators but also on results. This process supports not only the overall goals of the department 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, with each indicator weighted based on department priorities. The focus on student performance is evident in the heavy weighting of results-based indicators. Other indicators that are solely compliance focused and/or predicated on data such as survey results have a lesser weight.

The local determination assigned to each LEA is based on overall points allocated once the weights of each indicator are calculated. In addition, the department uses a metric to assess year-to-year change in LEA performance for each results-based indicator, when possible. Each LEA is provided a detailed matrix (see https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/special-education/lea_apr_indicator_summary_2021-22.pdf) listing their data for each indicator included in the local determinations process, how their data compare to the state, and whether they met the state-established target.

All LEAs, regardless of their determination, must address flagged indicators in their comprehensive LEA plan. These plans are submitted through the LEA planning platform, InformTN. This reduces the paperwork burden for LEAs, creates a continuum of communication throughout the entire department, and ensures that improvement strategies and efforts for SWDs are included in the overall LEA improvement plan rather than being disparate and disconnected.

In addition to addressing flagged indicators, LEAs determined to be Meets Requirements (MR) or Needs Assistance (NA) must send at least one representative to a department-led statewide conference and participate in required APR support sessions. LEAs determined to be Needs Intervention (NI) must complete the tasks associated with the MR and NA designations and also participate in virtual or in-person site visits. During those visits, staff from the Centers of Regional Excellence (CORE) and the APR Support Team work with LEAs to address flagged indicators. Using a root cause analysis, relevant LEA staff are asked about practices and procedures that might impact each of the flagged indicators. Data from the specific APR reporting year and other current data are used to diagnose needs and guide the development of strategies that will be included in the LEA's comprehensive improvement plan. Follow-up conversations to discuss progress within the plan are scheduled quarterly. LEAs that are determined to be Needs Substantial Intervention (NSI) must complete all the tasks associated with the "Needs Intervention" designation and are also required to develop a detailed action plan to accompany the LEA improvement plan. LEAs must adhere to this action plan and participate in short-term planning and monitoring cycles with CORE and/or the Special Education Programming Team to meet the specific goals outlined in their plans.

Dispute Resolution

The department's Office of General Counsel (OGC) is responsible for overseeing dispute resolution throughout the course of each year. This includes investigating and resolving administrative complaints as well as processing and monitoring mediation and due process hearing requests. Signed written complaints should have reports issued and be resolved within the allotted 60-day timeline or the agreed upon extended timeline. Extended timelines could be due to exceptional circumstances relative to the particular complaint or because the parent/individual/organization and department agree to allow additional time to engage in mediation or alternative forms of dispute resolution. Mediation and due process requests are to be documented by the OGC. If due process 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 a 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, evidence-based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

Identifying Initiatives

The department continues to champion the activities outlined in the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) regarding access to high-quality instruction for all SWDs and ensuring educators are providing appropriate access points, scaffolds, accommodations, and/or modifications to students to ensure students are making adequate progress with grade level content. To focus on access to high-quality instruction that aligns to state priorities and other initiatives, the department shifted from a teacher-focused training (Access for All) to a state-wide learning and mentoring network (Access for All Learning Network [AALN]). AALN provides training and support at the district and school leadership level to build capacity throughout the state for the collaboration of general and special education teachers. It uses high-quality instructional materials (HQIM) to identify access points and scaffolds in educators' preparation of instruction. LEAs engaged in AALN are provided additional funding opportunities through IDEA Discretionary mini-grants that support the participation of district and school leads in regular collaboration to launch and sustain inclusionary practices. The department hosts monthly network meetings for ongoing learning and professional development (PD) as well as quarterly communities of practice (CoPs) to highlight best practices of participating LEAs. AALN has both preschool and K-8 cohorts.

Data are collected throughout the initiative to assess implementation success and adjust as necessary. Although Tennessee has made great strides in inclusive opportunities for grades K-12 in terms of setting, we have not yet closed the gap related to proficiency and student growth. The K-8 AALN activities are designed to increase meaningful access to instruction, not simply access to the educational environment.

Given the extensive data on successes resulting from SSIP activities, as well as feedback from stakeholders and the need for continued support in the area of high-quality instruction, AALN provides training and coaching using the state's unit and lesson preparation protocol for the collaboration of general and special education teachers and the Instructional Practice Guide (IPG). Importantly, it prompts participants to view these materials through the lens of SWDs. In year one (2022-23) and two (2023-24), the focus is on literacy instruction using HQIM and high-quality instructional strategies. Year three (2024-25) and four (2025-26) will focus on math instruction. The network will ultimately develop mentor districts for the state. During the 2022-23 school year, the network hosted monthly meetings, quarterly CoPs, and provided coaching for leadership by the regional access coaches (RACs). AALN currently includes 37 preschool and 30 K-12 district partners.

In addition to AALN, the state also manages a multi-contract partnership called the TN Technical Assistance Network (TN-TAN), with leading subject-matter experts across the state engaged to assist with the provision of high-quality professional learning delivered virtually, at in-person events and conferences, and within CoPs. Our TN-TAN partners support educators and leaders in areas including disability-specific educational practices, access to instruction and consideration of a students' least restrictive environment (LRE), high-quality transition planning and postschool outcomes, the provision of assistive technology, preschool inclusive practices, and family engagement. TN-TAN accepts referrals and requests from educators, district leaders, and families.

Training on Initiatives

The department has increased the amount of high-quality technical assistance (TA) and PD offered to LEAs throughout the state. Many of the divisions within the department provide TA and PD around current policies and initiatives to their specific populations. However, to avoid siloing of efforts, the department has used its strategic plan (including the Special Education Coordination Framework) to create linkages in work across divisions and ensure that a diverse group of department staff and stakeholders are able to have conversations about the broad array of activities occurring. This work has ensured that SWDs and educators of SWDs remain a focus of all work conducted by the department and that all department staff remain cognizant of these subgroups.

The instructional programming team within the Division of Special Education and Intervention Programs (SEIP) delivers the majority of instructional TA and PD for special education staff within Tennessee, particularly regarding the aforementioned initiatives. This TA has included the development of a special education framework to assist teachers in the writing of Instructionally Appropriate IEPs and support for collaboration of department staff around Response to Instruction and Intervention (RTI²). Each member of the programming team has an area of expertise, including related services, low-incidence disabilities, IEP development, postsecondary transition, and assessment and eligibility, so that the team can offer a breadth of PD and TA to LEAs in all areas of special education. The programming team hosts monthly office hours and CoPs for special education directors and practitioners.

CORE consultants, in collaboration with select programming team members, serve as regional support for LEAs across the state. They take the lead in

working with NI LEAs and connect districts to resources and training on the aforementioned initiatives to support implementation at the district level. The CORE consultants serve as the conduit to LEAs so that there is one main point of contact at the state for LEAs rather than a multitude of people needed to answer different questions. The consultants are able to connect LEAs to resources, TA/PD opportunities, and guidance regarding department initiatives. In addition, four AALN RACs provide school leadership- or district leadership-directed coaching to work toward even greater behavioral change as educators implement the training in their district, schools, and classrooms.

The IDEA Data Team provides PD and TA to LEAs that focuses on using data to inform instructional decision-making and effectively leveraging the features of TN PULSE. This team develops guidance for LEAs on how to enter special education information into the statewide system and makes a concerted effort to link TN PULSE to department initiatives to ensure streamlined communication to LEAs. Embedded in this IEP data management system are many resources addressing important initiatives and topics so that relevant information can be accessed by users when writing IEPs and completing other special education documentation.

Identifying LEAs for TA/PD

While some of the TA and PD the department provides is predicated on LEA requests for support, the department also uses data to determine whether LEAs require TA or PD. In particular, the APR local determinations are used 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 MR may receive TA or PD if requested, the department focuses much of its resources and efforts on providing support to those LEAs in NA, NI, and NSI determination categories.

In addition, the department utilizes a cross-divisional approach to identify additional TA needs. This group, the IDEA Collaborative, includes leadership from the Division of SEIP, the OGC, FPO, and CORE. The collaborative meets weekly to review the findings from results-based monitoring, dispute resolution, and other communication with LEAs. This group subsequently makes recommendations for TA, focused monitoring, or additional supports that may be needed. The department also receives TA/PD requests through a referral link on the TN-TAN webpage, for which areas of support are identified and prioritized.

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 children with disabilities.

In addition to the systems listed under the "Technical Assistance System" section above, the department currently operates an online PD resource, "Best for All Central." This tool is designed to be a "one stop shop" for educators to access online training modules and additional resources to improve instructional practices. The Division of SEIP continues to add specific materials related to special education to this resource, including access to the TN-TAN supports. Stakeholders request assistance from the network through a single request form that is directed by the coordination grantee to the appropriate TA personnel, including preschool, behavior, autism, postsecondary transition, assistive technology, RTI2-A and RTI2-B supports, and family engagement. Along with professional learning, LEA system supports, and practitioner TA, TN-TAN is evaluated by external contractors who examine the reach of the network, quality of the PD, and the overall impact of the network.

The Special Education Programming Team also provides several opportunities for in-person or virtual PD for special educators throughout the year. Monthly virtual CoPs are offered to assessment specialists to ensure they are informed of federal and state evaluation and eligibility requirements and best practices for assessing students with disabilities. The department hosts institutes for special education supervisors annually that include PD related to the requirements of IDEA as well as state initiatives to improve outcomes for SWDs. The Division of SEIP, within the Office of Academics, also hosts a monthly two-hour virtual meeting with special education supervisors that provides guidance around IDEA-related issues, addresses concerns from the field, and gives educators an opportunity to engage with department staff in an open forum.

Stakeholder Engagement:

The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. The AC typically meets quarterly during each FFY in July, October, January, and April. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes, providing information over the last two FFYs regarding Tennessee's APR state determination, APR target setting, and new APR local determinations resources available to LEAs. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

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 regional special education supervisor study council meetings (East, Central, and West). At these meetings, data from the APR (including Indicator 17 formative milestones and outcomes) and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families. For example, the department hosts monthly listening sessions with representatives from statewide advocacy groups where they can ask questions about policies, rules, or practice trends, as well as share issues from the field. These listening sessions include legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The Arc Tennessee. For more information on the specific activities and/or strategies used to engage and increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents, please see the "Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities" section below.

Although there were no substantive revisions to FFY 2022 baselines and/or targets, the department made concerted efforts prior to the FFY 2020 APR submission to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/families/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too

challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Furthermore, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets. This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

The department has continued to engage stakeholders and solicit their feedback during the implementation of the SSIP. Various stakeholders have received information on the work through a variety of methods. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. Partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. Statewide data are also communicated within the SEA, via social media, on the project's website, and through an internal data dashboard. The success of the SSIP is contingent upon not only the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. The department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content.

Apply stakeholder engagement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

YES

Number of Parent Members:

21

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

The department understands the value and importance of parent involvement in SPP/APR planning and provided parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents with opportunities to analyze data and provide feedback that informed the SPP/APR target setting process and the development of improvement strategies. In FFY 2021, the Senior Director of Data Reporting led discussions with the AC about the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package, emphasizing the new stakeholder requirements and the focus on parent engagement. He requested that AC members complete the survey themselves (both during the discussions and via email communications) and connect with parents, if possible, to reinforce the critical nature of reviewing the target setting presentations and providing feedback on the proposed targets. The Senior Director of Data Reporting also met with one of the department's family engagement partners, The Arc Tennessee, to provide the target setting feedback process information and convey a similar message around the importance of involving parents in this work. He met directly with The Arc Tennessee's director to discuss ways to effectively disseminate the feedback survey and reach parents. Finally, the department made all SPP/APR target setting materials available to the public on its website (https://www.tn.gov/education/families/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab), encouraging responses from the broader community including individual parents of SWDs. Beyond the SPP/APR target setting process, the department engages frequently with parent stakeholders through the activities described in the "Broad Stakeholder Input" section above (e.g., AC meetings) and the "Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities" section below (e.g., DOE "listening sessions").

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

The department engages in numerous activities to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for SWDs, most notably working with a variety of organizations and partners to engage in continuous feedback loops to identify potential areas of needed support, develop guidance, seek feedback and implement the guidance, and monitor results for continuous improvement. The department utilizes this model to ensure all stakeholders have opportunities to participate in all components of the improvement cycle and inform the prioritized work to support students with disabilities.

The department has a long working relationship with The Arc Tennessee, a statewide, nonprofit advocacy agency that works to build the capacity of families, schools, and communities to ensure a successful education experience and postsecondary success for students with disabilities. It is the primary resource the department uses to build family partnerships. The Arc utilizes eight regional family engagement specialists to connect with local families and LEAs. The use of local regional specialists ensures families from diverse racial/ethnic, geographic, and socioeconomic statuses are reached and children's needs are met across the state. In addition to hosting family engagement sessions, the specialists serve as a resource to collect data around family support needs that TDOE utilizes to develop universal and targeted supports. The Arc also facilitates monthly listening sessions with the department and statewide advocacy representatives. The sessions provide a mechanism for identifying data trends for prioritizing the development of additional resources for families and LEAs. Using the continuous feedback model, the department evaluates the impact of the guidance on student outcomes. Furthermore, in September 2023, the department initiated a five-year contract with The Arc to become a TN-TAN partner. Through the grant, The Arc supports family engagement and helps LEAs and families of children with disabilities build important school to home connections. It also ensures that these families have access to the resources they need to understand and support their children's learning needs. This family engagement work provides families with free trainings throughout the year, opportunities to participate in advocacy networks, parent-friendly resources, access to a toll-free call center, and the chance to give feedback on a parent survey (the results of which are shared with the department).

The Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities' (AC) mission is to ensure the provision of appropriate services for children with disabilities in Tennessee. The members are representative of the diversity across the state and come from multiple stakeholder groups, including parents of students with disabilities as well as individuals with disabilities who work closely with the department to engage in the continuous improvement feedback model. The AC provides public input for proposed policy or regulation changes, advises of unmet needs in the education of students with disabilities, and supports the development of corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring reports.

Additionally, there are many organizations with which the department collaborates throughout the year, either having parent representatives or parent feedback mechanisms for collecting and sharing input with the department. Examples include the Tennessee Dyslexia Advisory Council; Tennessee Council for the Deaf, Deaf-Blind, and Hard of Hearing; Tennessee Deaf-Blind Project Advisory Council; Tennessee Council on Developmental Disabilities; Tennessee Council on Autism Spectrum Disorder; Tennessee Works Partnership; Tennessee State Rehabilitation Council; Tennessee Employment Roundtable; Tennessee Employment First Task Force; and the TransitionTN State Leadership Team. Another feedback mechanism includes the APR Indicator 8 Parent Survey, which solicits feedback from parents on an annual basis. The survey, developed in collaboration with The Arc, includes 10 items covering parent perceptions of the special education services their child receives. Parents are invited to participate using a sampling methodology that ensures that LEAs and schools selected for the survey each year are representative of the state. In FFY 2022, 31,939 parents were invited to participate, and the responses were somewhat representative across various demographic groups in the state.

Finally, the department has specific initiatives and partnerships it has launched to provide parents with resources to improve outcomes for SWDs, including but not limited to S.I.M.P.L.E. Moments (a social media campaign and district partnerships with families around literacy development and engagement); Public Broadcasting Service (foundational literacy and math lessons for families and Tennessee teachers); Family Literacy Nights Turnkey Package (LEA resources for hosting family literacy nights w/ specific guidance for SWDs); and the Ready4K text-based program (text messaging program that provides practical ways for families to engage in literacy and math activities at home).

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

The department's primary mechanism for soliciting public input for setting targets included the dissemination of short presentations (https://www.tn.gov/education/families/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab) with information and data about the SPP/APR target setting process and the administration of feedback surveys tied to these presentations. Discussions with internal and external stakeholders (such as the AC) regarding the APR target setting process began in October 2021. The presentations and surveys were made publicly available on the department website in late November/early December 2021 and remained open until late January 2021. Each presentation followed the same format and included a quick overview of the SPP/APR, a definition of the APR indicator on which the presentation was focused, the overall five-year data trend, the proposed targets for the APR indicator, and a link to the stakeholder feedback survey.

The stakeholder feedback surveys for each APR indicator were also similar in format. They collected respondent demographic information (role, race/ethnicity, geographic location) and asked stakeholders to respond to the following questions:

1. How did you hear about this APR target feedback opportunity?
 a. Through an advisory/advocacy group
 b. Through my local school/district
 c. Through social media/word-of-mouth
 d. I found it myself by searching the internet
 e. Other:
2. After reviewing the proposed targets for Indicator [#], which of the following statements best represents your opinion of the targets?
 a. The targets are too challenging
 b. The targets are not challenging enough
 c. The targets are just right
3. After reviewing the proposed targets, which of the following statements best represents your opinion of the data & analyses provided?
 a. The data & analyses are too complex
 b. The data & analyses are not complex enough
 c. The data & analyses are appropriate
4. Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets:
5. Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets:

The department received 153 responses across 14 different feedback surveys. Respondents reported being in a variety of stakeholder roles and were located in 28 different Tennessee counties across the state.

Beyond the SPP/APR target setting process, the department solicits public input frequently through the activities described in the "Broad Stakeholder Input," "Parent Members Engagement," and "Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities" sections above.

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

An overview of the SPP/APR target setting process for each Indicator is available to the public on the state website (https://www.tn.gov/education/families/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html) under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab. The "APR Local Determinations Process Guide (https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/special-education/APR_Local_Determinations_Process_Guide.pdf), posted publicly on the same state website under the "APR Resources" tab, contains the results of the target setting process for each Indicator starting on page 8.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2021 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 2021 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/APR, including any revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, is available.

The department reports annually to the public on the performance of the state and each LEA through the state website: https://www.tn.gov/education/families/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Reports provided on this site include the full SPPs/APRs for the past 10 years, a file detailing LEA performance on each SPP/APR indicator as compared to state SPP/APR targets (a copy of this file from the FFY 2021 APR can be found here: https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/special-education/lea_apr_indicator_summary_2021-22.pdf, and OSEP's letter of determination for the state for each APR since FFY 2012. Specific data from individual indicators (such as Indicator 3) can be found on the Special Education Data Services & Reports website provided above, the Tennessee state report card (https://tdepublicschools.ondemand.sas.com/), and the department's Data Downloads & Requests page (https://www.tn.gov/education/districts/federal-programs-and-oversight/data/data-downloads.html).

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2022 and 2023 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2023 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due

February 1, 2024, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

As a result of Tennessee's 2022 and 2023 state determination of Needs Assistance, the department continues to engage with the following technical assistance centers:

IDEA Data Center (IDC): The department has worked with IDC to seek feedback and TA related to its SSIP and SPP/APR. This feedback informed revisions and led to improved processes related to stakeholder engagement. In addition, Ongoing TA provided by IDC continues to support the development of process documents for each of the SPP/APR indicators. Finally, the department collaborated with IDC in the fall of 2023 to provide a comprehensive APR overview for department staff. The intent of this multi-day training was to broaden internal stakeholders' knowledge of APR measurements and help them understand how their programmatic work influences the state's progress toward the goals outlined in the SPP.

National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI): Department staff have worked with NCSI to refine the use of its IDEA discretionary funds to best leverage practices that will lead to systemic change. As a result of this assistance, the department revised the provision of LEA grants by aligning the use of funds to needs identified through a root cause analysis. The grants are intended to fund activities that will lead to systemic changes that measurably improve outcomes for students with disabilities. In addition, the assistance continues to inform the development of a TA network to address the most pressing priorities identified by districts through a comprehensive data review. Finally, the department has been engaged in several collaboratives including the Results Based Accountability (RBA), State Education Agency Leaders (SEAL), Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability, and Reform (CEEDR), and Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). This participation led collaborative discussions with other states and the curation of resources to inform department guidance.

National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT): The department engaged with NTACT to explore changes to the data collection relative to Indicator 14. In addition, the department engaged with NTACT staff regarding a checklist used to develop high quality transition plans (Indicator 13). As a result, the department refined its monitoring instrument and conducted training for internal staff on the consistent monitoring of transition plans. Additional activities and ongoing engagement with NTACT are planned.

Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA): The department has engaged with ECTA to explore and evaluate its monitoring and accountability systems related to Preschool Environments (Indicator 6). As a result of this involvement, the department issued a letter to all directors of schools in districts that failed to meet the state target for Indicator 6. In addition, staff participation in the early childhood inclusion cohort through ECTA informed the department's work related to increasing inclusive practices in the preschool setting. LEAs have subsequently partnered with the department to improve access to high quality preschool programs for children ages 3-5 (not in kindergarten) with disabilities.

Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2022 and 2023 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to Section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 23, 2023 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

Intro - Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2023 and 2024 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2024 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2025, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS009.

Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	78.72%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	73.55%	74.43%	74.73%	78.72%	79.25%
Data	72.72%	73.04%	73.93%	78.72%	76.35%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	79.78%	80.83%	81.88%	82.93%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. The AC typically meets quarterly during each FFY in July, October, January, and April. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes, providing information over the last two FFYs regarding Tennessee's APR state determination, APR target setting, and new APR local determinations resources available to LEAs. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

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 regional special education supervisor study council meetings (East, Central, and West). At these meetings, data from the APR (including Indicator 17 formative milestones and outcomes) and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families. For example, the department hosts monthly listening sessions with representatives from statewide advocacy groups where they can ask questions about policies, rules, or practice trends, as well as share issues from the field. These listening sessions include legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The Arc Tennessee. For more information on the specific activities and/or strategies used to engage and increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents, please see the "Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities" section below.

Although there were no substantive revisions to FFY 2022 baselines and/or targets, the department made concerted efforts prior to the FFY 2020 APR submission to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the

department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/families/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Furthermore, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets. This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

The department has continued to engage stakeholders and solicit their feedback during the implementation of the SSIP. Various stakeholders have received information on the work through a variety of methods. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. Partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. Statewide data are also communicated within the SEA, via social media, on the project's website, and through an internal data dashboard. The success of the SSIP is contingent upon not only the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. The department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	5,578
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	305
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	780
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	100
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	727

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
5,578	7,490	76.35%	79.78%	74.47%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The department was able to determine that, although the total number of students exiting with a regular high school diploma increased by 220 students, the increase was offset by 274 additional students receiving an alternate academic diploma (AAD) and 102 additional students dropping out. Furthermore, although 64 LEAs increased the percentage of students graduating with a regular high school diploma, the percentage decreased in 58 LEAs. In an effort to mitigate future slippage, the department has contracted with an external partner to increase the graduation rate, decrease the dropout rate, and strengthen postsecondary transition planning with the goal of improving post-school outcomes.

Graduation Conditions

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

The Tennessee Department of Education has raised standards and aligned graduation requirements to best prepare students for college and the workforce. All students must meet these criteria and conditions to graduate with a regular high school diploma, regardless of their disability status.

In accordance with State Board policy, high school students must complete 22 credits to graduate (see below), End of Course (EOC) exams, either the ACT or SAT, and a civics assessment (T.C.A. § 49-6-408). Their performance on the EOCs will factor into their semester grade for the course. View the FAQ on the State Board policy here: https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/documents/sbe_HS_Policy_2_103_faq.pdf

Total Required Credits: 22

•Math: 4 credits, including Algebra I, II, Geometry and a fourth higher level math course (Students must be enrolled in a mathematics course each school year)

•English: 4 credits
•Science: 3 credits, including Biology, Chemistry or Physics, and a third lab course
•Social Studies: 3 credits, including U.S. History and Geography, World History and Geography, U.S. Government and Civics, and Economics
•Physical Education and Wellness: 1.5 credits
•Personal Finance: 0.5 credits (Three years of JROTC may be substituted for one-half unit of Personal Finance if the JROTC instructor attends the Personal Finance training.)
•Foreign Language: 2 credits (May be waived by the LEA for students, under certain circumstances, to expand and enhance the elective focus)
•Fine Arts: 1 credit (may be waived by the local school district for students, under certain circumstances, to expand and enhance the elective focus)
•Elective Focus: 3 credits consisting of Math and Science, Career and Technical Education, Fine Arts, Humanities, Advanced Placement (AP) or International Baccalaureate (IB)

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS009.

Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a

state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	7.84%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	3.22%	3.20%	3.18%	7.84%	7.45%
Data	2.81%	2.78%	2.40%	7.84%	8.91%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	7.06%	6.28%	5.50%	4.72%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. The AC typically meets quarterly during each FFY in July, October, January, and April. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes, providing information over the last two FFYs regarding Tennessee's APR state determination, APR target setting, and new APR local determinations resources available to LEAs. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

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 regional special education supervisor study council meetings (East, Central, and West). At these meetings, data from the APR (including Indicator 17 formative milestones and outcomes) and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families. For example, the department hosts monthly listening sessions with representatives from statewide advocacy groups where they can ask questions about policies, rules, or practice trends, as well as share issues from the field. These listening sessions include legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The Arc Tennessee. For more information on the specific activities and/or strategies used to engage and increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents, please see the "Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities" section below.

Although there were no substantive revisions to FFY 2022 baselines and/or targets, the department made concerted efforts prior to the FFY 2020 APR submission to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here:

https://www.tn.gov/education/families/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Furthermore, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets. This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

The department has continued to engage stakeholders and solicit their feedback during the implementation of the SSIP. Various stakeholders have received information on the work through a variety of methods. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. Partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. Statewide data are also communicated within the SEA, via social media, on the project's website, and through an internal data dashboard. The success of the SSIP is contingent upon not only the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. The department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	5,578
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	305
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	780
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	100
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	727

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
727	7,490	8.91%	7.06%	9.71%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Although the percentage of students dropping out decreased in 53 LEAs, the decreases were offset by 45 LEAs in which the percentage increased. Among the LEAs in which the drop out percentage increased, the increase was less than 5 students in 37 of the 45 LEAs. Across all LEAs, the average increase was less than one student (0.71) dropping out per LEA. In an effort to mitigate future slippage, the department has contracted with an external partner to increase the graduation rate, decrease the dropout rate, and strengthen postsecondary transition planning with the goal of improving post-school outcomes.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth

Students in Tennessee are considered dropouts if they meet any of the following criteria:

•A student has unexcused absences for 10 or more consecutive days and all requirements for truancy intervention on behalf of the LEA have been followed;
•A student transfers to an adult high school, GED program, or job corps and does not earn an on-time regular diploma;
•A student transfers to another LEA in Tennessee but has no subsequent enrollment records after transferring;
•A student transfers to another school in the same LEA in Tennessee but has no subsequent enrollment records after transferring;
•A student does not graduate with their cohort by obtaining a regular high school diploma, a special education diploma, or an occupational diploma, and does not enroll in the SEA the subsequent school year.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

>A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

>B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

>D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED*Facts* file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	97.78%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	95.95%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2021	95.13%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	98.46%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	96.87%
Math	C	Grade HS	2021	93.33%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. The AC typically meets quarterly during each FFY in July, October, January, and April. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes, providing information over the last two FFYs regarding Tennessee's APR state determination, APR target setting, and new APR local determinations resources available to LEAs. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

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 regional special education supervisor study council meetings (East, Central, and West). At these meetings, data from the APR (including Indicator 17 formative milestones and outcomes) and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families. For example, the department hosts monthly listening sessions with representatives from statewide advocacy groups where they can ask questions about policies, rules, or practice trends, as well as share issues from the field. These listening sessions include legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The Arc Tennessee. For more information on the specific activities and/or strategies used to engage and increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents, please see the "Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities" section below.

Although there were no substantive revisions to FFY 2022 baselines and/or targets, the department made concerted efforts prior to the FFY 2020 APR submission to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/families/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Furthermore, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets. This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

The department has continued to engage stakeholders and solicit their feedback during the implementation of the SSIP. Various stakeholders have received information on the work through a variety of methods. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. Partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. Statewide data are also communicated within the SEA, via social media, on the project's website, and through an internal data dashboard. The success of the SSIP is contingent upon not only the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. The department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	10,798	8,176	14,963
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	3,089	1,277	2,429
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	6,600	5,675	10,981
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	946	1,068	1,080

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	10,796	8,170	18,953
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	2,624	1,222	3,467
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	7,078	5,720	13,748
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	942	1,067	1,079

(1) The children with IEPs who are English learners and took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment are not included in the prefilled data in this indicator.

(2) The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

(3) The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments, as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	10,635	10,798	97.65%	95.00%	98.49%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	8,020	8,176	96.11%	95.00%	98.09%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	14,490	14,963	95.12%	95.00%	96.84%	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	10,644	10,796	97.43%	95.00%	98.59%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	8,009	8,170	96.27%	95.00%	98.03%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	18,294	18,953	93.31%	95.00%	96.52%	Met target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

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

Assessment data for all students, including students with disabilities, can be found under the "Assessment Files" tab on the department's "Data Downloads and Requests" website: https://www.tn.gov/education/districts/federal-programs-and-oversight/data/data-downloads.html. Additional assessment data, including participation and achievement data for SWDs on assessments, can be found under the "Students with Disabilities Participation/Performance on Assessments" tab on the department's "Special Education Data Services & Reports" website: https://www.tn.gov/education/families/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. The direct link to FFY 2022 data for SWDs participation and performance on assessments can be found here: https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/data/swd_participation_performance_assessment_2022-23.xlsx. The direct link to FFY 2022 data for

SWDs participation and performance on assessments can be found here:
https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/data/swd_participation_performance_assessment_2022-23.xlsx.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

3A - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

        A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

        B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

        C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

        D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED*Facts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	8.89%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	2.00%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2021	6.85%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	11.56%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	4.69%
Math	C	Grade HS	2021	3.26%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	10.89%	11.89%	12.89%	13.89%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	4.00%	5.00%	6.00%	7.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	7.85%	8.85%	9.85%	10.85%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	13.56%	14.56%	15.56%	16.56%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	6.69%	7.79%	8.89%	9.89%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	4.26%	5.26%	6.26%	7.26%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. The AC typically meets quarterly during each FFY in July, October, January, and April. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes, providing information over the last two FFYs regarding Tennessee's APR state determination, APR target setting, and new APR local determinations resources available to LEAs. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

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 regional special education supervisor study council meetings (East, Central, and West). At these meetings, data from the APR (including Indicator 17 formative milestones and outcomes) and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families. For example, the department hosts monthly listening sessions with representatives from statewide advocacy groups where they can ask questions about policies, rules, or practice trends, as well as share issues from the field. These listening sessions include legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The Arc Tennessee. For more information on the specific activities and/or strategies used to engage and increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents, please see the "Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities" section below.

Although there were no substantive revisions to FFY 2022 baselines and/or targets, the department made concerted efforts prior to the FFY 2020 APR submission to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/families/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Furthermore, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets. This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

The department has continued to engage stakeholders and solicit their feedback during the implementation of the SSIP. Various stakeholders have received information on the work through a variety of methods. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. Partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. Statewide data are also communicated within the SEA, via social media, on the project's website, and through an internal data dashboard. The success of the SSIP is contingent upon not only the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. The department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	9,689	6,952	13,410
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	850	82	321
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	467	101	752

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	9,702	6,942	17,215

b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	966	180	200
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	562	325	421

(1)The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,317	9,689	11.73%	10.89%	13.59%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	183	6,952	3.15%	4.00%	2.63%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,073	13,410	6.85%	7.85%	8.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

In 2023, the proficiency rate for children with IEPs on the statewide ELA assessment in grade 8 decreased in 58 LEAs when compared to the previous year. Among the LEAs that decreased their proficiency, the rate decreased by an average of 4.7%. At the same time, 27 LEAs increased their proficiency in grade 8 ELA by an average of 4.7%. The slippage noted in Grade 8 Reading is demonstrated across multiple student groups and is not unique to SWDs.

Statewide summative assessments, such as the Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program (TCAP), evaluate how well students have mastered grade-level content, skills, and standards. Tennessee's ELA standards are progressive, which means students need to have a strong understanding of previous grade-level standards in foundational literacy skills (decoding) and language comprehension skills (vocabulary, background knowledge, etc.) to perform well on any grade-level summative assessment. Therefore, successful literacy experiences in the previous grades, meaningful engagement and access to high-quality literacy materials, and the opportunity to work with increasingly complex grade-level texts all play a significant role in a student's ability to perform well on these assessments.

Furthermore, ELA educators in the middle school grades hold either a K-6 or a 7-12 teacher license. Middle school teachers often experience differences in their preservice preparation related to reading acquisition, evidence-based instruction, and effective interventions for students struggling with reading/literacy acquisition, which could affect student performance on statewide reading assessments.

To further promote literacy development and success across all grade bands, the department has launched a statewide plan to ensure all students have equitable access to ELA instruction that is anchored in high-quality instructional materials coupled with ongoing professional learning for educators.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,528	9,702	13.70%	13.56%	15.75%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	505	6,942	7.33%	6.69%	7.27%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	621	17,215	3.26%	4.26%	3.61%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

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

Assessment data for all students, including students with disabilities, can be found under the "Assessment Files" tab on the department's "Data Downloads and Requests" website: https://www.tn.gov/education/districts/federal-programs-and-oversight/data/data-downloads.html. Additional assessment data, including participation and achievement data for SWDs on assessments, can be found under the "Students with Disabilities Participation/Performance on Assessments" tab on the department's "Special Education Data Services & Reports" website: https://www.tn.gov/education/families/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. The direct link to FFY 2022 data for SWDs participation and performance on assessments can be found here: https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/data/swd_participation_performance_assessment_2022-23.xlsx.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

>A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

>B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

>D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED*Facts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	38.52%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	46.07%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	56.31%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	49.82%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	52.08%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	57.34%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	46.52%	50.52%	54.52%	58.52%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	54.07%	58.07%	62.07%	66.07%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	64.31%	68.31%	72.31%	76.31%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	57.82%	61.82%	65.82%	69.82%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	60.08%	64.08%	68.08%	72.08%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	65.34%	69.34%	73.34%	77.34%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. The AC typically meets quarterly during each FFY in July, October, January, and April. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes, providing information over the last two FFYs regarding Tennessee's APR state determination, APR target setting, and new APR local determinations resources available to LEAs. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

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 regional special education supervisor study council meetings (East, Central, and West). At these meetings, data from the APR (including Indicator 17 formative milestones and outcomes) and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families. For example, the department hosts monthly listening sessions with representatives from statewide advocacy groups where they can ask questions about policies, rules, or practice trends, as well as share issues from the field. These listening sessions include legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The Arc Tennessee. For more information on the specific activities and/or strategies used to engage and increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents, please see the "Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities" section below.

Although there were no substantive revisions to FFY 2022 baselines and/or targets, the department made concerted efforts prior to the FFY 2020 APR submission to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/families/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Furthermore, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets." This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

The department has continued to engage stakeholders and solicit their feedback during the implementation of the SSIP. Various stakeholders have received information on the work through a variety of methods. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. Partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. Statewide data are also communicated within the SEA, via social media, on the project's website, and through an internal data dashboard. The success of the SSIP is contingent upon not only the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. The department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	946	1,068	1,080
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	403	470	626

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS

a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	942	1,067	1,079
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	523	568	632

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	403	946	40.76%	46.52%	42.60%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	470	1,068	47.43%	54.07%	44.01%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	626	1,080	64.86%	64.31%	57.96%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

In 2023, the proficiency rate for children with IEPs on the alternate ELA assessment in grade 8 decreased in 60 LEAs when compared to the previous year. Among the LEAs that decreased their proficiency, the rate decreased by an average of 27.5%. At the same time, 31 LEAs increased their proficiency in grade 8 ELA by an average of 32.1%. The department has been working with LEAs statewide to ensure only the students who meet alternate assessment criteria are participating in the alternate assessment. The department has provided explicit guidance and ongoing technical assistance to IEP teams to ensure the appropriate students are assigned to the alternative assessment. Following this guidance, IEP teams have identified students who previously took the alternative assessment and scored at or above proficiency level to recommend them for the grade-level TCAP assessment with appropriate accommodations. In response to the slippage, the department will intensify the TA and PD supports for LEAs that have experienced slippage in reading or mathematics. The state recently changed alternate assessments from MSAA to DLM for multiple reasons including the provision of increasingly intensive instructional resources for special education. Furthermore, the state personnel development grant (SPDG) will be expanded this year to add a third cohort. The current SPDG is focused on ensuring students with complex needs and significant cognitive disabilities have equitable access to standards-aligned instruction. The SPDG sustainability plan will further expand and extend the work to additional LEAs, middle schools, and elementary schools.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

In 2023, the proficiency rate for children with IEPs on the alternate ELA assessment in HS decreased in 49 LEAs when compared to the previous year. Among the LEAs that decreased their proficiency, the rate decreased by an average of 26.8%. At the same time, 35 LEAs increased their proficiency in HS ELA by an average of 32.6%. However, the LEAs in which proficiency decreased tended to be larger, testing an average of 29 HS students on the alternate assessment as opposed to an average of 15 HS students among the LEAs that increased their proficiency rate. The department has been working with LEAs statewide to ensure only the students who meet alternate assessment criteria are participating in the alternate assessment. The department has provided explicit guidance and ongoing technical assistance to IEP teams to ensure the appropriate students are assigned to the alternative assessment. Following this guidance, IEP teams have identified students who previously took the alternative assessment and scored at or above proficiency level to recommend them for the grade-level TCAP assessment with appropriate accommodations. In response to the slippage, the department will intensify the TA and PD supports for LEAs that have experienced slippage in reading or mathematics. The state recently changed alternate assessments from MSAA to DLM for multiple reasons including the provision of increasingly intensive instructional resources for special education. Furthermore, the SPDG will be expanded this year to add a third cohort. The current SPDG is focused on ensuring students with complex needs and significant cognitive disabilities have equitable access to standards-aligned instruction. The SPDG sustainability plan will further expand and extend the work to additional LEAs, middle schools, and elementary schools.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	523	942	59.81%	57.82%	55.52%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	568	1,067	55.63%	60.08%	53.23%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	632	1,079	57.46%	65.34%	58.57%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

In 2023, the proficiency rate for children with IEPs on the alternate math assessment in grade 8 decreased in 55 LEAs when compared to the previous year. Among the LEAs that decreased their proficiency, the rate decreased by an average of 29.2%. At the same time, 38 LEAs increased their proficiency in grade 8 math by an average of 33.5%. The department has been working with LEAs statewide to ensure only the students who meet alternate assessment criteria are participating in the alternate assessment. The department has provided explicit guidance and ongoing technical assistance to IEP teams to ensure the appropriate students are assigned to the alternative assessment. Following this guidance, IEP teams have identified students who previously took the alternative assessment and scored at or above proficiency level to recommend them for the grade-level TCAP assessment with appropriate accommodations. In response to the slippage, the department will intensify the TA and PD supports for LEAs that have experienced slippage in reading or mathematics. The state recently changed alternate assessments from MSAA to DLM for multiple reasons including the provision of increasingly intensive instructional resources for special education. Furthermore, the state personnel development grant (SPDG) will be expanded this year to add a third cohort. The current SPDG is focused on ensuring students with complex needs and significant cognitive disabilities have equitable access to standards-aligned instruction. The SPDG sustainability plan will further expand and extend the work to additional LEAs, middle schools, and elementary schools.

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

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

Assessment data for all students, including students with disabilities, can be found under the "Assessment Files" tab on the department's "Data Downloads and Requests" website: https://www.tn.gov/education/districts/federal-programs-and-oversight/data/data-downloads.html. Additional assessment data, including participation and achievement data for SWDs on assessments, can be found under the "Students with Disabilities Participation/Performance on Assessments" tab on the department's "Special Education Data Services & Reports" website: https://www.tn.gov/education/families/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. The direct link to FFY 2022 data for SWDs participation and performance on assessments can be found here: https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/data/swd_participation_performance_assessment_2022-23.xlsx.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

> A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

> B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

> C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

> D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED*Facts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	24.08
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	20.78
Reading	C	Grade HS	2021	33.81
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	22.02
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	23.71
Math	C	Grade HS	2021	18.04

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	23.08	22.58	22.08	21.58
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	19.78	19.28	18.78	18.28
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	33.31	32.81	32.31	31.81
Math	A <=	Grade 4	21.02	20.52	20.02	19.52
Math	B <=	Grade 8	22.71	22.21	21.71	21.21
Math	C <=	Grade HS	17.54	17.04	16.54	16.04

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. The AC typically meets quarterly during each FFY in July, October, January, and April. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes, providing information over the last two FFYs regarding Tennessee's APR state determination, APR target setting, and new APR local determinations resources available to LEAs. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity

to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

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 regional special education supervisor study council meetings (East, Central, and West). At these meetings, data from the APR (including Indicator 17 formative milestones and outcomes) and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families. For example, the department hosts monthly listening sessions with representatives from statewide advocacy groups where they can ask questions about policies, rules, or practice trends, as well as share issues from the field. These listening sessions include legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The Arc Tennessee. For more information on the specific activities and/or strategies used to engage and increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents, please see the "Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities" section below.

Although there were no substantive revisions to FFY 2022 baselines and/or targets, the department made concerted efforts prior to the FFY 2020 APR submission to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/families/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Furthermore, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets. This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

The department has continued to engage stakeholders and solicit their feedback during the implementation of the SSIP. Various stakeholders have received information on the work through a variety of methods. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. Partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. Statewide data are also communicated within the SEA, via social media, on the project's website, and through an internal data dashboard. The success of the SSIP is contingent upon not only the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. The department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	71,726	70,420	144,432
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	9,689	6,952	13,410
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	29,927	18,352	59,412
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,461	441	2,171
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	850	82	321
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	467	101	752

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	71,814	70,370	198,517
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	9,702	6,942	17,215
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	29,774	26,374	43,897
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,725	964	1,503
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	966	180	200
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	562	325	421

(1)The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	13.59%	43.76%	27.83	23.08	30.17	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	2.63%	26.69%	23.00	19.78	24.05	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	8.00%	42.64%	33.81	33.31	34.64	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

In 2023, the gap in proficiency rate for children with IEPs and all students on the statewide ELA assessment in grade 4 decreased in 51 LEAs when compared to the previous year. Among the LEAs that decreased their achievement gap, the gap decreased by an average of 7.4%. However, at the same time, 88 LEAs increased their achievement gap in grade 4 ELA by an average of 8.7%. The LEAs in which achievement gaps increased also tended to be larger, testing an average of 582 grade 4 students as opposed to an average of 365 grade 4 students among the LEAs that decreased their achievement gaps. Additionally, in almost half of the LEAs in which achievement gaps increased, the overall grade 4 ELA proficiency rate for students with IEPs also increased; it simply did not increase as much as the rate of all students in the LEA. In response to the slippage, the department will intensify the TA and PD supports for LEAs that have experienced slippage in reading or mathematics. This increased tier of support aims to ensure SWDs across all grades have access to high-quality Tier I instruction and materials that will improve educational experiences and outcomes. The tiered supports will build on and scale out the successes of the Access for All Learning Network (AALN) that are described in the SSIP below.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

In 2023, the gap in proficiency rate for children with IEPs and all students on the statewide ELA assessment in grade 8 decreased in 54 LEAs when compared to the previous year. Among the LEAs that decreased their achievement gap, the gap decreased by an average of 5.6%. However, at the same time, 82 LEAs increased their achievement gap in grade 8 ELA by an average of 5.2%. Additionally, in 15% of the LEAs in which achievement gaps increased, the overall grade 8 ELA proficiency rate for students with IEPs also increased; it simply did not increase as much as the rate of all students in the LEA. In response to the slippage, the department will intensify the TA and PD supports for LEAs who have experienced slippage in reading or mathematics. This increased tier of support aims to ensure SWDs across all grades have access to high-quality Tier I instruction and materials that will improve educational experiences and outcomes. The tiered supports will build on and scale out the successes of the Access for All Learning Network (AALN) that are described in the SSIP below.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	15.75%	43.86%	24.72	21.02	28.11	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	7.27%	38.85%	27.82	22.71	31.57	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	3.61%	22.87%	18.04	17.54	19.26	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

In 2023, the gap in proficiency rate for children with IEPs and all students on the statewide math assessment in grade 4 decreased in 52 LEAs when compared to the previous year. Among the LEAs that decreased their achievement gap, the gap decreased by an average of 7.1%. However, at the same time, 88 LEAs increased their achievement gap in grade 4 math by an average of 10.2%. The LEAs in which achievement gaps increased also tended to be larger, testing an average of 557 grade 4 students as opposed to an average of 400 grade 4 students among the LEAs that decreased their achievement gaps. Additionally, in approximately one third of the LEAs in which achievement gaps increased, the overall grade 4 math proficiency rate for students with IEPs also increased; it simply did not increase as much as the rate of all students in the LEA. In response to the slippage, the department will intensify the TA and PD supports for LEAs who have experienced slippage in reading or mathematics. This increased tier of support aims to ensure SWDs across all grades have access to high-quality Tier I instruction and materials that will improve educational experiences and outcomes. The tiered supports will build on and scale out the successes of the Access for All Learning Network (AALN) that are described in the SSIP below.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

In 2023, the gap in proficiency rate for children with IEPs and all students on the statewide math assessment in grade 8 decreased in 32 LEAs when compared to the previous year. Among the LEAs that decreased their achievement gap, the gap decreased by an average of 5.9%. However, at the same time, 103 LEAs increased their achievement gap in grade 8 math by an average of 9.2%. The LEAs in which achievement gaps increased also tended to be larger, testing an average of 555 grade 8 students as opposed to an average of 205 grade 8 students among the LEAs that decreased their achievement gaps. Additionally, in approximately one third of the LEAs in which achievement gaps increased, the overall grade 8 math proficiency rate for students with IEPs also increased; it simply did not increase as much as the rate of all students in the LEA. In response to the slippage, the department will intensify the TA and PD supports for LEAs who have experienced slippage in reading or mathematics. This increased tier of support aims to ensure SWDs across all grades have access to high-quality Tier I instruction and materials that will improve educational experiences and outcomes. The tiered supports will build on and scale out the successes of the Access for All Learning Network (AALN) that are described in the SSIP below.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

In 2023, the gap in proficiency rate for children with IEPs and all students on the statewide math assessment in HS decreased in 52 LEAs when compared to the previous year. Among the LEAs that decreased their achievement gap, the gap decreased by an average of 2.1%. However, at the same time, 77 LEAs increased their achievement gap in HS math by an average of 3.9%. The LEAs in which achievement gaps increased also tended to be larger, testing an average of 2,002 HS students as opposed to an average of 790 HS students among the LEAs that decreased their achievement gaps. Additionally, in approximately one third of the LEAs in which achievement gaps increased, the overall HS math proficiency rate for students with IEPs also increased; it simply did not increase as much as the rate of all students in the LEA. In response to the slippage, the department will intensify the TA and PD supports for LEAs who have experienced slippage in reading or mathematics. This increased tier of support aims to ensure SWDs across all grades have access to high-quality Tier I instruction and materials that will improve educational experiences and outcomes. The tiered supports will build on and scale out the successes of the Access for All Learning Network (AALN) that are described in the SSIP below.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs.

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon LEAs that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	20.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	1.80%	8.00%	8.00%	17.19%	14.38%
Data	20.00%	26.32%	20.83%	71.43%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	11.57%	8.76%	5.95%	3.14%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. The AC typically meets quarterly during each FFY in July, October, January, and April. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes, providing information over the last two FFYs regarding Tennessee's APR state determination, APR target setting, and new APR local determinations resources available to LEAs. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

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 regional special education supervisor study council meetings (East, Central, and West). At these meetings, data from the APR (including Indicator 17 formative milestones and outcomes) and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families. For example, the department hosts monthly listening sessions with representatives from statewide advocacy groups where they can ask questions about policies, rules, or practice trends, as well as share issues from the field. These listening sessions include legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The Arc Tennessee. For more information on the specific activities and/or strategies used to engage and increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents, please see the "Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities" section below.

Although there were no substantive revisions to FFY 2022 baselines and/or targets, the department made concerted efforts prior to the FFY 2020 APR submission to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/families/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Furthermore, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets. This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

The department has continued to engage stakeholders and solicit their feedback during the implementation of the SSIP. Various stakeholders have received information on the work through a variety of methods. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. Partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. Statewide data are also communicated within the SEA, via social media, on the project's website, and through an internal data dashboard. The success of the SSIP is contingent upon not only the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. The department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

134

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
3	13	100.00%	11.57%	23.08%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The department utilizes a rate ratio calculation methodology for each LEA in the state that meets "n" size requirements. In this calculation, the number of SWDs suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days is divided by the total number of SWDs within that LEA. This suspension/expulsion rate is then divided by the statewide average (number of SWDs, ages 3-21, suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days divided by the total number of SWDs, ages 3-21, in the LEA). The quotient of this calculation is the rate ratio. To be identified with a significant discrepancy for Indicator 4A, the rate ratio for an LEA must be 2.0 or greater and the LEA must meet the "n" size requirement for students suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days, which is a minimum of 5 students.

In FFY 2022 (based on discipline data from FFY 2021/2021-22 school year), the department included 8.8% of LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. This lower percentage is the direct result of the COVID-19 pandemic and a decrease in the total number of discipline incidents recorded. In the four years prior to the pandemic (FFY 2016 through FFY 2019), the percentage of districts meeting the minimum n/cell size for inclusion in 4A ranged from 13.0% to 17.1%. During the pandemic, the percentage of districts meeting the minimum n/cell size hit a low of 3.4% in FFY 2021 and has since rebounded to 8.8% in FFY 2022. Likewise, the total number of SWDs suspended or expelled for more than 10 days ranged from 904 to 1054 SWDs in the four years prior to the pandemic. After hitting a low of just 84 SWDs suspended or expelled for more than 10 days in FFY 2021, the total has increased substantially to 740 SWDs in FFY 2022.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Once the department compares the discrepancy rates of all LEAs, those identified with a significant discrepancy (have a rate ratio of 2.0 or greater AND have an "n" size of 5 or more SWDs suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days) 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. The review includes LEA policies, education information system data entry verification, general procedures for disciplinary removals, analysis of suspension data by special education status or race/ ethnicity, IEP reviews, positive behavior supports and interventions implemented district and school wide, student specific behavior intervention considerations and implementation, and manifestation determination reviews. The LEA was required to provide a description of its LEA practices and attach supporting documents as evidence. Examples of items required included a description of the LEA plan for creating positive school climate, staff training, its process for preventing and/or reducing inappropriate behavior in schools, its process for determining when and how to develop individual behavior intervention plans, and LEA in-school and out-of-school suspension policies. Individual student file reviews also were conducted to track removal from classrooms, whether LEA policies were appropriately followed, whether manifestation determination reviews occurred if appropriate, and if required whether functional behavior assessments were completed.

The information provided by each LEA identified with a significant discrepancy was reviewed by the SEA. LEAs that did not have adequate policies, procedures, or practices in place were found to be non-compliant and were required to revise these policies, procedures, or 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 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:

The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

LEAs were notified of noncompliance in writing with their local determinations. The SEA conducted phone conferences and site visits to assist with the development of LEA plans and ensure that necessary revisions to LEA policies, procedures, and practices were completed within one calendar year of notification. However, due to changes in the APR local determinations timeline and accompanying deadlines for correction of noncompliance, the SEA is not able to verify at the time of final SPP/APR submission whether LEAs have completed their required revisions. The SEA will verify adequate corrections of noncompliance and report on revised policies, procedures, and practices in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR. Furthermore, the SEA is in the process of revising its timeline for notification and correction of noncompliance so that it can ensure all corrections of noncompliance are completed prior to initial APR submission.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
5	5	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

LEAs submitted revised policies, practices, and procedures, as well as evidence of training and communication of changes for SEA review and verification of implementation/revisions. Furthermore, the SEA reviewed updated discipline data in the fall of 2023 for the five LEAs with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 (based on discipline data from FFY 2020/2020-21 school year). Using FFY 2023 discipline data (i.e., data from the 2022-23 school year), approximately 10 discipline records of SWDs suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days were randomly pulled for each LEA. After reviewing these records and all relevant data available within the statewide IEP data management system (TN PULSE), SEA reviewers found that all five LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

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

The SEA reviewed all individual cases of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 (based on discipline data from FFY 2020/2020-21 school year) and verified that all children who are still active and within the jurisdiction of the LEA are in compliance. In addition, the SEA examined records within the statewide IEP data management system (TN PULSE) with consideration given to whether compensatory services were needed as a result of

noncompliance with Indicator 4A. Records were examined related to any subsequent manifestation determinations, discipline incidents, restraints, or isolations, as well as current IEP supports, functional behavior assessments (FBAs) completed, behavior intervention plan (BIPs) in place, and attendance at home school or alternate placement. The SEA determined that none of these SWDs were denied free and appropriate public education (FAPE), which did not result in a need for compensatory services.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2020	1	1	0

FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The one LEA with findings of noncompliance identified prior to FFY 2021 that was not yet verified as corrected in FFY 2021 submitted revised policies, practices, and procedures, as well as evidence of training and communication of changes for SEA review and verification of implementation/revisions. The LEA also participated in additional required trainings as a result of the SEA not being able to verify correction of findings of noncompliance prior to FFY 2021. Furthermore, the SEA reviewed updated discipline data in the fall of 2023 for the one LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 (based on discipline data from FFY 2019/2019-20 school year). Using FFY 2023 discipline data (i.e., data from the 2022-23 school year), up to 10 discipline records of SWDs suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days were randomly pulled for this LEA. After reviewing these records and all relevant data available within the statewide IEP data management system (TN PULSE), SEA reviewers found the one LEA to be in compliance and the LEA correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

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

The SEA reviewed all individual cases of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 (based on discipline data from FFY 2019/2019-20 school year) and verified that all children who are still active and within the jurisdiction of the LEA are in compliance. In addition, the SEA examined records within the statewide IEP data management system (TN PULSE) with consideration given to whether compensatory services were needed as a result of noncompliance with Indicator 4A. Records were examined related to any subsequent manifestation determinations, discipline incidents, restraints, or isolations, as well as current IEP supports, FBAs completed, behavior BIPs in place, and attendance at home school or alternate placement. The SEA determined that none of these SWDs were denied FAPE, which did not result in a need for compensatory services.

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State's LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State's chosen methodology.

The State did not report that noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b) was corrected. When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that the district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Please refer to the "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021" and the "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021" sections in the Indicator Data description.

4A - OSEP Response

OSEP's Required Actions in response to the State's FFY 2021 SPP/APR required the State to explain, in its FFY 2022 SPP/APR, how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. OSEP appreciates the State reviewed its methodology to determine if it is reasonably designed. However, OSEP notes that the State's methodology included a very low percentage of the State's LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.

4A - Required Actions

The State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2022 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each district with noncompliance identified by the State: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

> A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

> B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

> --The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

> --The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	Not Valid and Reliable	23.53%	21.05%	71.43%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

136

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
6	6	11	100.00%	0%	54.55%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The department utilizes a rate ratio calculation methodology for each LEA in the state that meets "n" size requirements. In this calculation, the number of SWDs suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days in a specific racial/ethnic group is divided by the total number of SWDs within that LEA in the same specific racial/ethnic group. This suspension/expulsion rate is then divided by the statewide average (number of SWDs, ages 3-21, suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days divided by the total number of SWDs, ages 3-21, in the LEA). The quotient of this calculation is the rate ratio. To be identified with a significant discrepancy for Indicator 4B, the rate ratio for an LEA must be 2.0 or greater and the LEA must meet the "n" size requirement for students suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days in a specific racial/ethnic group, which is a minimum of 5 students.

In FFY 2022 (based on discipline data from FFY 2021/2021-22 school year), the department included 7.5% of LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. This lower percentage is the direct result of the COVID-19 pandemic and a decrease in the total number of discipline incidents recorded. In the four years prior to the pandemic (FFY 2016 through FFY 2019), the percentage of districts meeting the minimum n/cell size for inclusion in 4B ranged from 11.6% to 13.0%. During the pandemic, the percentage of districts meeting the minimum n/cell size hit a low of 0.7% in FFY 2021 and has since rebounded to 7.5% in FFY 2022. Likewise, the total number of SWDs suspended or expelled for more than 10 days ranged from 904 to 1054 SWDs in the four years prior to the pandemic. After hitting a low of just 84 SWDs suspended or expelled for more than 10 days in FFY 2021, the total has increased substantially to 740 SWDs in FFY 2022.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Once the department compares the discrepancy rates of all LEAs, those identified with a significant discrepancy (have a rate ratio of 2.0 or greater AND have an "n" size of 5 or more SWDs suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days in a specific racial/ethnic group) 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. The review includes LEA policies, education information system data entry verification, general procedures for disciplinary removals, analysis of suspension data by special education status or race/ ethnicity, IEP reviews, positive behavior supports and interventions implemented district and school wide, student specific behavior intervention considerations and implementation, and manifestation determination reviews. The LEA was required to provide a description of its LEA practices and attach supporting documents as evidence. Examples of items required included a description of the LEA plan for creating positive school climate, staff training, its process for preventing and/or reducing inappropriate behavior in schools, its process for determining when and how to develop individual behavior intervention plans, and LEA in-school and out-of-school suspension policies. Individual student file reviews also were conducted to track removal from classrooms, whether LEA policies were appropriately followed, whether manifestation determination reviews occurred if appropriate, and if required whether functional behavior assessments were completed.

The information provided by each LEA identified with a significant discrepancy was reviewed by the SEA. LEAs that did not have adequate policies, procedures, or practices in place were found to be non-compliant and were required to revise these policies, procedures, or 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 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:

The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

LEAs were notified of noncompliance in writing with their local determinations. The SEA conducted phone conferences and site visits to assist with the development of LEA plans and ensure that necessary revisions to LEA policies, procedures, and practices were completed within one calendar year of notification. However, due to changes in the APR local determinations timeline and accompanying deadlines for correction of noncompliance, the SEA is not able to verify at the time of final SPP/APR submission whether LEAs have completed their required revisions. The SEA will verify adequate corrections of noncompliance and report on revised policies, procedures, and practices in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR. Furthermore, the SEA is in the process of revising its timeline for notification and correction of noncompliance so that it can ensure all corrections of noncompliance are completed prior to initial APR submission.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

One LEA submitted revised policies, practices, and procedures, as well as evidence of training and communication of changes for SEA review and verification of implementation/revisions. Furthermore, the SEA reviewed updated discipline data in the fall of 2023 for the one LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 (based on discipline data from FFY 2020/2020-21 school year). Using FFY 2023 discipline data (i.e., data from the 2022-23 school year), approximately 10 discipline records of SWDs suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days were randomly pulled for the LEA. After reviewing these records and all relevant data available within the statewide IEP data management system (TN PULSE), SEA reviewers found the one LEA to be in compliance and correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

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

The SEA reviewed all individual cases of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 (based on discipline data from FFY 2020/2020-21 school year) and verified that all children who are still active and within the jurisdiction of the LEA are in compliance. In addition, the SEA examined records within the statewide IEP data management system (TN PULSE) with consideration given to whether compensatory services were needed as a result of noncompliance with Indicator 4B. Records were examined related to any subsequent manifestation determinations, discipline incidents, restraints, or isolations, as well as current IEP supports, FBAs completed, behavior BIPs in place, and attendance at home school or alternate placement. The SEA determined that none of these SWDs were denied FAPE, which did not result in a need for compensatory services.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies, by race and ethnicity, are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the

State's LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State's chosen methodology.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the district identified with noncompliance in FFY 2021 has corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that the district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data, such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Please refer to the "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021" section in the Indicator Data description.

4B - OSEP Response

OSEP's Required Actions in response to the State's FFY 2021 SPP/APR required the State to explain, in its FFY 2022 SPP/APR, how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies, by race or ethnicity, are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. OSEP appreciates the State reviewed its methodology to determine if it is reasonably designed. However, OSEP notes that the State's methodology included a very low percentage of the State's LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. Additionally, OSEP recognizes the State reported, "In FFY 2022 (based on discipline data from FFY 2021/2021-22 school year), the department included 7.5% of LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. This lower percentage is the direct result of the COVID-19 pandemic and a decrease in the total number of discipline incidents recorded."

4B- Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2022 have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data, such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 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))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS002.

Measurement

> A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
>
> B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
>
> C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)]times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2020	Target >=	73.50%	70.00%	70.00%	72.64%	73.78%
A	72.64%	Data	69.69%	70.88%	71.91%	72.64%	72.90%
B	2020	Target <=	11.10%	10.85%	10.85%	11.25%	11.07%
B	11.25%	Data	11.49%	11.38%	11.27%	11.25%	11.28%
C	2020	Target <=	1.30%	1.77%	1.77%	1.37%	1.19%
C	1.37%	Data	1.81%	1.61%	1.49%	1.37%	1.49%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	74.92%	76.06%	77.20%	78.34%
Target B <=	10.89%	10.71%	10.53%	10.35%
Target C <=	1.01%	0.83%	0.55%	0.37%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. The AC typically meets quarterly during each FFY in July, October, January, and April. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes, providing information over the last two FFYs regarding Tennessee's APR state determination, APR target setting, and new APR local determinations resources available to LEAs. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

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 regional special education supervisor study council meetings (East, Central, and West). At these meetings, data from the APR (including Indicator 17 formative milestones and outcomes) and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly,

supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families. For example, the department hosts monthly listening sessions with representatives from statewide advocacy groups where they can ask questions about policies, rules, or practice trends, as well as share issues from the field. These listening sessions include legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The Arc Tennessee. For more information on the specific activities and/or strategies used to engage and increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents, please see the "Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities" section below.

Although there were no substantive revisions to FFY 2022 baselines and/or targets, the department made concerted efforts prior to the FFY 2020 APR submission to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/families/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Furthermore, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets. This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

The department has continued to engage stakeholders and solicit their feedback during the implementation of the SSIP. Various stakeholders have received information on the work through a variety of methods. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. Partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. Statewide data are also communicated within the SEA, via social media, on the project's website, and through an internal data dashboard. The success of the SSIP is contingent upon not only the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. The department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	122,046
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	89,773
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	13,720
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	716
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	164
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	738

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.
NO

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	89,773	122,046	72.90%	74.92%	73.56%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	13,720	122,046	11.28%	10.89%	11.24%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,618	122,046	1.49%	1.01%	1.33%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program 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.

C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS089.

Measurement

A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (*e.g.*, 75-85%).

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data (Inclusive) – 6A, 6B, 6C

Part	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	Target >=	34.00%	38.00%	42.00%	32.39%	36.20%
A	Data	24.27%	26.58%	34.04%	32.39%	38.84%
B	Target <=	24.00%	29.00%	28.00%	39.53%	36.08%
B	Data	33.73%	32.42%	31.80%	39.53%	32.52%
C	Target <=				0.00%-0.48%	0.00%-0.48%
C	Data				0.48%	0.64%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. The AC typically meets quarterly during each FFY in July, October, January, and April. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes, providing information over the last two FFYs regarding Tennessee's APR state determination, APR target setting, and new APR local determinations resources available to LEAs. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

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 regional special education supervisor study council meetings (East, Central, and West). At these meetings, data from the APR (including Indicator 17 formative milestones and outcomes) and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families. For example, the department hosts monthly listening sessions with representatives from statewide advocacy groups where they can ask questions about policies, rules, or practice trends, as well as share issues from the field. These listening sessions include legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The Arc Tennessee. For more information on the specific activities and/or strategies used to engage and increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents, please see the "Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities" section below.

Although there were no substantive revisions to FFY 2022 baselines and/or targets, the department made concerted efforts prior to the FFY 2020 APR submission to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/families/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Furthermore, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets. This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

The department has continued to engage stakeholders and solicit their feedback during the implementation of the SSIP. Various stakeholders have received information on the work through a variety of methods. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. Partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. Statewide data are also communicated within the SEA, via social media, on the project's website, and through an internal data dashboard. The success of the SSIP is contingent upon not only the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. The department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content.

Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range is used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2020	32.39%
B	2020	39.53%
C	2020	0.48%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	40.01%	42.55%	43.82%	45.09%
Target B <=	32.63%	30.33%	29.18%	28.03%

Inclusive Targets (with Target Ranges) – 6C

FFY	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target C <=	0.00%	0.48%	0.00%	0.48%	0.00%	0.48%	0.00%	0.47%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

08/30/2023

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	3,497	4,735	2,061	10,293
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	1,066	2,022	944	4,032
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	1,488	1,377	551	3,416
b2. Number of children attending separate school	17	21	18	56
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	64	22	10	96

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	4,032	10,293	38.84%	40.01%	39.17%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	3,472	10,293	32.52%	32.63%	33.73%	Did not meet target	Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target(low)	FFY 2022 Target(high)	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C. Home	96	10,293	0.64%	0.00%	0.48%	0.93%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B aged 3 through 5, if applicable

The state's preschool enrollment has increased by 14.88%. Although LEAs have improved the provision of integrated IEP services to children who are enrolled in regular early childhood programs (RECPs), the Indicator 6B slippage has occurred because LEAs have not added regular education options at a rate commensurate to the significant increase in enrollment. As a result, children were placed in more restrictive settings. In addition, the LEAs' ability to create new RECP classrooms has been impacted by teacher and related service provider shortages. LEAs experienced 43 preschool lead teacher vacancies in FFY 2022 (2022-23 school year), potentially affecting up to roughly 8.5% of the preschool student population.

To support the equitable and appropriate placement of preschool children, the IDEA APR Support Team has collaborated with LEAs to identify root causes and develop strategies to increase integrated services in the RECP while decreasing the number of children receiving services in a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility. Furthermore, the department's Early Childhood Special Education division has provided LEAs with preschool grant opportunities to fund additional regular education options. The department has also encouraged LEAs to increase collaboration with community programs and to develop an inclusive culture and mindset that can support the provision of integrated IEP services.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C aged 3 through 5, if applicable

The observed increase of 0.29% for preschool children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 receiving special education and related services in the home is not attributable to any major shift in the disability categories of students placed in those environments. The majority of disability categories in those environments continues to be Autism, Developmental Delay, Multiple Disabilities, and Speech or Language Impairments, as in previous years. The slippage is also not attributable to a major shift in the demographics (race, gender, & ELL status) of students receiving services at home. In addition, a large portion of the increase is attributable to a single LEA. The IDEA APR Support Team is working closely with this LEA to ensure it has appropriate processes and procedures in place around preschool placement.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

      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.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

      a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
      b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
      c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
      d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
      e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three Outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A1	2009	Target >=	92.94%	93.00%	93.06%	91.70%	91.70%
A1	91.70%	Data	90.10%	89.23%	90.05%	89.76%	90.49%

A2	2009	Target >=	60.40%	60.00%	60.30%	57.81%	58.22%
A2	57.40%	Data	58.55%	57.50%	57.82%	55.45%	54.73%
B1	2009	Target >=	90.74%	89.50%	89.80%	89.74%	89.98%
B1	89.50%	Data	88.32%	89.47%	89.39%	88.43%	89.91%
B2	2009	Target >=	59.40%	57.00%	57.30%	56.19%	56.68%
B2	55.70%	Data	55.49%	54.75%	56.35%	53.68%	53.83%
C1	2009	Target >=	93.80%	93.90%	94.00%	92.60%	92.60%
C1	92.60%	Data	90.27%	90.14%	90.49%	89.62%	90.99%
C2	2009	Target >=	70.60%	69.00%	69.30%	68.00%	68.67%
C2	68.00%	Data	68.80%	66.23%	67.06%	64.44%	64.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	91.70%	91.98%	92.25%	92.53%
Target A2 >=	58.63%	59.04%	59.45%	59.86%
Target B1 >=	90.22%	90.46%	90.70%	90.94%
Target B2 >=	57.17%	57.66%	58.15%	58.64%
Target C1 >=	92.60%	92.60%	92.60%	92.81%
Target C2 >=	69.34%	70.01%	70.68%	71.35%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. The AC typically meets quarterly during each FFY in July, October, January, and April. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes, providing information over the last two FFYs regarding Tennessee's APR state determination, APR target setting, and new APR local determinations resources available to LEAs. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

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 regional special education supervisor study council meetings (East, Central, and West). At these meetings, data from the APR (including Indicator 17 formative milestones and outcomes) and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families. For example, the department hosts monthly listening sessions with representatives from statewide advocacy groups where they can ask questions about policies, rules, or practice trends, as well as share issues from the field. These listening sessions include legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The Arc Tennessee. For more information on the specific activities and/or strategies used to engage and increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents, please see the "Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities" section below.

Although there were no substantive revisions to FFY 2022 baselines and/or targets, the department made concerted efforts prior to the FFY 2020 APR submission to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/families/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Furthermore, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets. This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

The department has continued to engage stakeholders and solicit their feedback during the implementation of the SSIP. Various stakeholders have received information on the work through a variety of methods. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. Partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. Statewide data are also communicated within the SEA, via social media, on the project's website, and through an internal data dashboard. The success of the SSIP is contingent upon not only the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. The department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

7,161

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	80	1.12%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	519	7.25%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,885	40.31%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,761	38.58%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	912	12.74%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*	5,646	6,245	90.49%	91.70%	90.41%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*	3,673	7,157	54.73%	58.63%	51.32%	Did not meet target	Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	65	0.91%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	523	7.31%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,868	40.11%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,868	40.11%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	827	11.56%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age	5,736	6,324	89.91%	90.22%	90.70%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
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. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*							
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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*	3,695	7,151	53.83%	57.17%	51.67%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	63	0.88%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	447	6.25%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,280	31.90%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,119	43.64%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,238	17.32%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*	5,399	5,909	90.99%	92.60%	91.37%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*	4,357	7,147	64.00%	69.34%	60.96%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A2	For preschool children, the continued impact of missed opportunities due to COVID-19 remained throughout FFY 2022 (2022-23 school year). Many LEAs reported increased behavior challenges from children not having consistently accessed settings and peer interactions outside of the home. In addition, LEAs experienced 43 preschool lead teacher vacancies in FFY 2022 (2022-23 school year). The shortage of appropriately endorsed teachers and related service providers negatively impacted the ability of LEAs to improve preschool outcomes. As a result, the department has modified its Indicator 7 rating and training practices and provided targeted PD for preschool staff in 81 districts. The purpose of these changes is to strengthen preschool data practices to collect more valid data that accurately reflects preschool students' actual progress. LEAs have taken action to increase regular early childhood placements and integrated IEP services. The APR Support team will continue to work with LEAs to improve data quality and ensure that preschool staff are trained to determine and accurately enter ECO ratings.
B2	For preschool children, the continued impact of missed opportunities due to COVID-19 remained throughout FFY 2022 (2022-23 school year). Many LEAs reported increased behavior challenges from children not having consistently accessed settings and peer interactions

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	outside of the home. In addition, LEAs experienced 43 preschool lead teacher vacancies in FFY 2022 (2022-23 school year). The shortage of appropriately endorsed teachers and related service providers negatively impacted the ability of LEAs to improve preschool outcomes. As a result, the department has modified its Indicator 7 rating and training practices and provided targeted PD for preschool staff in 81 districts. The purpose of these changes is to strengthen preschool data practices to collect more valid data that accurately reflects preschool students' actual progress. LEAs have taken action to increase regular early childhood placements and integrated IEP services. The APR Support team will continue to work with LEAs to improve data quality and ensure that preschool staff are trained to determine and accurately enter ECO ratings.
C2	For preschool children, the continued impact of missed opportunities due to COVID-19 remained throughout FFY 2022 (2022-23 school year). Many LEAs reported increased behavior challenges from children not having consistently accessed settings and peer interactions outside of the home. In addition, LEAs experienced 43 preschool lead teacher vacancies in FFY 2022 (2022-23 school year). The shortage of appropriately endorsed teachers and related service providers negatively impacted the ability of LEAs to improve preschool outcomes. As a result, the department has modified its Indicator 7 rating and training practices and provided targeted PD for preschool staff in 81 districts. The purpose of these changes is to strengthen preschool data practices to collect more valid data that accurately reflects preschool students' actual progress. LEAs have taken action to increase regular early childhood placements and integrated IEP services. The APR Support team will continue to work with LEAs to improve data quality and ensure that preschool staff are trained to determine and accurately enter ECO ratings.

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

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

To gather the initial data informing the results of this indicator, LEAs use the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF) to address performance in each of the three outcomes areas (social-emotional skills, acquisition of knowledge and skills, and use of appropriate behaviors). This form is augmented and supplemented with the use of qualitative data, including information from families and IFSP/IEP team input and/or observations. Quantitative data is also collected to inform the data in this indicator, including data from one or more assessment tool(s) that are norm-referenced, curriculum-based, and criterion-referenced. The department provides support to LEAs regarding the use of these tools and appropriate data collection processes.

Once this information is complete and a rating is selected for one of the three areas assessed in this indicator, LEAs are responsible for inputting the ratings into the statewide IEP data management system (TN PULSE) so that the information can be pulled in various reports for analysis. It is from this data source that the ratings for students are gathered and processed for this indicator. The aggregate level data for all LEAs are input into an Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA)-developed tool that employs various logic checks to clean the data. Logic checks include ensuring that outcome data are listed for all three areas, that entrance and exit data are tracked, etc. The tool employs the ratings outlined in the COSF to determine growth. If data (i.e., ratings) are missing for any of the three outcome areas, a progress category is not assigned and the child is excluded from the numerator and denominator of the outcome summary statement calculations. This can result in a discrepancy among the total number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed and the denominator counts preschool children aged 3 through 5 who were functioning within age expectations in each outcome area. In FFY 2022, missing data/ratings accounted for the discrepancy between 7161 total preschool children assessed, 7157 as the denominator in outcome A, 7151 as the denominator in outcome B, and 7147 as the denominator in outcome C.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, the State must explain any discrepancies between the FFY 2022 total number assessed and the FFY 2022 denominator in its calculation of the percent of preschoolers aged 3 through 5 who were functioning within age expectations in each outcome area by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

As stated in the "List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator" section, the tool employs the ratings outlined in the COSF to determine growth. If data (i.e., ratings) are missing for any of the three outcome areas, a progress category is not assigned and the child is excluded from the numerator and denominator of the outcome summary statement calculations. This can result in a discrepancy among the total number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed and the denominator counts preschool children aged 3 through 5 who were functioning within age expectations in each outcome area. In FFY 2022, missing data/ratings accounted for the discrepancy between 7161 total preschool children assessed, 7157 as the denominator in outcome A, 7151 as the denominator in outcome B, and 7147 as the denominator in outcome C.

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Instructions

*Sampling **of parents from whom response is requested** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross-section of parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. The AC typically meets quarterly during each FFY in July, October, January, and April. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes, providing information over the last two FFYs regarding Tennessee's APR state determination, APR target setting, and new APR local determinations resources available to LEAs. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

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 regional special education supervisor study council meetings (East, Central, and West). At these meetings, data from the APR (including Indicator 17 formative milestones and outcomes) and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families. For example, the department hosts monthly listening sessions with representatives from statewide advocacy groups where they can ask questions about policies, rules, or practice trends, as well as share issues from the field. These listening sessions include legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The Arc Tennessee. For more information on the specific activities and/or strategies used to engage and increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents, please see the "Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities" section below.

Although there were no substantive revisions to FFY 2022 baselines and/or targets, the department made concerted efforts prior to the FFY 2020 APR

submission to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/families/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Furthermore, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets. This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

The department has continued to engage stakeholders and solicit their feedback during the implementation of the SSIP. Various stakeholders have received information on the work through a variety of methods. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. Partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. Statewide data are also communicated within the SEA, via social media, on the project's website, and through an internal data dashboard. The success of the SSIP is contingent upon not only the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. The department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	77.40%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	93.75%	94.00%	94.25%	83.35%	89.30%
Data	89.48%	91.33%	77.40%	88.30%	84.25%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	90.04%	90.78%	91.52%	92.26%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
5,512	6,435	84.25%	90.04%	85.66%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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 preschool students are identical to those disseminated to school age students. As well, the surveys collected for preschool students are analyzed and collated under the same methodology employed for school age students. Thus, the validity and reliability for those in preschool 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, survey data was disaggregated by grade level and it was found that surveys were disseminated to 855 P3 (three year old students in preschool) students with 241 responses from the family and 1,467 P4 (four year old students in preschool) students with 361 responses from the family.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.
31,939
Percentage of respondent parents
20.15%

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	20.09%	20.15%

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

The metric used to determine representativeness, from the NPSO, compares the respondent pool of children for whom parents responded against the demographics of children receiving special education services across the state (i.e., the target group). 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. Cells in the difference row that are greater than +/- 3%, indicate that the respondent group over or underrepresents the entire group of targeted respondents.

Chi-square tests confirmed that there was no statistically significant difference between the proportion of respondents and the proportion in the total population of students with an intellectual disability as well as students who are female, Native American, Pacific Islander, or Hispanic. For all other student groups, the difference in representativeness was statistically significant.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

During FFY 2022 school year, the Parent Survey was administered to all parents of SWDs ages 3 through 21 in 41 LEAs selected through the OSEP-approved sampling process. Tennessee's three largest LEAs participate in this survey each year with different schools, representative of the LEA as a whole, sampled every year. A total of 31,939 surveys were distributed to parents. There were 6,530 survey responses with usable data for a response rate of 20.45%. Note that this response rate is different from the one in the above data table (response rate calculated was 20.15%). This disparity is due to differences in responses to each question in the survey. Tennessee employs a 10-question survey, and while item one on the survey addresses parental involvement pertinent to this indicator, responses to this question are sometimes omitted by respondents. The data table above only captures the number of responses to this first question, divided by all the surveys disseminated to get the response rate of 20.15%; however, the response rate of 20.45% reflects the overall percentage of surveys received, including those with missing responses.

In terms of Indicator 8 results, item one on the survey asked parents about the LEA's facilitation of parent involvement. Of the 6,435 parents responding to item one, 85.66% (5,512 / 6,435) agreed that the LEAs facilitated their involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. The department's target of 90.04% was not met.

The table below provides a summary of representativeness data on all FFY 2022 Parent Survey respondents. The calculation, from the National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO), compares the respondent pool of children for whom parents responded against the demographics of children receiving special education services across the state (i.e., the target group). The difference row compares the two proportions (target proportion against respondent proportion) by selected attributes including: child disability, child gender, and child race/ethnicity. Cells in the difference row that are greater than +/- 3%, indicate that the respondent group over or underrepresents the entire group of targeted respondents. For this Parent Survey, students with specific learning disabilities for whom parents responded and Black students for whom parents responded were underrepresented in the respondent group (-3.83% and -6.25% respectively) and students from all other (non-listed) disability groups for whom parents responded and White students for whom parents responded were overrepresented in the respondent group (3.99% and 7.94% respectively).

_____SLD__ / __ED__ / __ID___ / __AO__ / Female / __B_ / __NA___ / ___A___ / __ PI___ / ___W___ / __M__ / __H___

Target Representation:_____26.19% / 2.45% / 6.47% / 64.89% / 34.09% / 18.43% / 0.19% / 1.47% / 0.10% / 64.49% / 4.92% / 10.40%
Respondent Representation:__ 22.36% / 1.93% / 6.83% / 68.88% / 34.43% / 12.17% / 0.23% / 1.88% / 0.08% / 72.43% / 4.10% / 9.10%
Difference:_____-3.83% / -0.52% / 0.36% / 3.99% / 0.34% / -6.25% / 0.04% / 0.41% / -0.02% / 7.94% / -0.81% / -1.30%

The demographics of the children for whom parents are responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics

The department will continue working in the 2023-24 school year to ensure that the population of children for whom parents respond is representative of the population of children receiving special education services in Tennessee. Efforts from the 2022-23 school year to remedy some of the noteworthy over/underrepresentation manifested in a decrease in underrepresentation of responses from families of Black students (improvement in representativeness from 6.76% to only 6.25% underrepresented) and a reduction in overrepresentation of responses from families of White students (from 9.46% to 7.94% in overrepresentation).

The department will focus its efforts to improve representativeness on increasing the overall participation rate and developing targeted strategies aimed at increasing underrepresented populations and decreasing overrepresented populations, as outlined in the "Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented" section below.

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

First, there will be continued efforts to more consistently notify and subsequently remind LEAs selected to disseminate the survey to continue eliciting responses from parents. This will come in the form of emails from the department's survey administration partner, East Tennessee State University (ETSU), to LEA staff directly. Second, participating LEAs have also been given suggestions to improve response rate, such as providing the survey at IEP meetings for students to ensure the parents are able to get the survey and respond while in the LEA. Third, the department has expanded number of languages in which the survey is available. Prior to FFY 2020, only English and Spanish languages were offered. Beginning in FFY 2020, Arabic, Amharic, and Burmese translations were available. The department will continue to work with districts to better understand their language needs and provide additional translations. Finally, the department is currently working with its family engagement partner, The ARC Tennessee, to consider other ways/methods to communicate with families regarding this survey and identify opportunities that may increase responses and participation.

In addition, the department has been collaborating with IDC to complete the Data Processes Toolkit for all APR Indicators. Part of this work includes the development of methods to increase representativeness among Indicator 8 survey respondents. The department will continue working with IDC to research best practices and implement targeted strategies aimed at increasing underrepresented populations and decreasing overrepresented populations.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

Chi-square tests confirmed that there was no statistically significant difference between the proportion of respondents and the proportion in the total population of students with an intellectual disability as well as students who are female, Native American, Pacific Islander, or Hispanic. For all other student groups, the difference in representativeness was statistically significant. Please see the "analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services" section above for additional analyses related to representativeness.

Black students and students with specific learning disabilities for whom parents responded were underrepresented in response rate based on the –3% criteria. Further analysis indicated that 85.7% of Black students' parents agreed with question 1 of the survey, compared to 85.6% of all other survey respondents. A 2x2 chi-square test indicated that this slight difference in agreement between parents of Black students and all other survey respondents was not statistically significant, and therefore does not introduce the potential for nonresponse bias. Among parents of students with specific learning disabilities, 87.9% agreed with question 1 of the survey, compared to 84.9% of all other survey respondents. The difference in agreement between parents of students with specific learning disabilities and all other survey respondents was statistically significant; however, the potential nonresponse bias introduced by this difference skews toward disagreement given that parents of students with specific learning disabilities were more likely to agree.

Steps to reduce identified bias, increase representativeness, and promote responses from a broad cross section of families that received Part B services are outlined in both the "strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year" and the "strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative" sections above.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously approved sampling plan changed?	YES
If yes, provide sampling plan.	TN_Approved_APR_Indicator_8_Sampling_Plan

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 guaranteed that every four years an LEA will complete the survey. This sampling is done via the 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 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 level are divided by four (for the four year cycle). 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 LEA.

This sampling methodology ensures that LEAs and schools selected for the survey each year are representative of the state. To ensure there is no potential bias or misrepresentation that can sometimes arise from student sampling, all students with disabilities within each selected LEA are surveyed. In addition, the application of the same survey collection process and same question regarding parent involvement for each administration certifies that the results of the survey are comparable and will yield valid and reliable estimates across school years.

The department revised its Indicator 8 sampling plan for the FFY 2020 through FFY 2025 SPP/APRs and submitted it with the FFY 2021 APR. It was approved by OSEP on September 28, 2023. The final version of the sampling plan is attached to this submission.

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report the metric used to determine representativeness of the demographics of children receiving special education services, as required by the Measurement Table.

The State submitted a sampling plan for this indicator with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR. OSEP identified concerns in its evaluation of the sampling plan that indicated it may not yield valid and reliable data for this indicator. The State has not yet responded to OSEP's concerns. The State must submit, by September 1, 2023, its revised sampling plan that the State plans to use for its FFY 2022 – FFY 2025 data collections and indicate how the revised plan addresses the concerns identified in OSEP's evaluation.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Please refer to the "State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services" and "describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics" sections in the Indicator Data description.

As stated above, the department revised its Indicator 8 sampling plan for the FFY 2020 through FFY 2025 SPP/APRs and submitted it with the FFY 2021 APR. It was approved by OSEP on September 28, 2023. The final version of the sampling plan is attached to this submission.

8 - OSEP Response

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2023 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2022	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

4

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/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 and/or cell size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	143	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

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). It is predicated on the comparison of a subgroup, such as racial/ethnic subgroups, 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, and this is supported in their LEA policies, practices, and procedures, then there is disproportionate representation in the form of overrepresentation.

To determine disproportionate representation, the department uses the Westat spreadsheet for calculating both Relative Risk Ratio (RRR) and Weighted Risk Ratio (WRR) based on LEA racial/ethnic data. For FFY 2022, 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 racial/ethnic 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 disproportionate representation:

a. Both a RRR and a WRR of 3.00 or greater. 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 (target group denominator) meets a minimum "n" size of 50 students;
c. Count of students with disabilities meets a minimum of 45 students; and
d. Count of students with disabilities in a specific racial/ethnic group (target group numerator) meets a minimum cell size of 5 students.

Data Sources

The October 1, 2022 Membership data (from EDFacts file FS052) and December 1, 2022 IDEA Child Count data (from the statewide IEP data management system, which populates EDFacts file FS002) were used in the disproportionate representation calculations for each of Tennessee's 147 LEAs.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

If LEAs meet the criteria outlined above and are identified with disproportionate representation, they are required to complete a self-assessment of their policies, practices, and procedures related to referral, evaluation, and identification. The SEA conducts a review of the self-assessments submitted by LEAs to determine whether the LEAs' policies, procedures, and practices are contributing to the disproportionate representation.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Tennessee has reset the baseline in FFY 2022 to account for changes to the LEA Indicator 9 self-assessment form. This tool was updated in the summer of 2023 to ensure LEAs were reviewing their own data to identify trends. The self-assessment form now asks districts to reflect on their internal policies, procedures, and practices regarding tiered instruction and intervention, instructional and behavioral curriculum, pre-referral processes, and evaluation processes, including a review of the LEA assessment library, eligibility decisions, reevaluation procedures, and placement decisions. In addition, LEAs must review a series of student files randomly sampled from the population(s) in which disproportionate representation was identified. The LEAs must ensure the Tennessee evaluation standards were followed by completing the assessment document form for each student, as well as verifying if all state and federal mandates regarding procedural safeguards were followed. Any missing responses are considered noncompliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2022, and OSEP accepts that revision.

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the section 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), (e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures). In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2022	7.25%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	5.07%	2.90%	4.26%	5.76%	5.11%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

9

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
27	10	138	5.11%	0%	7.25%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

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). It is predicated on the comparison of a subgroup, such as racial/ethnic subgroups, 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, and this is supported in their LEA policies, practices, and procedures, then there is disproportionate representation in the form of overrepresentation.

To determine disproportionate representation, the department uses the Westat spreadsheet for calculating both Relative Risk Ratio (RRR) and Weighted Risk Ratio (WRR) based on LEA racial/ethnic data. For FFY 2022, 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 racial/ethnic 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 disproportionate representation:

a. Both a RRR and a WRR of 3.00 or greater. 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 (target group denominator) meets a minimum "n" size of 50 students;
c. Count of students with disabilities in the specific disability category meets the minimum "n" size of 20 students; and,
d. Count of students with disabilities in a specific racial/ethnic group meets the minimum "n" size of 5 students.

Data Sources

The October 1, 2022 Membership data (from EDFacts file FS052) and December 1, 2022 IDEA Child Count data (from the statewide IEP data management system, which populates EDFacts file FS002) were used in the disproportionate representation calculations for each of Tennessee's 147 LEAs.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

All LEAs meeting the criteria outlined above, which are used to calculate disproportionate representation, are required to complete a self-assessment of their policies, practices, and procedures related to referral, evaluation, and identification. The SEA conducted a review of all self-assessments submitted by LEAs meeting the criteria for disproportionate representation and determined that 10 LEAs' policies, procedures, and practices contributed to the disproportionate representation.

LEAs that are identified as having inappropriate identification practices are required to undergo a site visit in which student records are pulled for review and interviews with key LEA staff take place. Follow-up strategies to address problematic identification practices are developed as a result of this site visit, and SEA staff maintain contact with identified LEAs throughout the school year to monitor progress and improvement.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Tennessee has reset the baseline in FFY 2022 to account for changes to the LEA Indicator 10 self-assessment form. This tool was updated in the summer of 2023 to ensure LEAs were reviewing their own data to identify trends. The self-assessment form now asks districts to reflect on their internal policies, procedures, and practices regarding tiered instruction and intervention, instructional and behavioral curriculum, pre-referral processes, and evaluation processes, including a review of the LEA assessment library, eligibility decisions, reevaluation procedures, and placement decisions. In

addition, LEAs must review a series of student files randomly sampled from the population(s) in which disproportionate representation was identified. The LEAs must ensure the Tennessee evaluation standards were followed by completing the assessment document form for each student, as well as verifying if all state and federal mandates regarding procedural safeguards were followed. Any missing responses are considered noncompliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
7	2	0	5

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Prong 2

The seven LEAs identified with disproportionate representation in FFY 2021, based on self-assessments submitted to the department in the fall of 2022, were required to undergo site visits in May 2023. The director of school psychology services led these visits in collaboration with the speech language and related services coordinator and conducted interviews with LEA administrative staff regarding the LEA's policies and procedures. Questions were asked about how LEA practices might relate to the identified disproportionate representation and based on the information gleaned from these discussions, the director of school psychology services identified areas in which practices should be improved to ensure the disproportionate representation identified was not a manifestation of inappropriate policies, procedures, and practices.

In addition to meetings with LEA administrative staff, schools were visited within the LEA and staff and documents were observed to see the policies, procedures, and practices in action. The director of school psychology services 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. This review process was used to get an overall perspective of persistent themes and concerns in the evaluation and eligibility documentation.

All information gleaned from these site visits was provided to LEA staff via written communication after the site visits. The seven LEAs were required to develop action plans based on these site visits and must periodically submit evidence of activities completed throughout the 2023-24 school year to address findings of potential contributing factors to disproportionate representation. Department staff continuously provided TA as necessary to the seven LEAs, giving them priority at relevant trainings and offering PD opportunities tailored to the LEAs.

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

Prong 1

As outlined in the section above, the director of school psychology services and speech language and related services coordinator conducted site visits and student file reviews in the seven LEAs identified with disproportionate representation. As a result of these file reviews, all seven LEAs were identified as having noncompliant records that may have led to disproportionate representation. Four districts did not follow out of state transfer practices, four districts failed to complete appropriate reevaluations to consider additional eligibility categories, and all seven districts had incomplete initial or reevaluations that may not have adequately identified the correct disability (or ruled out others).

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Due to changes in the APR local determinations timeline and accompanying deadlines for correction of noncompliance, the SEA is not able to verify at the time of final SPP/APR submission whether five of the seven LEAs identified with noncompliance have completed their required activities. The SEA will verify adequate corrections of noncompliance in the five remaining LEAs and report on revised policies, procedures, and practices in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR. Furthermore, the SEA is in the process of revising its timeline for notification and correction of noncompliance so that it can ensure all corrections of noncompliance are completed prior to initial APR submission. Please see the "FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected" section above for a description of actions that have been taken to correct noncompliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the 7 districts identified in FFY 2021 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Please refer to the "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021" section in the Indicator Data description.

10 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2022, and OSEP accepts that revision.

10 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the 10 districts identified in FFY 2022 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Further, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the remaining 7 districts identified in FFY 2021 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification, are in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311. In demonstrating the correction of the noncompliance identified in FFY 2021, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the State verified that each district with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 and each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2021: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

> a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
> b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
> 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.
>
> Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	89.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	94.28%	94.88%	90.88%	93.56%	93.02%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
35,739	33,168	93.02%	100%	92.81%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

2,571

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.

In Tennessee, an LEA is considered to be compliant if the evaluation is completed within 60 calendar days from the date the LEA received written consent for an initial evaluation. TN uses a student's final eligibility determination, which is recorded in the statewide IEP data management system (TN PULSE), to mark the end of the evaluation process. The requirement to complete evaluations/eligibility determinations within 60 calendar days of receipt of parental consent for an initial evaluation is outlined in Tennessee State Board of Education Rule 0520-01-09-.05 (https://publications.tnsosfiles.com/rules/0520/0520-01/0520-01-09.20220919.pdf).

Of the 35,739 students for whom parent consent to evaluate was granted in FFY 2022, 2,571 students did not have their evaluations completed within the 60 calendar timeline. These 2,571 students did not have an approved timeline extension request and the evaluation exceeded the timeline OR they did not complete any timeline extension request and the evaluation exceeded the timeline. The number of days beyond the timeline ranged from one to 418 days.

Pursuant to §§300.301(d) and §§300.309(c), LEAs can request timeline extensions for three approved reasons, and this request is submitted through the statewide IEP data management system (TN PULSE). Department staff review and approve or deny these requests. If the requests are approved, these students are not considered out of compliance. However, in instances in which extension requests are denied, these students are considered out of compliance. The three approved timeline extension reasons are:

1. For specific learning disability (SLD) evaluations, there is written mutual agreement on an extended timeframe by the child's parents and a group of qualified professionals;
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 a completed evaluation and the receiving district has made progress toward completing the evaluation.

Those students with acceptable reasons for delay who had evaluations completed with an approved timeline extension request are excluded in both the numerator and denominator of the compliance percentage calculation detailed above.

Without an approved timeline extension request, the TN PULSE system requires LEAs that complete evaluations after the 60 day timeline to provide a reason for the delay prior to finalizing the eligibility determination. The list of reasons are:

1. Student transfer within the district
2. Waiting on specialist reports
3. Excessive student absences
4. Parent did not show for scheduled meetings, or parent cancelled scheduled meeting too late to reschedule within timelines, or parent requested to schedule meeting outside of timelines
5. Student/parent serious medical issues
6. Repeated attempts to contact parents failed
7. Student shows documented progress when provided with research-based interventions in general education classroom
8. Other

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted

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

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 department collected data on initial consents for evaluations for all students with signed consent forms during FFY 2022 (July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023). Data were collected though the statewide IEP data management system (EasyIEP during the 2022-23 school year) for all of Tennessee's 147 LEAs. FFY 2022 was the fourteenth year these student-level data were collected through this data management system. The student-level data obtained through EasyIEP include:

• Student name and basic demographics
• LEA information
• 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
• LEA in which initial consent was signed

Where applicable, the following were also collected:

• Number of days over the 60 calendar day timeline
• Reasons for the delay
• Whether timeline extension request and made and whether it was approved
• Eligible disability category
• Exit date and reason
• District where consent was received

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
104	101	0	3

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Prong 2

For those 104 LEAs with 1 or more of the 2,336 late student evaluations during FFY 2021, department staff conducted data pulls of parental permissions signed in FFY 2021 to determine 100% compliance once the individual instances of previously identified noncompliance were corrected. To determine if these LEAs were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, the department looked at additional initial referrals from each of these LEAs. For LEAs with less than 500 initial referrals for evaluation in FFY 2021, the department required them to demonstrate 100% compliance for initial evaluations for a minimum of 30 consecutive days in FFY 2022. For LEAs with more than 500 initial referrals for evaluation in FFY 2021, the department required them to demonstrate 100% compliance for initial evaluation determinations for a minimum of 10 consecutive days in FFY 2022. The department was able to verify that all 104 LEAs were 100% compliant for at least a 30-day or 10-day time period.

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

Prong 1

The statewide IEP data management system (TN PULSE) is used to collect the data necessary to determine timely evaluation. This system was also used to follow-up on all instances of FFY 2021 student-level noncompliance when the evaluation exceeded established timelines. The department initially provided LEAs with guidance around how to correct noncompliance for FFY 2021 students whose initial evaluation was late and still open. These LEAs were required to research individual students and update TN PULSE if the evaluation had been completed. In the case of students whose evaluations were still pending, LEAs were required to complete the evaluation as soon as possible. In 2,333 instances across 101 districts, the evaluation or correction of other issues (e.g., mistakenly entered consent form, mistyping of date, etc.) for children whose initial evaluation was not timely was completed within one year. As of April 25, 2024, there are 3 students in three districts whose evaluations are still open. The department is conducting an investigation to ensure that these instances of noncompliance are addressed promptly.

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

As mentioned in the Prong 1 description, the IDEA Data Manager is conducting an investigation that includes contacting LEA special education supervisors to ensure that individual instances of noncompliance from FFY 2021 (i.e., open and overdue evaluations) are addressed immediately.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2020	4	4	0

FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

For the three LEAs with instances of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 that were not yet verified as corrected at the time of the FFY 2021 APR submission on February 1, 2023, the department staff conducted data pulls of parental permissions signed in FFY 2020 to determine 100% compliance once the individual instances of previously identified noncompliance were corrected. To determine if these LEAs were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, the department looked at additional initial referrals from each of these LEAs. For LEAs with less than 500 initial referrals for evaluation in FFY 2020, the department required them to demonstrate 100% compliance for initial evaluations for a minimum of 30 consecutive days in FFY 2022. For LEAs with more than 500 initial referrals for evaluation in FFY 2020, the department required them to demonstrate 100% compliance for initial evaluation determinations for a minimum of 10 consecutive days in FFY 2022. The department was able to verify that all three LEAs were 100% compliant for at least a 30 day or 10 day time period.

Please note that the counts in the table under "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021" represent individual instances of noncompliance, not LEAs identified with noncompliance. Moving forward, the department will report counts of LEAs identified with noncompliance.

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

There were 4 instances of noncompliance identified in three LEAs in FFY 2020 that were not yet verified as corrected at the time of the FFY 2021 APR submission on February 1, 2023. The department contacted the three LEAs responsible for the 4 children whose evaluations were still open and requested that they promptly correct the continued noncompliance. The department verified all four of these corrections using the statewide IEP data management system (TN PULSE) and provided further guidance to the LEAs to support timely initial evaluations and prevent future noncompliance.

Please note that the counts in the table under "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021" represent individual instances of noncompliance, not LEAs identified with noncompliance. Moving forward, the department will report counts of LEAs identified with noncompliance.

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the remaining 4 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 were corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Please refer to the "FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected" and "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021" sections in the Indicator Data description.

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the remaining three uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2021: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

> a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
> b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
> c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
> d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
> e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
> f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

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

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	99.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	96.37%	96.88%	75.89%	61.13%	92.55%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	6,990
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	1,099

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,128
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.	2,224
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	155
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	1,179

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
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.	2,128	2,333	92.55%	100%	91.21%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The total number of children with untimely transitions from Part C to Part B increased by 18 children statewide. Although 41 LEAs increased their percentage of timely transitions by an average of 22% from the previous year, this was offset by 49 LEAs for whom the percentage of timely transitions decreased by an average of 17%. Two LEAs had double-digit increases in the total number of untimely transitions in FFY 2022. Excluding these two LEAs, the average number of untimely transitions per LEA decreased slightly.

To ensure future compliance and prevent slippage, the IDEA APR Support Team has collaborated with LEAs to identify root causes and develop strategies to increase timely Part C to Part B transitions. The team has worked with LEAs to develop and implement early childhood transition policies and procedures. The department will continue to work with the identified LEAs to improve tracking, documentation, and monitoring practices to ensure adherence to timelines and requirements.

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

205

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. 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 205 children who were served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination who did not have eligibility determined by their third birthdays, and if eligible, did not have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. Of the 205 children, 98 had documentation and/or eligibility information completed by January 30, 2024, with a range of 1 to 455 days between the child's third birthday and the IEP or non-eligibility determination. The 107 children without documentation of an IEP or non-eligibility as of January 30, 2024 were overdue by an average of 395 days. Although all unacceptable, reasons provided for delays included: parent scheduling conflicts, inclement weather, late referrals from Part C, and school system staff training issues related to early childhood transition policies and procedures. The IDEA Data Team and the IDEA APR Support Team are actively supporting LEAs with uncorrected noncompliance to ensure that children who were served in Part C and referred to Part B have eligibility determined and if eligible, an IEP developed and implemented as soon as possible.

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

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 (TEIDS), and the statewide IEP data management system (TN PULSE). These data were collected, merged, compared, and analyzed into a unified data table to determine if any children had an untimely IEP. Each LEA with records showing an untimely outcome was given the opportunity to verify and respond to the data matched at the individual record level.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
64	52	0	12

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Prong 2:

Training and TA on the policies and procedures for early childhood transition were provided as a virtual presentation to each LEA with a finding of noncompliance. The IDEA APR Support Team provided all trainings and verified LEA participation through a sign-in attendance document. In addition, the APR IDEA Support Consultants provided districts with real-time TA related to currently transitioning children.

The department also conducted a subsequent review of additional data to determine that all LEAs with noncompliance for FFY 2021 were subsequently correctly implementing 34 CFR 300.124(b). Additional data were pulled from the Part C TEIDS system and the Part B statewide IEP data management system and analyzed to see if identified LEAs showed any children who had untimely IEPs. Department staff found that all 64 LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

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

Prong 1:

The department verified that 52 LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 updated and/or corrected the records, although late, for 163 children for whom implementation of the IEP was untimely. The data from the Part B TN PULSE system identified the date in which the IEP was developed or a non-eligibility determination was made. The department was unable to verify compliance in 12 LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021. As of April 25, 2024, 23 individual cases remained open with no documentation of an IEP, non-eligibility, or parent refusal. The department is conducting an investigation to ensure that these instances of noncompliance are addressed promptly.

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

As mentioned in the Prong 1 description, the IDEA Data Manager is conducting an investigation that includes contacting LEA special education supervisors to ensure that individual instances of noncompliance from FFY 2021 (i.e., students with untimely transitions who do not have an IEP or non-eligibility determination) are addressed immediately.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Please refer to the "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021" section in the Indicator Data description.

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the remaining 12 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2021: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, 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))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	50.03%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	74.03%	65.12%	81.22%	45.91%	14.29%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
34	458	14.29%	100%	7.42%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

An analysis of the data revealed the slippage is primarily a result of one of 7 indicators, the annual transition goal. This indicator has multiple facets and is slightly subjective. The department has contracted with an external transition specialist to increase the fidelity of the measure and pair the monitoring with PD and TA. Also, the department has revised the statewide IEP transition plan to include an annual transition goal. The state policy related to IEP development, implementation, and transition planning is being revised to add further clarification regarding the requirement for at least one measurable annual goal that will enable the student to meet their postsecondary goal(s).

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

State monitoring

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 2022, staff from the Division of Federal Programs and Oversight (FPO) completed the monitoring requirements of this indicator. Analyses of student documents/records were completed via an IEP Monitoring platform embedded in the statewide IEP data management system (EasyIEP during the 2022-23 school year), where individual student documents are randomly selected and reviewed for completion and accuracy. LEAs were required to complete a two-level review of students' documents and evaluate the compliance elements for Indicator 13. After the LEA case manager and LEA IDEA director completed the IEP Monitoring, staff from FPO completed two levels of secondary review. LEAs were subsequently notified and required to address areas identified with noncompliance within 20 business days. Staff from FPO verified that all instances of noncompliance were corrected by June 30, 2023.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	YES
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	NO

If no, please explain

Tennessee State Board of Education rule 0520-01-09-.12 (https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/stateboardofeducation/documents/meetingfiles2/3-16-17_IV_A_Special_Education_Programs_and_Services_Rule_0520_01_09_11_Clean_Copy.pdf) requires that prior to grade 9 or age 14, the IEP for students with disabilities must include information on an initial four-year plan of study and identify possible transition service needs. However, not all components required for Indicator 13 must be addressed at that time. Therefore, the data used for Indicator 13 is collected only for students age 16 or above who are required to have all components of Indicator 13 completed.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
118	1	0	117

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Prong 2

All 118 LEAs identified as noncompliant on Indicator 13 in FFY 2021 were required to hold a training regarding the corrective actions to retrain special education teams responsible for the completion of IEP transition plans. These LEAs were monitored again in FFY 2022, with the monitoring platform selecting 6 to 28 random student records to review and evaluate for compliance. The exact number is based on a risk assessment from the previous year and an algorithm ensures that at least one file includes an IEP transition plan. Any further noncompliance identified during this process was addressed through additional corrective actions. However, only one of the 118 LEAs identified as noncompliant on Indicator 13 in FFY 2021 achieved 100% compliance in FFY 2022.

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

Prong 1

The 492 individual cases of Indicator 13 noncompliance identified across 118 LEAs in FFY 2021 were corrected during FFY 2021 (2021-22 school year). Corrective actions were developed for each individual instance of noncompliance, and LEA-level staff members were required to provide evidence of corrected, compliant records within 20 business days. The submitted corrections were reviewed by SEA staff members to ensure that each individual case was compliant by the end of FFY 2021 (June 30, 2022).

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The department is taking steps to ensure that ongoing, LEA-level Indicator 13 noncompliance is corrected. It has contracted with an external transition specialist to increase the fidelity of the measure and pair the monitoring with PD and TA. Also, the department has revised the statewide IEP transition plan to include an annual transition goal. The state policy related to IEP development, implementation, and transition planning is being revised to add further clarification regarding the requirement for at least one measurable annual goal that will enable the student to meet their postsecondary goal(s).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2020	82	4	78

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Prong 2

All 82 LEAs identified as noncompliant on Indicator 13 in FFY 2020 were required to hold a training regarding the corrective actions to retrain special education teams responsible for the completion of IEP transition plans. These LEAs were monitored again in FFY 2022, with the monitoring platform selecting 6 to 28 random student records to review and evaluate for compliance. The exact number is based on a risk assessment from the previous year and an algorithm ensures that at least one file includes an IEP transition plan. Any further noncompliance identified during this process was addressed through additional corrective actions. However, only four of the 82 LEAs identified as noncompliant on Indicator 13 in FFY 2020 achieved 100% compliance in FFY 2021 or FFY 2022.

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

Prong 1

The 172 individual cases of Indicator 13 noncompliance identified across 82 LEAs in FFY 2020 were corrected during FFY 2020 (2020-21 school year). Corrective actions were developed for each individual instance of noncompliance, and LEA-level staff members were required to provide evidence of corrected, compliant records within 20 business days. The submitted corrections were reviewed by SEA staff members to ensure that each individual case was compliant by the end of FFY 2020 (June 30, 2021).

FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The department is taking steps to ensure that ongoing, LEA-level Indicator 13 noncompliance is corrected. It has contracted with an external transition specialist to increase the fidelity of the measure and pair the monitoring with PD and TA. Also, the department has revised the statewide IEP transition plan to include an annual transition goal. The state policy related to IEP development, implementation, and transition planning is being revised to add further clarification regarding the requirement for at least one measurable annual goal that will enable the student to meet their postsecondary goal(s).

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the remaining 82 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 were corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Please refer to the "FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected" and "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021" sections of the Indicator Data description.

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the remaining 117 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and 78 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and FFY 2020: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

> A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
> B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
> C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

Instructions

*Sampling **of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See <u>General Instructions</u> on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2023 on students who left school during 2021-2022, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2021-2022 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. *Definitions*

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under "competitive employment":

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services).

II. *Data Reporting*

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).
Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.
Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of "leavers" who are:

> 1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
> 2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
> 3. 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);
> 4. 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).

"Leavers" should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, "leavers" who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, "leavers" who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

III. *Reporting on the Measures/Indicators*
Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school *must* be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2009	Target >=	24.50%	26.00%	26.50%	26.34%	26.93%
A	22.00%	Data	26.11%	21.99%	25.75%	12.49%	20.97%
B	2009	Target >=	60.50%	61.00%	62.00%	63.12%	63.69%
B	57.00%	Data	61.08%	33.30%	62.55%	17.32%	66.10%
C	2009	Target >=	71.00%	71.00%	72.50%	74.78%	75.31%
C	65.00%	Data	71.13%	74.63%	74.25%	66.57%	75.84%

FFY 2021 Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	27.52%	28.11%	28.70%	29.29%
Target B >=	64.26%	64.83%	65.40%	65.97%
Target C >=	75.84%	76.37%	76.90%	77.43%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. The AC typically meets quarterly during each FFY in July, October, January, and April. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes, providing information over the last two FFYs regarding Tennessee's APR state determination, APR target setting, and new APR local determinations resources available to LEAs. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

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 regional special education supervisor study council meetings (East, Central, and West). At these meetings, data from the APR (including Indicator 17 formative milestones and outcomes) and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families. For example, the department hosts monthly listening sessions with representatives from statewide advocacy groups where they can ask questions about policies, rules, or practice trends, as well as share issues from the field. These listening sessions include legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The Arc Tennessee. For more information on the specific activities and/or strategies used to engage and increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents, please see the "Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities" section below.

Although there were no substantive revisions to FFY 2022 baselines and/or targets, the department made concerted efforts prior to the FFY 2020 APR submission to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/families/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Furthermore, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets. This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

The department has continued to engage stakeholders and solicit their feedback during the implementation of the SSIP. Various stakeholders have received information on the work through a variety of methods. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. Partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. Statewide data are also communicated within the SEA, via social media, on the project's website, and through an internal data dashboard. The success of the SSIP is contingent upon not only the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. The department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	1,737
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	1,196
Response Rate	68.85%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	280
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	498
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)	50
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).	81

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	280	1,196	20.97%	27.52%	23.41%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year	778	1,196	66.10%	64.26%	65.05%	Met target	No Slippage

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
of leaving high school (1 +2)							
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)	909	1,196	75.84%	75.84%	76.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	69.69%	68.85%

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

The metric used to determine representativeness, from the NPSO, compares the respondent pool of youth against the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school (i.e., the target group). The difference row compares the two proportions (target proportion against respondent proportion) by selected attributes including: child disability, child gender, child minority race/ethnicity, English learner status, and whether the student was a dropout. Cells in the difference row that are greater than +/- 3%, indicate that the respondent group over or underrepresents the entire group of targeted respondents.

Chi-square tests confirmed that there was no statistically significant difference between the proportion of respondents and the proportion in the target exiting population of students with disabilities for female students, Native American students, Asian or Pacific Islander students, Hispanic students, Multi-racial students, and students in each disability category. For Black, White, and dropout students, the difference in representativeness was statistically significant.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

The table below provides a summary of representativeness data on all FFY 2022 post-school survey respondents. The calculation, from the National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO), compares the respondent pool of students against the targeted group of students. This is done to determine whether the respondents represent the entire group of exited students that could have responded to the survey. The NPSO calculation compares two proportions (target proportion against respondent proportion) by selected attributes including: child disability, child gender, child race/ethnicity, English learner status, and whether the student was a dropout. Differences that are greater than +/- 3% indicate that the respondent group over or underrepresents the entire group of targeted respondents. For this post-school outcomes survey, the demographics were representative.

_____SLD___ / __ED___ / __ID__/___AO__/Female /___B____/__NA_ / A or PI /___H__ / ___W__ / __M__ /
__ELL__ / Dropout

Target Leaver Representation: 43.12% / 6.39% / 9.27% / 41.22% / 34.43% / 27.52% / 0.35% / 1.38% / 8.64% / 59.53% / 2.59% / 0.00% / 7.43%

Respondent Representation:__41.97% / 6.19% / 9.28% / 42.56% / 32.94% / 27.84% / 0.33% / 1.25% / 7.27% / 60.95% / 2.34% / 0.00% / 4.93%

Difference:_____-1.15% / -0.20% / 0.01% / 1.34% / -1.48% / 0.32% / -0.01% / -0.13% / -1.36% / 1.43% / -0.25% / 0.00% / -2.49%

The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)

YES

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

While the demographics of the survey respondents were representative of the overall cohort of students pulled in this sampling, there was one group (dropouts) that was slightly underrepresented. The lack of representativeness in the responses can be contributed to numerous factors, one of the most notable being not having the most accurate and current contact information for students/families. Absent current contact information, LEAs are unable to reach exited students. The department has continued to encourage LEAs to update all contact information for students whenever received, even if they are exiting the LEA at some point in the duration of the school year. Contact information for both students and families can be captured in LEA student information systems. To streamline the availability of this data for special educators, the department transfers student and family contact information from student information systems into the statewide IEP data management system (TN PULSE) nightly. Once in the system, users can augment, delete, add, and update the contact information as appropriate, and these data will remain linked to the appropriate student record. Continued housing of the contact information in a central location that special education staff can access will ideally help keep contact information current. The department provides this service of importing contact information free of charge to LEAs and makes them aware of this process/service multiple times through written and verbal communication/trainings.

The work done by the department in recent years to have contact information readily available in the statewide IEP data management system (TN PULSE), as well as the diligent efforts of the department to send updates, reminders, and suggested contact methods to LEAs required to participate in this indicator's survey, has and will continue to support higher response rates for this indicator. Improving the response rate for the indicator is yet another way to improve the representativeness of the respondents. After a significant increase from FFY 2019 to FFY 2020 (58.71% to 71.27%), the response rate decreased slightly in FFY 2021 (69.69%) and again in FFY 2022 (68.85%). While the department is pleased with this overall progress, it will continue focus its efforts to improve representativeness on increasing the overall participation rate and developing targeted strategies aimed at increasing underrepresented populations and decreasing overrepresented populations.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Response and nonresponse bias included chi-square tests and comparison of nonresponse rates across underrepresented student groups. Chi-square tests confirmed that there was no statistically significant difference between the proportion of respondents and the proportion in the target exiting population of students with disabilities for female students, Native American students, Asian or Pacific Islander students, Hispanic students, Multi-racial students, and students in each disability category. For Black, White, and dropout students, the difference in response representativeness was statistically significant. Please see the "analyses of the extent to which response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school " section above for additional analyses related to response representativeness. Nonresponse rates did not differ by gender with 29.59% of males not responding compared to 34.11% of females. There were differences by race/ethnicity, with nonresponse rates ranging from 42.00% (Hispanic) to 29.50% (White).

Dropout students were the only group that had a statistically significant underrepresentation in response rate. Further analysis indicated that 41% of dropout students were not engaged, compared to 24% of all other survey respondents. Although dropout students only represented 7.4% of the target population, the difference in non-engaged dropouts and non-engaged other exiters was statistically significant, and therefore does introduce the potential for nonresponse bias.

Steps to reduce identified nonresponse bias, increase response representativeness, and promote responses from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school are outlined in the "strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year" section above.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously approved sampling plan changed?	YES
If yes, provide sampling plan.	TN_Approved_APR_Indicator_14_Sampling_Plan

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) graduating with a special education diploma/certificate, (c) aging out of high school, or (d) dropping out are surveyed. 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 and middle schools are determined for each LEA. Then the number of schools in each school type category is divided by four (for the four-year cycle). Each school is given a unique code to randomize them for selection to remove bias. Once randomized, the number of high schools and middle 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 and schools selected for the survey each year are representative of the state. 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) graduating with a special education diploma/certificate, (c) aging out of high school, or (d) dropping out are surveyed. In addition, the application of the same survey collection process and same questions regarding post-school outcomes for each administration certifies that the results of the survey are comparable and will yield valid and reliable estimates across school years.

The department contracts with East Tennessee State University (ETSU) to disseminate, collect, and analyze survey results. To complete the survey, LEA staff contact students who exited by telephone, in-person visits, mail, email, or virtual communication (e.g., FaceTime, Zoom). The LEA staff use an

online secure website to enter the data collected through the surveys. The web survey data are housed at ETSU and data are automatically compiled for analysis and reporting by ETSU and provided to the department.

The department revised its Indicator 14 sampling plan for the FFY 2020 through FFY 2025 SPP/APRs and submitted it with the FFY 2021 APR. It was approved by OSEP on September 28, 2023. The final version of the sampling plan is attached to this submission.

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

The State submitted a sampling plan for this indicator with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR. OSEP identified concerns in its evaluation of the sampling plan that indicated it may not yield valid and reliable data for this indicator. The State has not yet responded to OSEP's concerns. The State must submit by September 1, 2023 its revised sampling plan that the State plans to use for its FFY 2022 – FFY2025 data collections and indicate how the revised plan addresses the concerns identified in OSEP's evaluation.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Please refer to the "State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school" and "describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics" sections in the Indicator Data description.

As stated above, the department revised its Indicator 8 sampling plan for the FFY 2020 through FFY 2025 SPP/APRs and submitted it with the FFY 2021 APR. It was approved by OSEP on September 28, 2023. The final version of the sampling plan is attached to this submission.

14 - OSEP Response

The State did not identify the steps taken to reduce any identified bias to promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, as required by the Measurement Table.

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED*Facts* Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	45
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	35

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. The AC typically meets quarterly during each FFY in July, October, January, and April. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes, providing information over the last two FFYs regarding Tennessee's APR state determination, APR target setting, and new APR local determinations resources available to LEAs. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

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 regional special education supervisor study council meetings (East, Central, and West). At these meetings, data from the APR (including Indicator 17 formative milestones and outcomes) and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families. For example, the department hosts monthly listening sessions with representatives from statewide advocacy groups where they can ask questions about policies, rules, or practice trends, as well as share issues from the field. These listening sessions include legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The Arc Tennessee. For more information on the specific activities and/or strategies used to engage and increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents, please see the "Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities" section below.

Although there were no substantive revisions to FFY 2022 baselines and/or targets, the department made concerted efforts prior to the FFY 2020 APR submission to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/families/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too

challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Furthermore, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets. This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

The department has continued to engage stakeholders and solicit their feedback during the implementation of the SSIP. Various stakeholders have received information on the work through a variety of methods. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. Partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. Statewide data are also communicated within the SEA, via social media, on the project's website, and through an internal data dashboard. The success of the SSIP is contingent upon not only the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. The department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	50.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	13.00%	14.00%	15.00%	60.00%-70.00%	60.00%-70.00%
Data	66.67%	47.27%	65.71%	83.33%	82.61%

Targets

FFY	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	60.00%	70.00%	60.00%	70.00%	60.00%	70.00%	60.00%	70.00%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target (low)	FFY 2022 Target (high)	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
35	45	82.61%	60.00%	70.00%	77.78%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED*Facts* Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

Measurement

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1 Mediations held	27
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	14
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	5

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. The AC typically meets quarterly during each FFY in July, October, January, and April. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes, providing information over the last two FFYs regarding Tennessee's APR state determination, APR target setting, and new APR local determinations resources available to LEAs. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

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 regional special education supervisor study council meetings (East, Central, and West). At these meetings, data from the APR (including Indicator 17 formative milestones and outcomes) and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families. For example, the department hosts monthly listening sessions with representatives from statewide advocacy groups where they can ask questions about policies, rules, or practice trends, as well as share issues from the field. These listening sessions include legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The Arc Tennessee. For more information on the specific activities and/or strategies used to engage and increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents, please see the "Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities" section below.

Although there were no substantive revisions to FFY 2022 baselines and/or targets, the department made concerted efforts prior to the FFY 2020 APR submission to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here:

https://www.tn.gov/education/families/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Furthermore, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets. This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

The department has continued to engage stakeholders and solicit their feedback during the implementation of the SSIP. Various stakeholders have received information on the work through a variety of methods. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. Partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. Statewide data are also communicated within the SEA, via social media, on the project's website, and through an internal data dashboard. The success of the SSIP is contingent upon not only the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. The department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	56.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%	65.00%-75.00%	65.00%-75.00%
Data	53.85%	70.59%	66.67%	52.94%	63.16%

Targets

FFY	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	65.00%	75.00%	65.00%	75.00%	65.00%	75.00%	65.00%	75.00%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target (low)	FFY 2022 Target (high)	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
14	5	27	63.16%	65.00%	75.00%	70.37%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data*:* The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) (SiMR) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets*:* In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:
- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates)) outlined above):
- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates)) outlined above):
- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2023). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

In Phase I, Tennessee identified a SiMR of increasing by one percent annually the percent of students with a specific learning disability (SLD) in grades 3-8 scoring at or above Basic (since renamed "Approaching") on the statewide English/language arts (ELA) assessment. Evaluation activities were developed by the department to track progress toward and achievement of this ambitious but achievable goal.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (*e.g.*, a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

Tennessee's SSIP strategies have been primarily implemented through a single initiative that has seen three concurrent titles over the past ten years as funding sources and primary partners have changed: TN SPDG, TN Access for All, and the AALN (current). All three formats of the SSIP initiative have used a cohort model that serves a group of districts for multiple years. In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State provided measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025 based on the cohort of districts (38) being served by the Access For All initiative during the 2021-22 academic year. During late Spring of 2022 – The State asked the New Teacher Project (TNTP) and the University of Tennessee at Knoxville's Center for Literacy, Education and Employment (CLEE) to assist them in crafting the AALN to succeed the Access For All initiative to better align SSIP activities with new STATE improvement strategies. The network prioritizes PD resources for district and school administrators – who have the greatest ability to remove barriers and promote the successful implementation of the SSIP EBPs within their classrooms. FFY 2022 was the first year after the initiative change where the districts receiving SSIP supports, through AALN at the time of the state assessment, were different than the FFY 2020 Cohort. AALN supported 14 districts during Spring 2023, had two districts leave Cohort 1 during the summer, and now support 19 districts through 2 cohorts. Only 13 districts from the FFY 2020 Cohort being used here for the SiMR reporting are currently engaged in AALN (10 from Cohort 1 and 3 from Cohort 2; 2 others were engaged last Spring but are not currently). The other 25 FFY 2020 Cohort districts elected to self-sustain implementation of the SSIP evidence-based strategies independently of AALN, but still receive other State resources and supports related to the four SSIP strategies.

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

Tennessee's detailed theory of action can be found on page 38 of the SSIP Phase III-4 report: https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/special-education/sped_ssip_phase_iii4_201920.pdf. The broad theory of action can be found on page 7 of the same document: https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/special-education/sped_ssip_phase_iii4_201920.pdf.

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	31.47%

Targets

FFY	Current Relationship	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	39.24%	40.24%	41.24%	42.24%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of students with a specific learning disability (SLD) in grades 3-8 in SSIP FFY 2022 districts scoring at or above Approaching on the statewide English language arts (ELA) assessment	Number of students with a specific learning disability (SLD) in grades 3-8 in SSIP FFY 2022 districts who received a valid score on the statewide English language arts (ELA) assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1,798	4,993	33.59%	39.24%	36.01%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 data.

The student level statewide assessment file used to populate EDFacts files FS185 and FS188 is the source of TCAP English Language Arts performance levels for students in grades 3-8. This file is merged with the student level End-of-Year Frequency file retrieved from the TN PULSE data system annually on June 30 to identify all students with SLD served by one of the FFY 2022 SSIP districts at any point during the relevant school year. The instructional environment data comes from the federal IDEA Child Count report formatted to populate EDFacts FS002. It is pulled from the TN PULSE data system with a census date of May 1 in the relevant year.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

The 2018-19 assessment results, compiled in the fall of 2019-20, were the baseline SiMR data for the then cohort of SSIP districts. For the 2022-23 school year, 36.01% of students with an SLD in grades 3-8 scored at or above Approaching Expectations on the statewide ELA assessment with a participation rate of 98.7%. This was an increase of 2.42% from the previous reporting year.

Collection of baseline data regarding the percent of students with a SLD who have access to core instruction for 80 percent or more of the day for the then cohort of SSIP districts came from a census report pulled on May 1, 2019. As a baseline for this measure, 73.95% of the students with an SLD were in the general education setting 80 percent or more of the day. The most recent comparison pull was completed on May 1, 2023 to assess change from the baseline data pull to this fiscal year. This data pull indicated that 87.34% of students with an SLD were served in the general education setting 80 percent or more of the day, an increase of 13.39% since baseline.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data *(i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey)* that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)
YES

Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

AALN 2022-2023 participating districts continued implementation of SSIP evidence-based practices over a multi-year timeline, participants will focus on access to high-quality tier 1 literacy and math instruction for all students, intensive reading intervention, and intensive math and writing intervention over at least four academic years. The multi-year design allows more time to work with districts, allowing for gradual release of support duties to district personnel and school administrators. During FFY 2022 the participating cohort 1 districts were primarily focused on intensive reading intervention and the participating cohort 2 districts on high-quality tier 1 literacy instruction. Progress data were collected throughout the period of Spring 2022-23 and Fall of the 2023-24 school years through a series of post training surveys, classroom observations, coaching records, and an Individualized Education Program (IEP) file review. This data collection was focused specifically on SSIP strategies one, two, three, and four.

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)
NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)
NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

Tennessee's evaluation plan can be found on pages 62 to 108 of the SSIP Phase II report: https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/special-education/sped_ssip_phase_ii.pdf. Although some information such as dates and staffing may have changed, the core components of the plan (including the evaluation questions) remain intact.

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)
NO

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

Infrastructure Changes

The department has continued the implementation efforts of several large-scale infrastructure changes previously undertaken to support the State's strategic plan, Best for All (https://bestforall.tnedu.gov/).

Winter/Spring 2023 – The New Teacher Project (TNTP) and TDOE develop the content for the remaining Spring AALN dates while the SSIP Regional

Access Coaches develop the content and facilitative questions for the remaining quarterly CoPs within the 2022-2023 school year. CLEE and evaluators continue to monitor participation, schedule coaching, and collect/analyze participant feedback using the SSIP member database and reporting schedule created in Fall 2022.

Winter/Spring 2023 – The TDOE and CLEE develop the System of Support, partnership contracts, and assurances for the 2023-2024 school year, creating opportunities for existing Cohort 1 districts as well as new Cohort 2 districts to have access to more funding for HQIM and other resources to continue the implementation of AALN.

Winter/Spring 2023 – The plan for AALN's 2023-2024 school year is formally introduced to all potential SSIP districts through a series of virtual office hours and coaching conversations. All SSIP districts are encouraged to continue their efforts through the AALN.

Summer 2023 – AALN hosted a Summer Summit for its newest cohort of schools (Cohort 2) to onboard them to the network and begin core activities designed to enhance literacy instruction for students with disabilities. The content was taught by AALN Regional Access Coaches in collaboration with the Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE). The regional district support personnel (CORE interventionists) were present to gain insight into the AALN curriculum to provide added support to the CORE districts that are also participating in AALN.

Fall 2023 – The SSIP Evaluators in conjunction with the Access For All higher education partner (The University of Tennessee, UT CLEE) expanded on the initiative's data collection monitoring plan and redesigned the data dashboard infrastructure available to all stakeholders. Survey features have been added to decrease human error and increase the efficiency of data cleanup. Data measures are now uploaded in real-time and are shared throughout the data communication systems (these were previously updated daily or weekly). The UT CLEE partners and the regional district support personnel (CORE interventionists) review participation rate metrics to ensure districts meet their implementation timelines. Initiative leaders, including key stakeholders and Regional Access Coaches (RACs), now have access to real-time, deidentified raw data and data dashboards.

Fall 2023 – The eight AALN Regional Access Coaches (RAC) who previously coached district leaders on strategy implementation for students preschool through 8th grade were divided into two focus groups: an Early Childhood only coaching team and a Kindergarten-8th grade only coaching team). Allowing the four RACs on the K-8 team to better focus on supporting SSIP implementation.

Implementation Activities

Strategy One: Access to Core Instruction, Strategy Two: Providing Increasingly Intensive Intervention, and Strategy Four: Access to High-Quality Instructional Materials (HQIM)

Winter/Spring 2023 – AALN Regional Access Coaches (RACs) continued delivering the content to their districts through online virtual Learning Network meetings and quarterly CoPs. From January through May 2023, two Learning Networks and one additional CoP took place to review and refine understanding of evidence-based practices.

Winter/Spring 2023 – The AALN has four SSIP Regional Access Coaches for grades K-8 who work with the district and school administrators at least twice per month to track progress towards milestones, problem-solve, and revise each SSIP district's implementation action plan. Coaches also regularly provide TA to SSIP districts concerning infrastructure development and classroom implementation of the EBPs.

Summer 2023 – 12 Cohort 1 districts agree to continue their SSIP implementation with support from AALN through a formal partnership letter.

Summer 2023 – The 19 incoming Cohort 2 districts attend the 3-day Summer Inclusion Workshop to onboard them to the network and begin core activities designed to enhance literacy instruction for students with disabilities. Each new SSIP district write an SSIP implementation action plan that includes milestone targets. 97.8% of participants at the Summer Inclusion Workshop agree or strongly agree their district team (who attended the workshop) came away better prepared to enhance their support to students with disabilities through access to Tier 1 instruction.

Fall 2023 – TDOE and AALN Key Partners worked together to develop a rubric for assessing how well the districts are implementing the knowledge and strategies of AALN. Regional Access Coaches began the 2023-2024 school year by meeting with each district to assess where they are within the implementation rubric and review their implementation action plan.

Fall 2023 – RACs delivered content to their districts through a series of fall PD in monthly one-hour Learning Network meetings specifically geared to each individual Cohort and quarterly three-hour fall COPs. Through December 31, 2023, 44 Cohort 1 district leaders from 12 districts, and 76 Cohort 2 district leaders from 19 districts completed the Learning Network participant survey. Fall COP surveys have recorded 7 responses from Cohort 1 districts and 12 responses from Cohort 2 districts.

RAC's accompanied district leaders and CORE interventionists in classroom walkthrough observations and district classroom observation norming sessions using the Tennessee Instructional Practice Guide (Tn IPG).

Strategy Three: Addressing Skill Deficits through Instructionally Appropriate IEP (IAIEP) Development

Summer & Fall 2023 – A random sample of SSIP district IEPs were collected and analyzed as a measure of quality using a normed quality rubric addressing the present levels of educational performance (PLEP) and measurable annual goals (MAGs) of the IEP.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

Infrastructure Changes

AALN Data Sharing (expansion of the data collection monitoring plan and redesign of the data dashboard infrastructure available to all stakeholders) – Data measures were uploaded/updated in real-time and shared throughout the data communication systems. All data dashboards were redesigned to give expanded insights, be more accessible, and increase access to data. These outcomes were related to the data and accountability/monitoring components of the systems of support framework. This strategy supported system change through its support of continuous improvement cycles and was necessary for both the achievement of the SiMR and the sustainability of systems improvement efforts.

AALN Revised and Expanded – The PD delivery model, curriculum, and learning calendar were updated and expanded to cover the 2nd delivery year of year 1 literacy content and the 1st delivery year of year 2 content. Cohort 2 districts were recruited statewide (including from previous SSIP cohorts) and began implementation. These outcomes were related to the PD and TA components of the systems framework. This strategy supports system change and was necessary to both the achievement of the SiMR, the sustainability of systems improvement efforts, and scale up.

AALN Data Collection and Reporting System Installed – Post-activity surveys were written, digital versions were created, data collection calendars were put in place, and reports were written and disseminated to all stakeholders. These outcomes were related to the data and accountability/monitoring components of the systems framework. This strategy supported system change through its support of continuous improvement cycles and was necessary for both the achievement of the SiMR and the sustainability of systems improvement efforts.

Implementation Activities

Strategy One, Two, and Four: Access to Core Instruction, Providing Increasingly Intensive Intervention, and Access to High-Quality Instructional Materials (HQIM)

AALN Regional Access Coaches (RACs) continued delivering the content to their Cohort 1 districts through online virtual Learning Network meetings and quarterly CoPs. From January 2023 through December 2023, 6 Learning Networks and 2 additional CoP took place to review and refine understanding of evidence-based practices for Cohort 1. From August 2023 to December 2023, AALN Regional Access Coaches began delivering Year One content to Cohort 2 districts, 4 Learning Network and 1 CoP took place to build and refine understanding of evidence-based practices.

AALN Summer Inclusion Summit w/ District Action Plan Writing – Participants from 19 districts participated in a 3-day Summer Inclusion Summit Workshop for Cohort 2. Content built upon prior learning and connected it within new learning focused on ensuring students with disabilities have access to high-quality instruction through the use of HQIM. Each SSIP district wrote an SSIP implementation action plan that included milestone targets- this Action Plan is revised throughout the year. SSIP district participants also attend monthly Learning Network meeting and seasonal CoPs (quarterly) to review and refine understanding of evidence-based practices This outcome is related to the governance, PD, and TA components of the systems framework. This strategy supports system change through the installation of EBPs and is necessary to the achievement of the SiMR, the sustainability of systems improvement efforts, and scale-up.

Coaching – Throughout Spring 2023, coaching sessions were scheduled (about twice per month) with each of the Cohort 1 districts to track progress towards milestones, problem solve, and revise each SSIP district's implementation action plan. Between August and December 2023, 144 post-coaching reflections were received by the RACs for supports to Cohort 1 and 2 districts. A coach sees multiple district leaders, school administrators, and teachers within a single setting (district office or school) or may visit leaders and teachers in multiple locations during a coaching day. AALN had eight SSIP Regional Access Coaches who worked with the Cohort 1 district teams from preschool through 8th grade during Winter/Spring 2023; however, beginning Fall 2023, four of those coaches are now dedicated only to teachers and administrators from kindergarten to 8th grade, while the remaining coaches focus on preschool teachers and leaders. Coaches also regularly provide TA to SSIP districts concerning infrastructure development and classroom implementation of the EBPs. These outcomes are related to the data, quality standards, and accountability/monitoring components of the systems framework. These strategies support system change through their support of continuous improvement cycles and are necessary to both the achievement of the SiMR and the sustainability of systems improvement efforts.

Fidelity Measurement – Through last academic year, 93 TN Instructional Practice Guide Knowledge Base (IPG-KB) observations in K-8 English Language Arts classrooms were recorded by the RACs; 96% of these observations reported having students with disabilities present. From August to December 2023, 47 K-8 English Language Arts teachers from 8 districts had an IPG-KB walkthrough observation recorded by the RACs. Moving forward the IPG walkthrough observations will take place three times per school year (teachers observed may change between collection windows) and each district will also be scored based on their observed teacher's aggregate implementation of the AALN strategies to identify successes and barriers. The state's CORE teams are also collecting IPG data as a part if their literacy support activities; 275 IPGs from 10 AALN districts were shared with AALN this fall to assist is SSIP evaluation. This outcome was related to the data, quality standards, and accountability/monitoring components of the systems framework. This strategy supported system change through its support of continuous improvement cycles and was necessary to both the achievement of the SiMR and the sustainability of systems improvement efforts.

Strategy Three: Addressing Skill Deficits through IAIEP Development

IEP sampling – A random sample of SSIP district IEPs were collected and analyzed as a measure of quality using a normed quality rubric addressing the present levels of educational performance (PLEP) and measurable annual goals (MAGs) of the IEP. This outcome is related to the data, quality standards, and accountability/monitoring components of the systems framework. This strategy supports system change through its support of continuous improvement cycles and is necessary to both the achievement of the SiMR and the sustainability of systems improvement efforts.

Did the State implement any <u>new</u> (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)
NO

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

All district team members will continue through this year's training support progression. All Cohort 1 district teams will complete Year Two Literacy content, receive literacy implementation sustainability supports (not yet finalized), and begin Year One Mathematics content. Cohort 2 will complete Year One Literacy content and begin Year Two Literacy content. The training support progression includes monthly Learning Network meetings, the Spring CoP, and ongoing coaching through May 2024 of this academic year. These district and school leaders will continue to receive TA from SSIP leadership as needed. Teacher fidelity observation measurement (Instructional Practice Guide) will continue to be collected by SSIP districts through the 2023-24 academic year. The implementation support activities for the 2024-25 school year will follow the same progression as this school year: monthly fall and spring Learning Network, quarterly CoPs, ongoing coaching, and new sustainability activities.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

• Inclusive Culture and Environment
• Flexible Access to Instruction
• Multi-Sensory Approach and Data-Based Decision-Making
• Writing of IAIEPs

• System Coaching (previously named Cognitive Coaching)
• Access to HQIM

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

Evidence-Based Practice: Environment – For a student to truly have access to core instruction, there must be an inclusive culture and environment established to effectively support students and research contends that both emotional support and classroom climate – which the department groups under the umbrella of "culture and environment" – have the capacity to yield improved student outcomes.

Evidence-Based Practices: Flexible Access to Instruction – This was one of the initial EBPs employed to address the SSIP's first improvement strategy. Work with this EBP has continued, in conjunction with additional training on the EBP of environment, as a positive environment is essential for flexible access strategies to be successful. Trainings around this EPB have focused on ensuring students have the appropriate scaffolds and infrastructure in place to succeed in the classroom. Flexible access centers on the principles of effective learning through flexibility in engagement, representation, and expression. Flexible access and scaffolding of instruction serve as effective complements. Flexible access encourages educators to respond to the beneficial, and inevitable, variance among students in the classroom to ensure access to instruction and accurate assessment of knowledge/skills. The use of accommodations and modifications for SWDs was one of the focal points of the trainings on access and scaffolding. This was done to ensure districts adequately understand that fair does not necessarily mean equal as (1) SWDs may require additional supports and services to best access core instruction and (2) greater flexible access for all students lessens the need for individual student accommodations. This contention lies at the very heart of this EBP – it prioritizes that instruction must be accessible to every student in the classroom and that this is the responsibility of the educator.

Evidence-Based Practices: Multi-Sensory Approach and Data-Based Decision-Making – These EBPs have been grouped together, as they are innately intertwined. As shared in Phase III – 2, both inform one another, as do their sub practices. The materials developed for SSIP strategy two were focused heavily on utilizing a multi-sensory approach to educate and support SWDs, partially informed by the research findings on the integration of multiple senses to enhance and strengthen learning pathways.

Evidence-Based Practice: Writing of IAIEPs – This EBP has been implemented in several waves over the last several phases. To assess the quality of the IEPs being developed in the SSIP districts, the department created a rubric that continues to measure the quality of IEPs for specific sections of the document, and the annual review allows the department to identify concerning trends in writing IEPs, particularly regarding both the data collection and writing of present levels of performance and measurable annual goals. To address these prominently weak areas of the IEPs sampled throughout the SSIP's previous phases, these sections of the IEP became a major focus of continuing SSIP work.

Evidence-Based Practice: System Coaching – This EBP is a process that truly embodies what it means to "coach," contrasting with what "coaches" often provide in education which is actually "consulting." Cognition drives behavior, so in SSIP Coaching, specific paraphrasing and mediative questions asked by the coach aim to draw out district leadership and teacher resourcefulness and create more self-directed professionals who can change their own behavior. Regional Access Coaches (RACs) were added to the team to specifically provide coaching cycles at the district leadership level. These coaches engage in a planning conversation, assist in the collection of implementation fidelity data that the district requests, then engage in reflecting and/or problem resolving conversations using training in System Coaching.

Evidence-Based Practice: HQIM and Access – HQIM are one lever to ensure students with disabilities have improved outcomes (i.e., close the achievement gap). Through PD, HQIM are being used to better provide access for SWDs in the general education classroom. This PD includes strengthening opportunities for ongoing collaboration among general education teachers and special education teachers, building leadership, and support staff to actively engage in lesson preparation and unit preparation when using HQIM.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.

Inclusive Culture and Environment: For the SWDs particularly addressed in Tennessee's SiMR (students with an SLD) core instruction should be a part of a student's least restrictive environment given that appropriate interventions and supports should make access to core instruction in the general education setting a viable option for 80% or more of a student's day. Access for All training and coaching activities focused on this EBP lead to district's prioritizing access to core instruction through both general and special education change in practice, inclusive teaching mindsets paired with greater educator efficacy, as a result, improved student outcomes.

Flexible Access to Instruction: For the SWDs particularly addressed in Tennessee's SiMR (students with an SLD) core instruction should focus on ensuring students have the appropriate access and scaffolds in place to succeed in the classroom. Access for All training and coaching activities focused on this EBP lead to teachers' greater use of a larger and more flexible "toolbox" of engagement, representation, and expression, reducing the need for accommodations and modifications for SWDs. Greater access, through flexibility for all students, leads to better student outcomes, especially for SWDs.

Multi-Sensory Approach and Data-Based Decision-Making: For the SWDs particularly addressed in Tennessee's SiMR (students with an SLD) core instruction should focus on ensuring students have learning activities that are strengths-based and naturally engaging. Access for All training and coaching activities focused on this EBP lead to teachers' greater use of practices tailored to every child's learning needs, leading to better student outcomes, especially for SWDs who rely on this approach to learn, remember, and use new knowledge and skills.

Writing of IAIEPs: For the SWDs particularly addressed in Tennessee's SiMR (students with an SLD) IEPs must capture thorough and accurate present levels of educational performance and reasonably calculated and individualized measurable annual goals. Consultation through district partnerships across the state provides districts with support to improve IAIEP writing.

Cognitive Coaching: The four regional access coaches (RACs) provide district leadership or individual teacher-level coaching cycles. These coaches engage in planning conversations, collect data in the classroom, and then engage in reflecting and/or problem-resolving conversations using training in Cognitive Coaching. This activity supports the greater understanding of and implementation of the other EBPs, which increases a student with an SLD's access to high-quality instruction, which leads to better student outcomes.

Access to HQIM: If districts have HQIM and are provided high-quality professional learning focused on creating structures and alignment of HQIM to the individual needs of students with disabilities through the identification of access points and appropriate scaffolds, then educator and administrative teams will improve classroom practice for students with disabilities in grades K-8, leading to increased academic and post-secondary success.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

The IPG is a rubric that an observer completes during a foundational literacy skills lesson walk-through. The observer focuses on interactions between materials, teacher moves, and student engagement through practice. Focus is on observable outcomes such as student work, student application, and student discussions. The primary focus of data collection is to provide feedback that is most beneficial for the teacher. All SSIP districts conduct systematic observations of instruction in a sample of their classrooms to gauge the implementation of EBPs and to inform continuous improvement. SSIP participants collect and share their IPG data regularly with the SSIP coaches to identify successes, address implementation barriers, and to update their District Action Plan items related to classroom instruction. In addition, a sample of districts have data collected by the RACs or CORE interventionists (AALN partner) to inform overall program improvement.

During the 2022-23 academic year, 93 IPGs representing 11 districts were collected by the RAC and 96% were classrooms including students with disabilities. The five items of focus under culture of learning were observed in 99% of IPGs; for example these include "Students are engaged in the work of the lesson from start to finish" and "Students and their teacher demonstrate a joy for learning through positive relationships and strong classroom culture that is responsive to student interests, experiences, and approaches to learning". The three items focused on high-quality texts at the center of instruction were observed in 95% of IPGs; for example this included "majority of the lesson is spent reading, writing, or speaking about the text(s)" and "The anchor texts are at or above the complexity level expected for the grade and time in the school year". An item for future growth included "Teacher uses questions and tasks to reflect the depth of textual analysis required by grade- level standards and integrate these standards in service of building knowledge" (50% at the Mostly or Yes levels).

During Fall 2023, each of the 4 RACs collected 73 IPGs in 17 Cohort 1 and 2 districts. From Cohort 1 (C1), 94% were classrooms including students with disabilities (C2-83%). The five items of focus under culture of learning were observed in 98% of IPGs (C2-83%). The three items focused on high-quality texts at the center of instruction were observed in 99% of C1 IPGs (C2-81%). Areas for overall growth included "Teacher uses questions and tasks to reflect the depth of textual analysis required by grade- level standards and integrate these standards in service of building knowledge" (C1 -62% & C2-53% at the Mostly or Yes levels) and "Teacher uses questions and tasks to reflect the depth of textual analysis required by grade- level standards and integrate these standards in service of building knowledge" (C1-40% & C2-43% at the Mostly or Yes levels). Teachers in these schools will be observed again in the winter and spring of 2024 – allowing evaluators to measure changes in implementation fidelity. While the samples (which districts, schools, and classrooms observed) are not identical between this and the previous academic year, it is encouraging to see that more teachers were observed using questions and tasks to reflect the depth of textual analysis with a higher level of skill supporting that Year 2 content is already making a positive impact on instruction.

The Office of Statewide Supports Academic Support Team, comprised of eight Centers of Regional Excellence (CORE) teams, provides embedded one-on-one support to Tennessee's school districts in implementing the department's strategic priorities. These teams are staffed with academic specialists (literacy, math, data, special education/intervention, and career technical education) who are deployed to support school districts with strategic diagnosing, planning, implementing, and monitoring the impact of statewide priorities through partnerships to build leader capacity for continuous academic improvement. CORE consultants focus on district systems, processes, stakeholders, culture, and resources in order to support sustainable change. Districts opt into two types of support: comprehensive and strategic. The support strategy (for both types of support) is focused on the implementation of high-quality instructional materials through a phased approach which includes (but not limited to) planning for implementation; establishing unit and lesson preparation; supporting feedback and coaching; and identifying and responding to the needs of all students. Comprehensive support engages districts through continuous cycles of improvement as they progress toward desired outcomes grounded in TN High-Quality Instructional Materials Framework. Strategic support may target one or more components of the continuous improvement cycle dependent upon the needs and desire of the district at any given point within their ongoing implementation work. Consultants guide the districts to use data to develop two to three month action period plans, to implement the plans, and to reflect on the plans. Districts supported by literacy consultants are attaining about 6 outcomes from the High-Quality Instructional Framework per action period. Through CORE support, 89% of the comprehensive support districts have strengthened their preparation processes to include more collaboration and to deepen investment in high-quality instructional materials. By understanding regional district needs, consultants also organize regional literacy collaboration opportunities to provide a space for districts to share best practices and to solve for common barriers. In addition, consultants support Focus Schools by building the capacity of school level leaders through one-on-one support. The focus with these schools is to improve outcomes for our most vulnerable student groups.11 AALN districts are also receiving literacy supports and IPG observations CORE team members. For these districts, RACs and CORE Interventionists collaborate together.

The COREs began sharing their IPG data with SSIP evaluators this Fall to help all stakeholders improve activities. CORE shared 275 IPGs representing 10 C2 districts. The five items of focus under culture of learning were observed in 90% of IPGs. The three items focused on high-quality texts at the center of instruction were observed in 81% of IPGs. Areas for overall growth included "Teacher uses questions and tasks to reflect the depth of textual analysis required by grade- level standards and integrate these standards in service of building knowledge" (61% at the Mostly or Yes levels) and "Teacher uses questions and tasks to reflect the depth of textual analysis required by grade- level standards and integrate these standards in service of building knowledge" (47% at the Mostly or Yes levels). Teachers in these schools will be observed again in the winter and spring of 2024.

In addition to IPGs, the AALN districts write a district implementation action plan in the summer of their first year. These plans are routinely reviewed with RACs during monthly team coaching sessions. As a part of the continuous improvement cycles embedded in these coaching sessions teams identify completed milestones, determine next steps, express resources needed, and add new actions needed to drive positive student outcomes. The action plans serve as living records of the process changes that districts undergo to improve implementation at the system level.

For strategy 4, a random sample of IEPs from high-incidence disability categories in a sample of state districts this year was collected and reviewed for quality using the current IAIEP rubric (developed under previous SSIP phases) between May 1 and September 30, 2023. Current SSIP districts were a part of this sample. SSIP leadership analyze these results and apply their insights to future trainings and TA within AALN.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

At the conclusion of monthly Learning Network meetings (LN), Cohort 1 (C1) participants are invited to complete an online survey about their experience and its impact on their implementation; 26 participant surveys (representing 17 districts) were collected after the four Spring 2023 meetings. Overall, participants have seen great benefit from the meetings, agreeing or strongly agreeing that facilitators were knowledgeable and helpful (96%) and that the LN improved their ability to utilize new learning in their role (92%). An additional 9% of participants felt confident to facilitate discussions regarding the focus discussed in today's Learning Network after attending than before (77-86%).

At the conclusion of the Spring 2023 CoP, C1 participants were invited to complete an online survey about their experience and its impact on their implementation; 24 participant surveys (representing 7 districts) were collected. Overall, participants have seen great benefit from the CoP, agreeing or strongly agreeing that facilitators were knowledgeable and helpful (88%) and that the CoP(s) improved their ability to utilize new learning in their role (88%). An additional 30% of participants felt confident to facilitate discussions regarding the focus discussed in today's CoP after attending than before

(58-88%).

At the end of Spring 2023, C1 district team members were asked to complete an online survey about their coaching experience and what impact it had on their district's implementation of SSIP strategies; 24 surveys were completed by 11 districts. The two areas where participants received the most supports from their RAC were 'IPG Walkthroughs' (75%) and 'Collaboration between SPED and Gen. Ed. Teachers' (58%).

During July 17-19, 2023, district leaders of C2 from 19 districts across Tennessee were trained by AALN RACs in collaboration with the TDOE. This workshop was held in-person from July 17-19, 2023, for the district leaders of C2 to build community with fellow district leaders, learn the vision and beliefs of AALN, and learn how to design inclusive classrooms that establish and sustain a culture of learning. The district leaders identified strengths, weakness, opportunities, and threats for providing access to all students in their reading instruction and left the week with preliminary action plans. At the conclusion of the Summit, online surveys were distributed to evaluate the content taught and the effectiveness of the workshop in preparing the participants to support their districts' needs. Participants in the training completed 45 surveys. Overall, the response was very positive with 91% of respondents either strongly agreeing or agreeing with all of the Likert Scale questions on the survey. The post training survey used a Likert Scale to ascertain the participants' agreement with the nine statements aligned to the expected training outcomes. Most participants strongly agreed or agreed with all the survey items. The items with which respondents most agreed was "The content of this workshop was aligned to the needs and context of my district's work for Access for All" (98%). The item with the lowest agreement was "I feel better prepared to support all teachers with our district's reading foundational skills instructional materials" (91%).

At the conclusion of monthly LN, C1 participants are invited to complete an online survey about their experience and its impact on their implementation; 45 participant surveys (representing 11 districts) were collected after the four Fall 2023 meetings. Overall, participants have seen great benefit from the meetings, agreeing or strongly agreeing that facilitators were knowledgeable and helpful (93%) and that the Learning Networks improved their ability to utilize new learning in their role (96%). An additional 9% of participants felt confident to facilitate discussions regarding the focus discussed in today's Learning Network after attending than before (89-98%).

At the conclusion of the Fall 2023 CoP, C1 participants were invited to complete an online survey about their experience and its impact on their implementation;16 participant surveys (representing 9 districts) were collected. Overall, participants have seen great benefit from the CoP, agreeing or strongly agreeing that facilitators were knowledgeable and helpful (94%) and that the CoP(s) improved their ability to utilize new learning in their role (94%). An additional 13% of participants felt confident to facilitate discussions regarding the focus discussed in today's CoP after attending than before (81-94%).

At the end of Fall 2023, C1 district team members were asked to complete an online survey about their coaching experience and what impact it had on their district's implementation of SSIP strategies; 14 surveys were completed. The two areas where participants received the most supports from their RAC were 'IPG Walkthroughs' (100%) and 'Unit Prep/Lesson Prep Planning' (86%); 93% thought their district trends in their IPG data led to changes in their supports to teachers. The two areas where the most participants had taken steps to support teachers in to enhance literacy instruction based on their IPG data were 'scaffolds' (86%) and 'Unit Prep/Lesson Prep' (79%). 93% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that their RAC had positively supported their impact on the implementation of HQI in literacy for Students with disabilities. Overall, 80% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that their district had seen positive gains in their implementation of action plan items and strategies aligned to the SSIP.

At the conclusion of monthly LN, C2 participants are invited to complete an online survey about their experience and its impact on their implementation; 76 participant surveys (representing 17 districts) were collected after the four Fall 2023 meetings. Overall, participants have seen great benefit from the meetings, agreeing or strongly agreeing that facilitators were knowledgeable and helpful (99%) and that the CoP(s) improved their ability to utilize new learning in their role (99%). An additional 15% of participants felt confident to facilitate discussions regarding the focus discussed in today's Learning Network after attending than before (84-96%).

At the conclusion of the Fall 2023 CoP, C2 participants were invited to complete an online survey about their experience and its impact on their implementation; 12 participant surveys (representing 8 districts) were collected. Overall, participants have seen great benefit from the CoP, agreeing or strongly agreeing that facilitators were knowledgeable and helpful (100%) and that the CoP(s) improved their ability to utilize new learning in their role (100%). An additional 42% of participants felt confident to facilitate discussions regarding the focus discussed in today's CoP after attending than before (58-100%).

At the end of Fall 2023, C2 district team members were asked to complete an online survey about their coaching experience and what impact it had on their district's implementation of SSIP strategies; 23 surveys were completed. The two areas where participants received the most supports from their RAC were 'Collaboration between SPED and Gen. Ed. Teachers' (83%) and 'IPG Walkthroughs' (78%); 87% thought their district trends in their IPG data led to changes in their supports to teachers. The two areas where the most participants had taken steps to support teachers in to enhance literacy instruction based on their IPG data were 'use of curriculum' (83%) and 'Unit Prep' (74%); 96% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that their RAC had positively supported their impact on the implementation of HQI in literacy for Students with disabilities. Overall, 92% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that their district had seen positive gains in their implementation of action plan items and strategies aligned to the SSIP.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Strategies 1, 2, and 4: AALN will continue to employ a training and implementation support model focused on all four strategies as they pertain to Literacy. Consistent reinforcement of the work through the Learning Network, CoPs, classroom observations, coaching, and refined materials/resources ensure the continued integration of the strategies and EBPs into the classroom. Coaching will be used by SSIP Regional Access Coaches to continue to support district teams as they impact strong educator behavioral change through the effective implementation and access of HQIM. SSIP districts will continue to review, update, and revise their Action Plans through the use of data-driven decision making and continuous improvement cycles. Similar to the prior year, many Cohort 1 & 2 districts have set increasing the opportunities for general educations and special education collaborative literacy unit and lesson preparation as the major priority. All districts are looking to continue to refine their implementation of the IPG walkthroughs protocol. It us also anticipated that the SSIP Regional Access Coaches will continue to be invited to facilitate district/school PD topics related to district Action Plans. New resources and activities will be created in the 2024-25 academic year to assist Cohort 1 districts in their sustainability of these three strategies as they pertain to Literacy.

Strategies 1, 2, and 4: AALN will begin to employ a training and implementation support model focused on all four strategies as they pertain to Mathematics. Consistent reinforcement of the work through the Learning Network, CoPs, classroom observations, coaching, and refined materials/resources will ensure the continued integration of the strategies and EBPs into the classroom. Coaching will be used by SSIP Regional Access Coaches to continue to support district teams as they impact strong educator behavioral change through the effective implementation and access of HQIM. SSIP Cohort 1 districts will create and then continue to review, update, and revise their Mathematics Action Plans through the use of data-driven

decision making and continuous improvement cycles.

Strategy 3: IAIEP data will be presented to districts to inform their district PD activities and teachers will review and revise their IEP writing practices. The department will collect a new sample of IEPs for quality measurement between May-September of 2024.

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.

The AALN Summer Workshop was provided before the 2023-24 academic year to 19 SSIP Cohort 2 school districts' central office and school administrators. The participants were trained by TDOE Leaders, AALN Regional Access Coaches, and a national facilitator from The New Teacher Project. The workshop focused on making sure that ALL students in Tennessee learn foundational reading skills through HQIM. District teams were given significant time to explore and use their HQIM as they contextualized proper unit and lesson planning in their district's schools. Teams identified strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats for providing access to all students in their reading instruction and left the week with preliminary action plans. Ninety-seven percent of participants agreed or strongly agreed that their district team (who attended the workshop) was better prepared to enhance their supports to students with disabilities in their district through access to Tier 1 instruction.

The monthly Learning Networks this spring and fall were facilitated by the Regional Access Coaches to give district leaders from both cohorts the opportunity to build community while they learn, discuss, and collaborate on HQIM, tools, and content provided by The New Teacher Project. Ninety-five percent of Cohort 1 respondents felt empowered to be active participants during the Learning Network and found the facilitators knowledgeable and helpful; 96% for Cohort 2. From before to after the meetings, there was a 14% increase in confidence of both Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 participants' ability to facilitate discussions in their districts regarding the use of the tools discussed.

The Spring and Fall CoPs were set up to dig deeper into concepts taught during the Summer Workshop and give opportunities for collaboration between educational leaders on the topics of implementation tools and HQIM lesson preparation. Most participants agreed or strongly agreed that the training improved their ability to utilize new learning in their roles during the CoP; 63% for Cohort 1 in the Spring, 100% for Cohort 1 in the Fall, and 96% for Cohort 2 in the Fall. From before to after the meetings, there was a 28% increase in confidence of Cohort 1's Spring ability to facilitate discussions in their districts regarding the use of the tools discussed; 17% increase for Cohort 1 in the Fall and a 14% increase for Cohort 2 in the Fall.

The AALN employed eight half-time Regional Access Coaches in Spring 2023 who worked one-on-one with district leaders twice a month varying the discussions to meet the individual needs of each district, school-level staff member, or administrator on SSIP EBP implementation. The coaches accompanied the districts on IPG walkthroughs, helped facilitate collaboration between special education and general education, and gave individualized training on HQIM, problem-solving, lesson planning, and Unit Preparation. The spring coaching participation survey included 3 qualitative questions for feedback. The responses overall were very positive with several respondents expressing how beneficial the walk-throughs and planning sessions were for their district. In the Fall, 4 RACs were selected to work full time with K-8 (no longer splitting early childhood and literacy duties) providing the same coaching supports as last spring. The fall coaching participation survey also had overall responses from both cohorts that were very positive with several respondents expressing how beneficial time for collaboration was for their districts.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. The AC typically meets quarterly during each FFY in July, October, January, and April. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes, providing information over the last two FFYs regarding Tennessee's APR state determination, APR target setting, and new APR local determinations resources available to LEAs. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

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 regional special education supervisor study council meetings (East, Central, and West). At these meetings, data from the APR (including Indicator 17 formative milestones and outcomes) and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families. For example, the department hosts monthly listening sessions with representatives from statewide advocacy groups where they can ask questions about policies, rules, or practice trends, as well as share issues from the field. These listening sessions include legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The Arc Tennessee. For more information on the specific activities and/or strategies used to engage and increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents, please see the "Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities" section below.

Although there were no substantive revisions to FFY 2022 baselines and/or targets, the department made concerted efforts prior to the FFY 2020 APR submission to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/families/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Furthermore, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets. This information will be taken into consideration for future

efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

The department has continued to engage stakeholders and solicit their feedback during the implementation of the SSIP. Various stakeholders have received information on the work through a variety of methods. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. Partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. Statewide data are also communicated within the SEA, via social media, on the project's website, and through an internal data dashboard. The success of the SSIP is contingent upon not only the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. The department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content.

The AALN gathers participant feedback at every stage of the content delivery process through surveys that collect district administrators' knowledge and ability gains, the implementation of activities according to expected training fidelity, and a series of open-ended feedback questions. These surveys are tailored to each PD activity and are annually reviewed, and content and surveys are modified at least annually by SSIP leadership based on participant feedback. Surveys collected during this Phase have included the summer workshop, monthly Learning Network sessions, a Fall and Spring CoP, and a Fall Coaching Survey.

Spring 2023: The monthly Cohort 1 Learning Network Participant Surveys collected in Spring 2023 asked for how future Learning Network meetings could be improved, and 19 responses were provided. Forty-two percent of responses were positive or indicated a desire to continue participating in PD opportunities. One response was a request to follow the same format in future Learning Network meetings. Another response was an appreciation for having something to immediately share in their district. One participant stated they weren't able to access a breakout session within the online platform.

Spring 2023: The Spring Cohort 1 CoP Participant Survey asked for how future CoPs could be improved, and twenty-one responses were provided. Almost half of the responses, 47%, focused on the success of the sessions, stating they were collaborative and helpful. Four participants shared that meetings could be shorter. One reported that the length of the meetings impeded instructional time during the school day. A couple of participants expressed a desire for more time to talk with other districts about that day's topic or time to brainstorm other areas of need. One participant felt that Slack was not a user-friendly platform and wanted to use Google Drive instead.

Spring 2023: An electronic AALN Coaching Feedback Survey was collected at the end of Spring 2023 from Cohort 1. Twenty participants provided feedback on what way(s) could the Regional Access Coach better support their district. Thirty percent of the responses were solely positive. Thirty percent also requested more in-person supports from their coach. The survey also included an opportunity to collect district needs for overall implementation during the upcoming quarter. The fourteen responses varied but the topic of how grant monies could be spent was brought up multiple times.

Summer 2023: The Cohort 2 Summer Workshop Participant Survey received 33 responses related to feedback about the content provided. Eleven of the responses talked about collaboration between general education and special education staff, "that collaboration will benefit everyone from teachers to students." Several participants also mentioned the importance of 'planning' as well as 'shifting' your mindset', "Mindset and planning are keys". Another participant stated, "This was one of the best trainings I've ever attended."

Fall 2023: The monthly Cohort 1 Learning Network Participant Surveys collected in Fall 2023 asked for what resources could be helpful in implementing the content discussed and nineteen responses were provided. Twenty-one percent of respondents requested more examples. A few respondents requested more time to complete the tasks given to them. A couple of respondents requested links to resources and a recording of the meeting so they could rewatch and share with others.

Fall 2023: The monthly Cohort 2 Learning Network Participant Surveys collected in Fall 2023 asked for what resources could be helpful in implementing the content discussed and thirty four responses were provided. Twenty one percent of respondents requested to receive additional resource materials or additional support in collaboration, scaffolding, or IPG. A few requested suggestions on scheduling and scaffolding options.

Fall 2023: The Fall Cohort 1 CoP Participant Survey asked for what resources could be helpful in implementing the content discussed, and eight responses were provided. Three respondents asked to use a PD day for training. Three respondents requested watching real-life examples either in person or as a recording. One respondent requested the list of books mentioned from district spotlight and another requested the accommodation monitoring tool.

Fall 2023: The Fall Cohort 2 CoP Participant Survey asked what resources could be helpful in implementing the content discussed, and twelve responses were provided. Over half focused on the success of the sessions, stating that they were informative and/or helpful. Two respondents noted that they found the collaboration with other districts beneficial. Another two participants stated they would share the information learned with others in their districts to better guide their planning.

Fall 2023: An electronic AALN Coaching Feedback Survey was collected at the end of Fall 2023 from Cohort 1. Nine participants provided feedback on what way(s) could the Regional Access Coach better support their district. Sixty-seven percent suggested continuing to provide the supports they are already receiving. Others requested additional supports in IPG walkthroughs and scheduling. The survey also included an opportunity to collect district needs for overall implementation during the upcoming quarter. The eleven responses all sited that time was their biggest concern and help finding ways to collaborate and plan together would be needed to improve implementation.

Fall 2023: An electronic AALN Coaching Feedback Survey was collected at the end of Fall 2023 from Cohort 2. Seventeen participants provided feedback on what way(s) could the Regional Access Coach better support their district. The responses varied and included the desire for more collaboration and ways to support their teachers with scaffolding. The survey also included an opportunity to collect district needs for overall implementation during the upcoming quarter. The twenty-two responses included requests for ways to schedule collaborative planning and increase teacher buy-in.

In addition, the AALN university partner (University of Tennessee) facilitates weekly meetings with all Regional Access Coaches where real-time implementation feedback is provided and shared with the department's SSIP leaders. The department also hosts a monthly project Leadership Meeting where coaches, key stakeholders, CORE Interventionists, and SSIP evaluators share participant and stakeholder input.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

The department has continued to engage and solicit feedback from stakeholders during implementation of the SSIP. Various stakeholders have received information on the work, including special education supervisors, educators, administrators, service providers, advocacy groups, other SEA divisions, and the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities. Information has been shared publicly through a variety of modes,

including council/task force meetings and newsletters. Statewide data was also communicated within the SEA and via social media.

Success of the SSIP is contingent upon not just the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. In addition, the department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content. SSIP leadership from the TDOE have facilitated discussion and shared feedback of the SSIP implementation and activities as a regular item in the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities meetings. AC members (comprised of parents of SWDs, individuals with disabilities, educators, and student and parent advocates) and other stakeholders in attendance at these meetings provide feedback through participation in roundtable conversations. These are open meetings which are recorded and available on the department's website for public viewing.

To ensure that training is resulting in implementation, various data is collected on the quality of IEPs, the fidelity of training, observations focused on training concept implementation, and training and classroom visits by the SSIP Regional Access Coaches.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

The State used the AALN data dashboard and reports (produced at the conclusion of each major support activity cycle) to consistently monitor stakeholder concerns. RACs routinely address this overall feedback when developing new Learning Network and CoP content. RACs also take specific feedback from districts (especially requests for resources or help) and address them during monthly coaching sessions. Feedback pertaining to network structure, data collection, and coaching quality are shared with SSIP leadership who address global themes during monthly meetings with RACs or at CoPs. Specific feedback with leadership is addressed through TA given through emails, online video conference, or direct face to face meetings.

In addition, stakeholders are provided with a "who to contact" document so they know who to contact for questions/concerns in specific areas, as well as a single email address that any question or concern can be sent to that is checked daily and assigned to the best person to address. Districts have milestone meetings with SSIP Regional Access Coaches twice per month and can contact their additional regional support staff (CORE special education interventionists), the general email address, the project manager, or the CORE interventionist directly with concerns or requests at any time, and they do. The applicable team members followed up with stakeholders through email, phone/zoom calls, and/or in-person. TA was provided, data reviewed, dashboard features redesigned or added, and data cleaned as concerns were related to data collection, data dashboard functionality, or data accuracy. CORE interventionists, coaches, and other initiative leaders review feedback data with district facilitators and observers through continuous improvement cycles to improve action planning for TA and classroom observations. TA and coaching sessions are provided to the districts and teachers to strengthen implementation and problem-solve in a truly collaborative manner. The project manager meets weekly with the coaches and CLEE staff, biweekly with the CORE intervention team/lead, and monthly with the full project team, and the CLEE logistics teams meet with the UK evaluation team weekly to raise and solve data issues/needs that arise.

The shift to the Access for All Network (AALN) increased direct supports for district leadership to aid them in being responsive to teachers' needs, to increase collaboration between general education and special education, set a Leadership Vision, protect, and increase teachers' effective collaborative planning time, and using HQIM with integrity for students with disabilities. By continuing to implement the first three strategies, but within HQIM as the primary strategy, the SSIP has directly done what teachers requested in previous SSIP years ; "more applications that shows how to use these strategies and activities within our curriculum," "give more clear and different strategies to implement in the classroom for daily lessons," give us "more time with team members" and our "grade level."

SSIP coaches have reported that districts, based on the feedback from their teachers and stakeholders, are being proactive in making scheduling a priority so that both special education and general education teachers are able to collaboratively plan together. Special initiative funds from the State have been used in many districts to supply special education teachers with the general education curriculum. Districts have audited their professional learning offerings and are creating their own PD content to better educate one another on scaffolding and strategies for fostering inclusion. A couple of districts have gotten trained in CKLA, meeting teachers where they are at, and using data to inform decision making. When prioritizing collaborative unit and lesson preparation, many districts are sending instructional coaches or administrators in to lead those sessions.

The AALN, in response to participants resource requests, found new partners within other TDOE initiatives and at the state's UCEDD (TRIAD at the University of Vanderbilt) to create content on how each inclusion model can be used effectively in literacy units and lessons. For example, TRIAD is developing a one pager for teachers and district leaders concerning co-teaching. These new AALN resources will be added to the State's Best For All Central Universal Resources page available to all educators in the state.

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

17 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:

Zachary Stone

Title:

Senior Director of Data Reporting

Email:

Zachary.Stone@tn.gov

Phone:

(615) 532-9702

Submitted on:

04/25/24 4:15:56 PM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

Tennessee
2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)

Percentage (%)	Determination
67.50%	Needs Assistance

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

Section	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	20	15	75.00%
Compliance	20	12	60.00%

(1) For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part B."

2024 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment (2)	Grade 4		
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8		
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	25%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	88%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	23%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	79%	0

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 4		
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8		
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	44%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	85%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	20%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	84%	1

(2) Statewide assessments include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment.

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	10	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma**	74	1

**When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. §300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, "the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential."

2024 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator (3)	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021 (4)	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	54.55%	N/A	0
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	7.25%	NO	1
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	92.81%	NO	1
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	91.21%	NO	1
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	7.42%	NO	0
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	100.00%		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	100.00%		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	100.00%		2
Longstanding Noncompliance			1
Programmatic Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	Yes, 2 to 4 years		

(3) The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2024_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

(4) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are >=5% and <10% for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, and >=90% and <95% for Indicators 11, 12, and 13.

Data Rubric

Tennessee

FFY 2022 APR (1)

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data

APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1

APR Score Calculation

Subtotal	21
Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2022 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	26

(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

618 Data (2)

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 8/30/23	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 1/10/24	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/15/23	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/3/23	1	1	1	3

618 Score Calculation

Subtotal	21
Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	26.00

(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation

A. APR Grand Total	26
B. 618 Grand Total	26.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	52.00
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
Denominator	52.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) =	1.0000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	100.00

(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2024 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) Timely – A State will receive one point if it submits all ED*Facts* files or the entire E*MAPS* survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	ED*Facts* Files/ E*MAPS* Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	C002 & C089	8/30/2023
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	2/21/2024
Part B Exiting	C009	2/21/2024
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	2/21/2024
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	1/10/2024
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in E*MAPS*	11/15/2023
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in E*MAPS*	5/3/2023

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to ED*Facts* aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in E*MAPS*. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

Dispute Resolution
IDEA Part B
Tennessee
School Year: 2022-23

A zero count should be used when there were no events or occurrences to report in the specific category for the given reporting period. Check "Missing' if the state did not collect or could not report a count for the specific category. Please provide an explanation for the missing data in the comment box at the top of the page.

Section A: Written, Signed Complaints

(1) Total number of written signed complaints filed.	107
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued.	83
(1.1) (a) Reports with findings of noncompliance	38
(1.1) (b) Reports within timelines	83
(1.1) (c) Reports within extended timelines	0
(1.2) Complaints pending.	0
(1.2) (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing.	0
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	24

Section B: Mediation Requests

(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes.	39
(2.1) Mediations held.	27
(2.1) (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints.	20
(2.1) (a) (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints.	14
(2.1) (b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints.	7
(2.1) (b) (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints.	5
(2.2) Mediations pending.	4
(2.3) Mediations withdrawn or not held.	8

Section C: Due Process Complaints

(3) Total number of due process complaints filed.	91
(3.1) Resolution meetings.	45
(3.1) (a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings.	35
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated.	2
(3.2) (a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited).	0
(3.2) (b) Decisions within extended timeline.	2
(3.3) Due process complaints pending.	10
(3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing).	79

Section D: Expedited Due Process Complaints (Related to Disciplinary Decision)

(4) Total number of expedited due process complaints filed.	3
(4.1) Expedited resolution meetings.	2
(4.1) (a) Expedited written settlement agreements.	1
(4.2) Expedited hearings fully adjudicated.	0
(4.2) (a) Change of placement ordered	0
(4.3) Expedited due process complaints pending.	0
(4.4) Expedited due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	3

State Comments:

Errors:
Please note that the data entered result in the following relationships which violate edit checks:

State error comments:

This report shows the most recent data that was entered by:
Tennessee
These data were extracted on the close date:
11/15/2023

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2024 will be posted in June 2024. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

Final Determination Letter

June 21, 2024

Honorable Lizzette Reynolds
Commissioner
Tennessee Department of Education
710 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, TN 37243

Dear Commissioner Reynolds :

I am writing to advise you of the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) 2024 determination under Section 616 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Department has determined that Tennessee needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B of the IDEA. This determination is based on the totality of Tennessee's data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2022 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

Tennessee's 2024 determination is based on the data reflected in its "2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix" (RDA Matrix). The RDA Matrix is individualized for each State and Entity and consists of:

(1)   a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors;

(2)   a Results Matrix that includes scoring on Results Elements;

(3)   a Compliance Score and a Results Score;

(4)   an RDA Percentage based on both the Compliance Score and the Results Score; and

(5)   the State's or Entity's Determination.

The RDA Matrix is further explained in a document, entitled "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part B" (HTDMD).

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making determinations in 2024, as it did for Part B determinations in 2014-2023. (The specifics of the determination procedures and criteria are set forth in the HTDMD document and reflected in the RDA Matrix for Tennessee).

In making Part B determinations in 2024, OSEP continued to use results data related to:

(1)   the participation and performance of CWD on the most recently administered (school year 2021-2022) National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), as applicable (For the 2024 determinations, OSEP using results data on the participation and performance of children with disabilities on the NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. OSEP used the available NAEP data for Puerto Rico in making Puerto Rico's 2024 determination as it did for Puerto Rico's 2023 determination. OSEP did not use NAEP data in making the BIE's 2024 determination because the NAEP data available for the BIE were not comparable to the NAEP data available for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico; specifically, the most recently administered NAEP for the BIE is 2019, whereas the most recently administered NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico is 2022.)

(2)   the percentage of CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma; and

(3)   the percentage of CWD who dropped out.

For the 2024 IDEA Part B determinations, OSEP also considered participation of CWD on Statewide assessments (which include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment). While the participation rates of CWD on Statewide assessments were a factor in each State or Entity's 2024 Part B Results Matrix, no State or Entity received a Needs Intervention determination in 2024 due solely to this criterion. However, this criterion will be fully incorporated beginning with the 2025 determinations.

You may access the results of OSEP's review of Tennessee's SPP/APR and other relevant data by accessing the E*MAPS* SPP/APR reporting tool using your Tennessee-specific log-on information at https://emaps.ed.gov/suite/. When you access Tennessee's SPP/APR on the site, you will find, in applicable Indicators 1 through 17, the OSEP Response to the indicator and any actions that Tennessee is required to take. The actions that Tennessee is required to take are in the "Required Actions" section of the indicator.

It is important for you to review the Introduction to the SPP/APR, which may also include language in the "OSEP Response" and/or "Required Actions" sections.

You will also find the following important documents in the Determinations Enclosures section:

(1)   Tennessee's RDA Matrix;

(2)   the HTDMD link;

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.

106   Part B

(3) "2024 Data Rubric Part B," which shows how OSEP calculated Tennessee's "Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data" score in the Compliance Matrix; and

(4) "Dispute Resolution 2022-2023," which includes the IDEA Section 618 data that OSEP used to calculate the Tennessee's "Timely State Complaint Decisions" and "Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions" scores in the Compliance Matrix.

As noted above, Tennessee's 2024 determination is Needs Assistance. A State's or Entity's 2024 RDA Determination is Needs Assistance if the RDA Percentage is at least 60% but less than 80%. A State or Entity's determination would also be Needs Assistance if its RDA Determination percentage is 80% or above but the Department has imposed Specific Conditions on the State's or Entity's last three IDEA Part B grant awards (for FFYs 2021, 2022, and 2023), and those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2024 determination.

Tennessee's determination for 2023 was also Needs Assistance. In accordance with Section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if a State or Entity is determined to need assistance for two consecutive years, the Secretary must take one or more of the following actions:

(1) advise the State or Entity of available sources of technical assistance that may help the State or Entity address the areas in which the State or Entity needs assistance and require the State or Entity to work with appropriate entities;

(2) direct the use of State-level funds on the area or areas in which the State or Entity needs assistance; or

(3) identify the State or Entity as a high-risk grantee and impose Specific Conditions on the State's or Entity's IDEA Part B grant award.

Pursuant to these requirements, the Secretary is advising Tennessee of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers and resources at the following websites: Monitoring and State Improvement Planning (MSIP) | OSEP Ideas That Work, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Topic Areas, and requiring Tennessee to work with appropriate entities. In addition, Tennessee should consider accessing technical assistance from other Department-funded centers such as the Comprehensive Centers with resources at the following link: https://compcenternetwork.org/states. The Secretary directs Tennessee to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. We strongly encourage Tennessee to access technical assistance related to those results elements and compliance indicators for which it received a score of zero. Tennessee must report with its FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2025, on:

(1) the technical assistance sources from which Tennessee received assistance; and

(2) the actions Tennessee took as a result of that technical assistance.

As required by IDEA Section 616(e)(7) and 34 C.F.R. §300.606, Tennessee must notify the public that the Secretary of Education has taken the above enforcement actions, including, at a minimum, by posting a public notice on its website and distributing the notice to the media and through public agencies.

IDEA determinations provide an opportunity for all stakeholders to examine State data as that data relate to improving outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. The Department encourages stakeholders to review State SPP/APR data and other available data as part of the focus on improving equitable outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. Key areas the Department encourages State and local personnel to review are access to high-quality intervention and instruction; effective implementation of individualized family service plans (IFSPs) and individualized education programs (IEPs), using data to drive decision-making, supporting strong relationship building with families, and actively addressing educator and other personnel shortages.

For 2025 and beyond, the Department is considering three criteria related to IDEA Part B determinations as part of the Department's continued efforts to incorporate equity and improve results for CWD. First, the Department is considering as a factor OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). This factor would be reflected in the determination for each State and Entity through the "longstanding noncompliance" section of the Compliance Matrix beginning with the 2025 determinations. In implementing this factor, the Department is also considering beginning in 2025 whether a State or Entity that would otherwise receive a score of Meets Requirements would not be able to receive a determination of Meets Requirements if the State or Entity had OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). Second, the Department is considering as potential additional factors the improvement in proficiency rates of CWD on Statewide assessments. Third, the Department is considering whether and how to continue including in its determinations criteria the participation and proficiency of CWD on the NAEP.

For the FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission due on February 1, 2025, OSEP is providing the following information about the IDEA Section 618 data. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part B data submitted as of the due date will be used for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR and the 2025 IDEA Part B Results Matrix and States and Entities will not be able to resubmit their IDEA Section 618 data after the due date. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part B data will automatically be prepopulated in the SPP/APR reporting platform for Part B SPP/APR Indicators 3, 5, and 6 (as they have in the past). Under EDFacts Modernization, States and Entities are expected to submit high-quality IDEA Section 618 Part B data that can be published and used by the Department as of the due date. States and Entities are expected to conduct data quality reviews prior to the applicable due date. OSEP expects States and Entities to take one of the following actions for all business rules that are triggered in the EDPass or EMAPS system prior to the applicable due date: 1) revise the uploaded data to address the edit; or 2) provide a data note addressing why the data submission triggered the business rule. States and Entities will be unable to submit the IDEA Section 618 Part B data without taking one of these two actions. There will not be a resubmission period for the IDEA Section 618 Part B data.

As a reminder, Tennessee must report annually to the public, by posting on the State educational agency's (SEA's) website, the performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in Tennessee on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after Tennessee's submission of its FFY 2022 SPP/APR. In addition, Tennessee must:

(1) review LEA performance against targets in the State's SPP/APR;

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.

107   Part B

(2) determine if each LEA "meets the requirements" of Part B, or "needs assistance," "needs intervention," or "needs substantial intervention" in implementing Part B of the IDEA;

(3) take appropriate enforcement action; and

(4) inform each LEA of its determination.

Further, Tennessee must make its SPP/APR available to the public by posting it on the SEA's website. Within the upcoming weeks, OSEP will be finalizing a State Profile that:

(1) includes Tennessee's determination letter and SPP/APR, OSEP attachments, and all State or Entity attachments that are accessible in accordance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; and

(2) will be accessible to the public via the ed.gov website.

OSEP appreciates Tennessee's efforts to improve results for children and youth with disabilities and looks forward to working with Tennessee over the next year as we continue our important work of improving the lives of children with disabilities and their families. Please contact your OSEP State Lead if you have any questions, would like to discuss this further, or want to request technical assistance.

Sincerely,

Valerie C. Williams

Valerie C. Williams
Director
Office of Special Education Programs

cc: Tennessee Director of Special Education

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.

108   Part B