

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2019**

Tennessee



**PART B DUE
February 1, 2021**

**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 16 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

For additional information about how data collection and reporting for Indicators 1 through 16 were impacted by COVID-19, please see the narratives and "Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)" field within each Indicator section.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

146

General Supervision System

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

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 distinctive levels: on-site, desktop, and self-assessment. A risk analysis comprised of multiple factors identifies the level of risk and likelihood that an LEA may not comply with certain requirements. Results from the analysis designate each LEA's risk as one of three levels: significant (which results in department staff conducting a monitoring visit with the LEA on-site), elevated (which identifies LEAs for participation in desktop monitoring), or low risk (with LEAs completing a self-assessment). 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 an on-site monitoring occurs prior to determining the desktop and self-assessment selections.

IEP Self-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 office hours and a webinar or in-person training offered by the department annually.

In the first step of this monitoring process, the department assigns ten student IDs to each LEA, which consists of randomly sampled student records to evaluate. These records are representative of the disability category makeup of each individual LEA for viable sampling. First, the case manager or teacher must assess these records using the protocol made available through a monitoring platform. Second, the LEA-level administrator (most often the IDEA Director) reviews the case managers' responses and may make revisions as appropriate before submitting the final review to the department. A copy of the IEP Self-Monitoring Protocol is available at <https://eplan.tn.gov/DocumentLibrary/ViewDocument.aspx?DocumentKey=1629725&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 assessment via the same platform. The third review is conducted by state-level monitoring specialists in the division of Federal Programs and Oversight (FPO) through a desktop audit. State-level monitoring specialists 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 coordinator reviews and finalizes all decisions in the system. The system then generates a final Monitoring Results Report, and the compliance coordinator notifies all LEAs when results are available to review. The department continues to hold office hours three times per week to discuss any questions that LEAs may have regarding the review process, Monitoring Results Report, required action steps, or close out process.

Fiscal Monitoring: The fiscal monitoring of IDEA Part B funds and grants is completed by the Office of Local Finance. This monitoring ensures that LEAs are appropriately spending and allocating IDEA Part B funds at both the LEA- and individual school-level. In addition, fiscal monitoring is completed for those 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 and each indicator selected is weighted based on the department's 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 less reliable data (e.g., survey results) have a lesser weight.

The actual 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 growth metric to assess year-to-year improvement 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/data/lea_apr_indicator_summary_201819.pdf for examples) listing their actual data for each indicator included in the determinations process, how their data compare against the state, and whether they met the state-established target.

All LEAs, regardless of their determination, must address any 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 "Needs Assistance" are required to attend a virtual meeting to review the APR process, learn how to conduct a root case analysis, and brainstorm strategies to improve district performance.

LEAs determined to be "Needs Intervention" must complete all the tasks associated with the "Needs Assistance" designation and are also required to participate in virtual or in-person site visits. During those visits, staff from the Centers of Regional Excellence (CORE) work with LEAs to address indicators flagged during the determinations process. 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 APR federal fiscal year and other current data are used to guide the development of strategies that will be included in the LEA's comprehensive plan for improvement. Follow-up conversations to discuss progress within the plan are scheduled on a quarterly basis.

LEAs that are determined to be "Needs Substantial Improvement" 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 meet with department staff on a monthly basis to discuss progress and any challenges that may be preventing them from meeting the goals outlined in their plans.

Dispute Resolution

The department's Office of General Counsel 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 hearings 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 Office of General Counsel. 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 hearing officer at the request of either party).

Technical Assistance System

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

Identifying Initiatives

The department has continued championing the initiatives outlined in Tennessee's State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) regarding access to high-quality instruction for all students with disabilities and ensuring educators are providing appropriate interventions to students that address their areas of deficit/need. Due to the successes seen as result of this work, both in classroom observations of participating teachers/schools and concrete student-level data, these initiatives expanded to even more LEAs. In the 2017-18 school year, LEAs had the opportunity to apply for participation in a second SPDG/SSIP cohort (SPDG 2.0) to implement these strategies. Twenty additional LEAs were selected for participation in the K-12 initiative and 17 were selected for the new early childhood initiative. These LEAs implemented SPDG 2.0 activities throughout the 2018-19 and 2019-20 school years. During the Spring of 2020, 46 new LEAs (28 K-12 and 18 early childhood) were selected for the SPDG 3.0 cohort to continue this initiative of targeted support through a four-year partnership. Implementation began in these districts in July 2020.

Metrics are collected throughout the initiative to assess implementation success and make adjustments as necessary. Although Tennessee has made great strides in inclusive opportunities for K-12 in terms of setting, we have not yet closed the gap related to proficiency and student growth. The K-12 SPDG initiative is designed to increase access to instruction and intervention, not just the educational environment. In terms of early childhood, Tennessee has had one of the lowest percentages in the nation of students ages 3-5 receiving the majority of their special education services in a regular early childhood program. As one action to address this, the department worked with the seventeen LEAs that were part of a two-year Early Childhood SPDG 2.0 cohort. These LEAs completed a number of initiatives targeted at increasing inclusion, access to developmentally appropriate environments, and high-quality instruction for children with disabilities (ages 3-5).

Training on Initiatives

The department has gone to great lengths to increase the amount of high-quality technical assistance and professional development offered to LEAs throughout the state. Many of the divisions within the department provide individual trainings and professional development to their specific populations relative to current policies and initiatives. However, to avoid siloing of efforts, the department has used its strategic plan to create linkages in work being done across divisions and ensure that a diverse group of department staff and stakeholders are at the table to have conversations about the broad array of work being done. This work has ensured that SWDs and educators of SWDs remain a focus of the work being done by the department as a whole and that department staff remain cognizant of these subgroups.

The instructional programming team within the Division of Special Populations conducts the majority of instructional technical assistance and professional development for special education staff within Tennessee, particularly regarding the aforementioned initiatives. This assistance has included the development of a special education framework to assist teachers in the writing of Instructionally Appropriate IEPs and the collaboration with others in the department relative to Response to Instruction and Intervention (RTI²). Each member of the instructional programming team has a particular area of expertise, ranging from speech/language therapy to high school transition, so that the team can offer a wide gamut of professional development and technical assistance to LEAs in all areas of special education.

CORE interventionists, in collaboration with select Division of Special Populations staff, serve as regional support for LEAs across the state. They not only take the lead in working with "Needs Intervention" and "Needs Substantial Intervention" LEAs, but also assist with training on the aforementioned initiatives or providing requested professional development. The CORE interventionists 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 different people needed to answer different questions. The interventionists are able to connect LEAs to resources, training opportunities, and guidance regarding department initiatives.

The Data Services team provides professional development and routine technical assistance to LEAs on the use of data to inform instructional decision-making and the effective use of the statewide IEP data management system (EasyIEP). This team develops documentation and manuals for LEAs regarding inputting special education information into the statewide system and goes to great lengths to link the technology platform to the department initiatives to ensure streamlined communication to LEAs. Embedded in this IEP data management system are many resources addressing crucial initiatives produced by the department to ensure such information can be readily accessed by users when creating special education documents.

Identifying LEAs for Technical Assistance/Professional Development

While some of the technical assistance and professional development the department provides is predicated on LEA requests for support, the department also uses data to determine whether LEAs require technical assistance or professional development. In particular, the Division of Special Populations uses the APR local determinations as a barometer of whether LEAs are successfully improving the outcomes of SWDs and are compliant with federal and state regulations. While those LEAs in the determination category of "Meets Requirements" may receive technical assistance or professional development if requested, the department focuses much of its resources and efforts on providing support to those LEAs in "Needs Assistance," "Needs Intervention," and "Needs Substantial Intervention" determination categories.

In addition, the department utilizes a cross-divisional approach to identify additional technical assistance needs. This group, the IDEA collaborative, includes leadership from the Division of Special Populations, the Office of General Counsel, 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 technical assistance, focused monitoring, or additional supports that may be needed.

Professional Development System

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

In addition to the systems listed under the "Technical Assistance System" section above, the department recently unveiled an online professional development 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 Special Populations continues to add specific materials related to special education to this resource.

The Division of Special Populations also provides several opportunities for in-person or virtual professional development for special educators throughout the year. The division hosts an annual institute for special education supervisors that includes professional development related to the requirements of IDEA as well as state initiatives to improve outcomes for SWDs. The department likewise hosts an annual Partners in Education (PIE) conference whereby educators across the state can access professional learning to expand their skills and knowledge.

Finally, the division engages in professional development through activities funded by the SPDG. The division has sustained work from its previous SPDG, expanding to a third cohort of districts and focusing on the three coherent improvement strategies included in Tennessee's SSIP: Access to core instruction, increasingly intensive interventions, and high-quality IEPs. The division was also recently awarded a new SPDG and will engage high school teams in professional development opportunities related to the provision of high-quality instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities or complex needs.

Stakeholder Involvement

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

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the Council 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 Council meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. 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.

The Council is also consulted on the targets set for specified indicators in the SPP/APR whenever they are changed or updated (except for indicators that are calculated through accountability processes and compliance indicators). When targets were required to be set for FFY 2018 - FFY 2024, feedback from the Council was solicited during a dedicated presentation. Information on the tentative targets was shared with Council members with rationale for how the data were gathered, why it was chosen, and whether they thought there might be more viable data to consider. Information gleaned from this session was then used when setting the final targets. The department plans to replicate and expand this target-setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. In general, the department works to ensure that the Council is as informed as possible about anything relative to the SPP/APR as they capture a powerful and crucial snapshot of the stakeholder community.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education directors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education director study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR 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, directors are delivered important updates around Division of Special Populations activities and have the opportunity to 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, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT) and parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP).

Finally, the department has convened a new advisory group that includes 15 special education supervisors (and other district staff, as relevant/necessary). This collaborative is intended to provide feedback on large-scale proposed updates, changes, regulations, and other important matters, with topic-focused meetings taking place throughout the school year. This group is yet another vehicle by which to solicit invaluable stakeholder feedback and further augment the information provided by all the other aforementioned stakeholders.

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

YES

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY18 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 2018 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2018 APR in 2020, 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/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html>. Reports provided on this site include the full SPPs/APRs for the past seven 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 2018 APR can be found here: https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/special-education/data/lea_apr_indicator_summary_201819.pdf), and OSEP's letter of determination for the state for the most recent APR. Specific data from individual indicators (such as Indicator 3) can be found on the website provided above, the Tennessee state report card (<https://reportcard.tnedu.gov/>), and the department's Data Downloads & Requests page (<https://www.tn.gov/education/data/data-downloads.html>).

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2019 and 2020 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2020 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 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, 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 2018 SPP/APR

As a result of Tennessee's 2019 and 2020 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 technical assistance related to its SSIP and SPP/APR. This technical assistance informed revisions and led to improved processes related to stakeholder engagement. In addition, the technical assistance provided by IDC continues to inform the development of process documents for each of the SPP/APR indicators.

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 technical assistance 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) and State Education Agency Leaders (SEAL). This participation led to 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 Early Childhood 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 involvement in the early childhood inclusion cohort through ECTA informed the department's work related to the SPDG. Through this work, LEAs have partnered with the department to improve access to high quality early childhood programs for children ages 3-5 with disabilities.

Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2019 and 2020 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 25, 2020 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, 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.

Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State does not have any FFY 2019 data for indicator 17.

Intro - Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2021 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 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, 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) graduating from high school 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 of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2011	67.40%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	69.37%	70.96%	71.87%	73.55%	74.43%
Data	69.02%	69.99%	71.79%	72.72%	73.04%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	74.73%

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 through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the Council 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 Council meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. 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.

The Council is also consulted on the targets set for specified indicators in the SPP/APR whenever they are changed or updated (except for indicators that are calculated through accountability processes and compliance indicators). When targets were required to be set for FFY 2018 - FFY 2024, feedback from the Council was solicited during a dedicated presentation. Information on the tentative targets was shared with Council members with rationale for how the data were gathered, why it was chosen, and whether they thought there might be more viable data to consider. Information gleaned from this session was then used when setting the final targets. The department plans to replicate and expand this target-setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. In general, the department works to ensure that the Council is as informed as possible about anything relative to the SPP/APR as they capture a powerful and crucial snapshot of the stakeholder community.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education directors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education director study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR 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, directors are delivered important updates around Division of Special Populations activities and have the opportunity to 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, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT) and parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP).

Finally, the department has convened a new advisory group that includes 15 special education supervisors (and other district staff, as relevant/necessary). This collaborative is intended to provide feedback on large-scale proposed updates, changes, regulations, and other important

matters, with topic-focused meetings taking place throughout the school year. This group is yet another vehicle by which to solicit invaluable stakeholder feedback and further augment the information provided by all the other aforementioned stakeholders.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	07/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	7,038
SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	07/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	9,520
SY 2018-19 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	07/27/2020	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	73.93%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
7,038	9,520	73.04%	74.73%	73.93%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:

4-year ACGR

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

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.

Following the implementation of the Tennessee Diploma Project in 2009, high school students must complete 22 credits to graduate. They also will be tested in core subject areas with End of Course exams, part of the Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program, or TCAP. Their performance on these exams will factor into their semester grade for the course.

To receive a regular high school diploma, all students enrolled in a Tennessee public school during their eleventh (11th) grade year must take either the ACT or SAT. View the FAQ on the policy here: <https://www.tn.gov/education/assessment/act-sat.html>

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)

Indicator 1 was not affected by COVID-19, as these data were collected during the 2018-19 school year.

Regarding target-setting: The target for FFY 2019 is the target graduation percentage for the SWDs subgroup, as per Tennessee's Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) plan. Because the plan's calculation for graduation targets is predicated of previous year's data, the targets for subsequent years will have to be updated annually to reflect new targets in place. In FFY 2019, graduation targets were set using the following calculation:

Graduation Target = Graduation Rate for Previous Year + Graduation Rate Growth Goal
The Graduation Rate Growth Goal is determined via the following calculation:

Graduation Rate Growth Goal = $(100 - \text{Graduation Rate for Previous Year}) / 16$

The following calculation for graduation target is based on actual data from FFY 2018:

Graduation Rate Growth Goal: $(100\% - 73.04\%) / 16 = 1.69$

Graduation Target: $73.04\% + 1.69\% = 74.73\%$

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 dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

OPTION 1:

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 left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

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.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2011	9.60%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target <=	3.37%	3.32%	3.27%	3.22%	3.20%
Data	3.62%	5.26%	2.46%	2.81%	2.78%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target <=	3.18%

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 through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the Council 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 Council meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. 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.

The Council is also consulted on the targets set for specified indicators in the SPP/APR whenever they are changed or updated (except for indicators that are calculated through accountability processes and compliance indicators). When targets were required to be set for FFY 2018 - FFY 2024, feedback from the Council was solicited during a dedicated presentation. Information on the tentative targets was shared with Council members with rationale for how the data were gathered, why it was chosen, and whether they thought there might be more viable data to consider. Information gleaned

from this session was then used when setting the final targets. The department plans to replicate and expand this target-setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. In general, the department works to ensure that the Council is as informed as possible about anything relative to the SPP/APR as they capture a powerful and crucial snapshot of the stakeholder community.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education directors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education director study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR 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, directors are delivered important updates around Division of Special Populations activities and have the opportunity to 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, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT) and parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP).

Finally, the department has convened a new advisory group that includes 15 special education supervisors (and other district staff, as relevant/necessary). This collaborative is intended to provide feedback on large-scale proposed updates, changes, regulations, and other important matters, with topic-focused meetings taking place throughout the school year. This group is yet another vehicle by which to solicit invaluable stakeholder feedback and further augment the information provided by all the other aforementioned stakeholders.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	5,647
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	846
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	138
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	555
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	33

Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? (yes/no)

NO

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

YES

Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology

The data used to calculate the dropout rate provided above did not come from data in the EdFacts file FS009 but instead was based on data submitted for LEA level EdFacts file FS032. The latter report comes from the statewide student information system which the department uses as the system of record when calculating reports such as graduation rates, dropout rates, and membership counts. To align with these reports, the data in the LEA level EdFacts file FS032 has been used consistently by the department to calculate Indicator 2. The calculation is based on the annual event dropout rate for students leaving an LEA in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data. In the numerator of this dropout calculation is the number of students meeting the criteria established for dropouts as per the LEA level EdFacts file FS032:

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

The grade parameters established for Indicator 2 (only including SWDs in grades 9-12 who were classified as dropouts) were applied to the data in the LEA level EdFacts file FS032 for the 2018-19 school year. The denominator of this dropout calculation is the number of students with disabilities in grades 9-12 enrolled during the 2018-19 SY as based on the census information collected in the LEA level EdFacts file FS002. Thus, the calculation of dropouts for FFY 2018 is as follows:

Count of students with disabilities who dropped out as per the LEA level EdFacts file C032 and were in grades 9-12 = 843
 Count of students with disabilities enrolled in grades 9-12 as per the LEA level EdFacts file C002 = 35,062

843 / 35,062 = 2.40%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
843	35,062	2.78%	3.18%	2.40%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

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

As enumerated above, students are considered dropouts if they meet the criteria outlined in EdFacts file FS032. 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 below.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 2 was not affected by COVID-19, as these data were collected during the 2018-19 school year.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate 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 EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

B. 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. 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 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, 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.

3B - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2016	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Overall	97.68%	Actual	99.02%		97.68%	96.23%	97.89%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2016	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Overall	97.99%	Actual	98.99%		97.99%	97.08%	97.97%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	95.00%
Math	A >=	Overall	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 through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the Council 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 Council meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. 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.

The Council is also consulted on the targets set for specified indicators in the SPP/APR whenever they are changed or updated (except for indicators that are calculated through accountability processes and compliance indicators). When targets were required to be set for FFY 2018 - FFY 2024, feedback from the Council was solicited during a dedicated presentation. Information on the tentative targets was shared with Council members with rationale for how the data were gathered, why it was chosen, and whether they thought there might be more viable data to consider. Information gleaned

from this session was then used when setting the final targets. The department plans to replicate and expand this target-setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. In general, the department works to ensure that the Council is as informed as possible about anything relative to the SPP/APR as they capture a powerful and crucial snapshot of the stakeholder community.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education directors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education director study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR 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, directors are delivered important updates around Division of Special Populations activities and have the opportunity to 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, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT) and parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP).

Finally, the department has convened a new advisory group that includes 15 special education supervisors (and other district staff, as relevant/necessary). This collaborative is intended to provide feedback on large-scale proposed updates, changes, regulations, and other important matters, with topic-focused meetings taking place throughout the school year. This group is yet another vehicle by which to solicit invaluable stakeholder feedback and further augment the information provided by all the other aforementioned stakeholders.

FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

NO

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			97.89%	95.00%		N/A	N/A

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			97.97%	95.00%		N/A	N/A

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 information for all students, including students with disabilities, can be found on Tennessee's State Report Card at: <https://reportcard.tnedu.gov/>. The data for the last school year in which assessments were administered (2018-19) is currently available on this site. Further assessment data, including participation and achievement data for SWDs on assessments, can be found at the following site: <https://www.tn.gov/education/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html>.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate 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 EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and 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)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. 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 reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 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

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2016	Target >=	32.08%	35.08%		13.90%	15.51%
A	Overall	10.90%	Actual	21.05%	NVR	10.90%	12.51%	12.29%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2016	Target >=	33.33%	36.33%		16.33%	16.85%
A	Overall	13.33%	Actual	27.50%	NVR	13.33%	13.85%	15.16%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	15.29%
Math	A >=	Overall	18.16%

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 through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the Council 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 Council meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. 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.

The Council is also consulted on the targets set for specified indicators in the SPP/APR whenever they are changed or updated (except for indicators that are calculated through accountability processes and compliance indicators). When targets were required to be set for FFY 2018 - FFY 2024, feedback from the Council was solicited during a dedicated presentation. Information on the tentative targets was shared with Council members with rationale for how the data were gathered, why it was chosen, and whether they thought there might be more viable data to consider. Information gleaned from this session was then used when setting the final targets. The department plans to replicate and expand this target-setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. In general, the department works to ensure that the Council is

as informed as possible about anything relative to the SPP/APR as they capture a powerful and crucial snapshot of the stakeholder community.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education directors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education director study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR 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, directors are delivered important updates around Division of Special Populations activities and have the opportunity to 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, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT) and parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP).

Finally, the department has convened a new advisory group that includes 15 special education supervisors (and other district staff, as relevant/necessary). This collaborative is intended to provide feedback on large-scale proposed updates, changes, regulations, and other important matters, with topic-focused meetings taking place throughout the school year. This group is yet another vehicle by which to solicit invaluable stakeholder feedback and further augment the information provided by all the other aforementioned stakeholders.

FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

NO

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

Reading Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

Math Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above											

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
proficient against grade level											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			12.29%	15.29%		N/A	N/A

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			15.16%	18.16%		N/A	N/A

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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

3C - 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 districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

(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 districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts 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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions 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 nondisabled children within the LEAs

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

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n 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 noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy 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 the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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, etc.) 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), 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	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target <=	2.40%	2.20%	2.00%	1.80%	8.00%
Data	17.39%	22.22%	8.00%	20.00%	26.32%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target <=	8.00%

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 through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the Council 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 Council meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. 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.

The Council is also consulted on the targets set for specified indicators in the SPP/APR whenever they are changed or updated (except for indicators that are calculated through accountability processes and compliance indicators). When targets were required to be set for FFY 2018 - FFY 2024, feedback from the Council was solicited during a dedicated presentation. Information on the tentative targets was shared with Council members with rationale for how the data were gathered, why it was chosen, and whether they thought there might be more viable data to consider. Information gleaned from this session was then used when setting the final targets. The department plans to replicate and expand this target-setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. In general, the department works to ensure that the Council is as informed as possible about anything relative to the SPP/APR as they capture a powerful and crucial snapshot of the stakeholder community.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education directors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education director study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR 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, directors are delivered important updates around Division of Special Populations activities and have the opportunity to 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, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT) and parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP).

Finally, the department has convened a new advisory group that includes 15 special education supervisors (and other district staff, as relevant/necessary). This collaborative is intended to provide feedback on large-scale proposed updates, changes, regulations, and other important matters, with topic-focused meetings taking place throughout the school year. This group is yet another vehicle by which to solicit invaluable stakeholder feedback and further augment the information provided by all the other aforementioned stakeholders.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-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 size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

122

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
5	24	26.32%	8.00%	20.83%	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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 4A was not affected by COVID-19, as these data were collected during the 2018-19 school year.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 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 ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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. Based on information collected during this process, the SEA has verified that areas of noncompliance have been corrected.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	0	6	0

FFY 2018 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 2020 for the six LEAs with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 (based on discipline data from both FFY 2018 and FFY 2017). Using FFY 2020 discipline data (i.e., data from the 2019-20 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 (EasyIEP), SEA reviewers found all to be in compliance and LEAs 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 2018 (based on discipline data from both FFY 2018 and FFY 2017) 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 (EasyIEP) 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 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR

4A - OSEP Response

4A - Required Actions

The State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2019 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 Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 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:

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

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

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 districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n 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 size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts 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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions 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 nondisabled children within the LEAs

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

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy 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 the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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, etc.) 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), 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	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	NVR	23.53%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	0%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-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 size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

127

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
9	4	19	23.53%	0%	21.05%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 4B was not affected by COVID-19, as these data were collected during the 2018-19 school year.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 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 ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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. Based on information collected during this process, the SEA has verified that areas of noncompliance have been corrected.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	0	6	0

FFY 2018 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 2020 for the six LEAs with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 (based on discipline data from both FFY 2018 and FFY 2017). Using FFY 2020 discipline data (i.e., data from the 2019-20 school year), approximately 10 discipline records of SWDs suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days within each identified racial/ethnic group were randomly pulled for each LEA. After reviewing these records and all relevant data available within the statewide IEP data management system (EasyIEP), SEA reviewers found all to be in compliance and LEAs 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 2018 (based on discipline data from both FFY 2018 and FFY 2017) 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 (EasyIEP) 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, 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 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

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

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2019 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 Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 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 2019.

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Education environments (children 6-21): Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

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	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2005	Target >=	67.50%	69.50%	71.50%	73.50%	70.00%
A	53.48%	Data	70.06%	70.46%	70.16%	69.69%	70.88%
B	2005	Target <=	11.40%	11.30%	11.20%	11.10%	10.85%
B	14.69%	Data	10.74%	11.11%	11.48%	11.49%	11.38%
C	2005	Target <=	1.60%	1.50%	1.40%	1.30%	1.77%
C	1.89%	Data	1.79%	1.78%	1.79%	1.81%	1.61%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	70.00%
Target B <=	10.85%
Target C <=	1.77%

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 through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the Council 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 Council meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. 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.

The Council is also consulted on the targets set for specified indicators in the SPP/APR whenever they are changed or updated (except for indicators that are calculated through accountability processes and compliance indicators). When targets were required to be set for FFY 2018 - FFY 2024, feedback from the Council was solicited during a dedicated presentation. Information on the tentative targets was shared with Council members with rationale for how the data were gathered, why it was chosen, and whether they thought there might be more viable data to consider. Information gleaned from this session was then used when setting the final targets. The department plans to replicate and expand this target-setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. In general, the department works to ensure that the Council is as informed as possible about anything relative to the SPP/APR as they capture a powerful and crucial snapshot of the stakeholder community.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education directors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education director study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR 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, directors are delivered important updates around Division of Special Populations activities and have the opportunity to 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, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT) and parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP).

Finally, the department has convened a new advisory group that includes 15 special education supervisors (and other district staff, as relevant/necessary). This collaborative is intended to provide feedback on large-scale proposed updates, changes, regulations, and other important matters, with topic-focused meetings taking place throughout the school year. This group is yet another vehicle by which to solicit invaluable stakeholder feedback and further augment the information provided by all the other aforementioned stakeholders.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	116,450
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	83,739
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	13,125
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	808
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	226
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	697

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 2019 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	83,739	116,450	70.88%	70.00%	71.91%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	13,125	116,450	11.38%	10.85%	11.27%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,731	116,450	1.61%	1.77%	1.49%	Met Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Child count/educational environment data used for FS002 and Indicator 5 was pulled on December 1, 2019 and was therefore not affected by COVID-19.

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: Preschool environments: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 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 aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

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

Instructions

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

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.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2014	Target >=	28.50%	30.00%	32.00%	34.00%	38.00%
A	26.53%	Data	26.53%	24.09%	24.17%	24.27%	26.58%
B	2014	Target <=	39.20%	34.00%	29.00%	24.00%	29.00%
B	35.62%	Data	35.62%	35.71%	34.14%	33.73%	32.42%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	42.00%
Target B <=	28.00%

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 through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the Council 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 Council meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. 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.

The Council is also consulted on the targets set for specified indicators in the SPP/APR whenever they are changed or updated (except for indicators that are calculated through accountability processes and compliance indicators). When targets were required to be set for FFY 2018 - FFY 2024, feedback from the Council was solicited during a dedicated presentation. Information on the tentative targets was shared with Council members with rationale for how the data were gathered, why it was chosen, and whether they thought there might be more viable data to consider. Information gleaned from this session was then used when setting the final targets. The department plans to replicate and expand this target-setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. In general, the department works to ensure that the Council is as informed as possible about anything relative to the SPP/APR as they capture a powerful and crucial snapshot of the stakeholder community.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education directors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education director study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR 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, directors are delivered important updates around Division of Special Populations activities and have the opportunity to 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, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability

Rights Tennessee (DRT) and parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP).

Finally, the department has convened a new advisory group that includes 15 special education supervisors (and other district staff, as relevant/necessary). This collaborative is intended to provide feedback on large-scale proposed updates, changes, regulations, and other important matters, with topic-focused meetings taking place throughout the school year. This group is yet another vehicle by which to solicit invaluable stakeholder feedback and further augment the information provided by all the other aforementioned stakeholders.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	14,958
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	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	5,091
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	4,677
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b2. Number of children attending separate school	76
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	3

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 2019 SPP/APR Data

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 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	5,091	14,958	26.58%	42.00%	34.04%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	4,756	14,958	32.42%	28.00%	31.80%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Child count/educational environment data used for FS089 and Indicator 6 was pulled on December 1, 2019 and was therefore not affected by COVID-19.

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 2 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	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A1	2009	Target >=	92.76%	92.82%	92.88%	92.94%	93.00%
A1	91.70%	Data	90.52%	90.29%	89.09%	90.10%	89.23%
A2	2009	Target >=	58.60%	59.20%	59.80%	60.40%	60.00%

A2	57.40%	Data	59.21%	59.61%	58.07%	58.55%	57.50%
B1	2009	Target >=	90.56%	90.62%	90.68%	90.74%	89.50%
B1	89.50%	Data	89.51%	88.81%	88.75%	88.32%	89.47%
B2	2009	Target >=	57.60%	58.20%	58.80%	59.40%	57.00%
B2	55.70%	Data	57.59%	57.33%	56.24%	55.49%	54.75%
C1	2009	Target >=	93.66%	93.72%	93.70%	93.80%	93.90%
C1	92.60%	Data	91.33%	90.14%	91.14%	90.27%	90.14%
C2	2009	Target >=	69.40%	69.80%	70.20%	70.60%	69.00%
C2	68.00%	Data	69.40%	68.74%	69.40%	68.80%	66.23%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A1 >=	93.06%
Target A2 >=	60.30%
Target B1 >=	89.80%
Target B2 >=	57.30%
Target C1 >=	94.00%
Target C2 >=	69.30%

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 through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the Council 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 Council meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. 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.

The Council is also consulted on the targets set for specified indicators in the SPP/APR whenever they are changed or updated (except for indicators that are calculated through accountability processes and compliance indicators). When targets were required to be set for FFY 2018 - FFY 2024, feedback from the Council was solicited during a dedicated presentation. Information on the tentative targets was shared with Council members with rationale for how the data were gathered, why it was chosen, and whether they thought there might be more viable data to consider. Information gleaned from this session was then used when setting the final targets. The department plans to replicate and expand this target-setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. In general, the department works to ensure that the Council is as informed as possible about anything relative to the SPP/APR as they capture a powerful and crucial snapshot of the stakeholder community.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education directors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education director study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR 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, directors are delivered important updates around Division of Special Populations activities and have the opportunity to 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, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT) and parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP).

Finally, the department has convened a new advisory group that includes 15 special education supervisors (and other district staff, as relevant/necessary). This collaborative is intended to provide feedback on large-scale proposed updates, changes, regulations, and other important matters, with topic-focused meetings taking place throughout the school year. This group is yet another vehicle by which to solicit invaluable stakeholder feedback and further augment the information provided by all the other aforementioned stakeholders.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

5,911

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	39	0.66%

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	450	7.62%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,003	33.90%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,421	40.98%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	995	16.84%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	4,424	4,913	89.23%	93.06%	90.05%	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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	3,416	5,908	57.50%	60.30%	57.82%	Did Not Meet Target	No 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	42	0.71%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	490	8.30%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,045	34.64%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,436	41.26%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	891	15.09%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	4,481	5,013	89.47%	89.80%	89.39%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	3,327	5,904	54.75%	57.30%	56.35%	Did Not Meet Target	No 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	38	0.64%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	385	6.53%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,520	25.77%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,505	42.47%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,450	24.58%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	4,025	4,448	90.14%	94.00%	90.49%	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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	3,955	5,898	66.23%	69.30%	67.06%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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 Form (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 (EasyIEP) 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 a state-developed tool that employs various logic checks to clean the data. Logic checks include ensuring that outcome data is 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In Tennessee, all schools were required to close for in-person learning by March 20, 2020. In most LEAs, it became more difficult to access children for instruction, testing, etc. From FFY 2018 to FFY 2019, Indicator 7 saw a decrease of approximately 400 less students with both entrance and exit scores for at least one of the three outcomes. Although there was no slippage, the disruption caused by COVID-19 may have contributed to the smaller "n" size in FFY 2019.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

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 2 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.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the 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 through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the Council 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 Council meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. 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.

The Council is also consulted on the targets set for specified indicators in the SPP/APR whenever they are changed or updated (except for indicators that are calculated through accountability processes and compliance indicators). When targets were required to be set for FFY 2018 - FFY 2024, feedback from the Council was solicited during a dedicated presentation. Information on the tentative targets was shared with Council members with rationale for how the data were gathered, why it was chosen, and whether they thought there might be more viable data to consider. Information gleaned from this session was then used when setting the final targets. The department plans to replicate and expand this target-setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. In general, the department works to ensure that the Council is as informed as possible about anything relative to the SPP/APR as they capture a powerful and crucial snapshot of the stakeholder community.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education directors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education director study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR 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, directors are delivered important updates around Division of Special Populations activities and have the opportunity to 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, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT) and parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP).

Finally, the department has convened a new advisory group that includes 15 special education supervisors (and other district staff, as relevant/necessary). This collaborative is intended to provide feedback on large-scale proposed updates, changes, regulations, and other important matters, with topic-focused meetings taking place throughout the school year. This group is yet another vehicle by which to solicit invaluable stakeholder feedback and further augment the information provided by all the other aforementioned stakeholders.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	77.40%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	93.00%	93.25%	93.50%	93.75%	94.00%
Data	90.87%	91.00%	90.60%	89.48%	91.33%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	94.25%

FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
1,346	1,739	91.33%	94.25%	77.40%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

33,115

Percentage of respondent parents

5.25%

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

There are two main factors that contributed to the large decrease in parents who agreed that their child's school facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities:

1. In a typical year, Parent Survey packets are mailed directly to special education supervisors by the department contractor, East Tennessee State University (ETSU). These packets include paper surveys with the student name, LEA, school, and numeric identifier, with postage paid envelopes and letters to parents explaining the survey in English and Spanish. These are distributed to school principals, who are asked to disseminate the surveys to students to take home to parents. A letter attached to the survey provides parents a URL as an alternate means of survey completion if they do not want to complete the hard copy. This method of survey administration historically resulted in a response rate of 15% to 19%. COVID-19 forced schools across the state to close no later than March 20, 2020. With no students in schools to receive paper surveys from their principal, the department made the decision to modify the administration method and mail postcards with the survey information (i.e., web link, student unique ID) directly to parents. This new method resulted in a response rate that was around 10% less than the previous year (5.3%). Lower response rates can have implications for the reliability of the data, especially if the new survey method affected which parents responded and introduced additional sampling bias into the results.

2. The survey itself changed drastically from FFY 2018 to FFY 2019. The department collaborated with stakeholder group, the ARC of Tennessee in Summer 2019 to develop a more parent-friendly, less time demanding experience. The survey was reduced from 21 questions to 10 questions. Wording to questions (including question one) were changed. Finally, the new survey includes a six point Likert scale with "not sure" and "N/A" choices (strongly agree/agree/not sure/disagree/strongly disagree) rather than a six point scale with only agreement choices (very strongly agree/strongly agree/agree/disagree/strongly disagree/very strongly disagree). Reducing/changing the number of categories from which the Indicator 8 score is calculated may have had a significant impact on the results, as approximately 11% of respondents selected "not sure" on question 1 of the survey. Despite this slippage, the department feels confident in the validity of the new survey and that the responses collected moving forward (along with the new baseline percentage) will more accurately reflect parent perceptions of child's school.

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

The surveys disseminated for pre-K students are identical to those disseminated to school age students. As well, the surveys collected for pre-K students are analyzed and collated under the same methodology employed for school age students. Thus, the validity and reliability for those in pre-K is identical to those who are school age and allows for continuity across all grade bands to ensure all the information collected is valid, reliable, and cohesive. For this reporting period, survey data was disaggregated by grade level and it was found that surveys were disseminated to: 1,045 P3 (three year old students in pre-K) students with 72 responses from the family and 1,649 P4 (four year old students in pre-K) students with 91 responses from the family.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	NO

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

LEAs are sampled based on their locations in the state so that all regions are represented and it is ensured that every four years 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. 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 selected for the survey are representative of the state and the application of the same survey collection process and same question regarding parent involvement certifies that the results of the survey are comparable and will yield valid and reliable estimates across school years. By including all students with disabilities in the sampled LEAs for surveying, there is no opportunity for bias in the students selected for the survey and it can be certain that the makeup of the students with disabilities population is being wholly reflected.

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	YES
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	Indicator 8_Parent Survey_FFY2019
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	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 2020-21 school year to ensure that the population of parents surveyed is representative of the population of children receiving special education services in Tennessee. Efforts from the 2019-20 school year to remedy some of the noteworthy over/underrepresentation manifested in a large decrease in underrepresentation of responses from families of nonwhite minority students (improvement of 9.88% in representativeness to only 0.01% underrepresented) and a small reduction of underrepresentation of responses from families of students with an emotional disturbance (decrease of 0.54% in underrepresentation).

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 ETSU to LEA staff directly. 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. In addition, the department is currently working with its family engagement partner, the ARC of Tennessee, to consider other ways/methods to communicate with families regarding this survey and identify opportunities that may increase responses and participation.

Finally, 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.

Include 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.

During FFY 2019 school year, the Parent Survey was administered to all parents of SWDs ages 3 through 21 in 43 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. In FFY 2019, a total of 33,115 surveys were distributed to parents. There were 1,764 survey responses with usable data for a response rate of 5.33%. Note that this response rate is different from the one in the above data table (response rate calculated was 5.25%). 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 5.25%; however, the response rate of 5.33% 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 1,739 parents responding to item one, 77.40% (1,346 / 1,739) agreed that the LEAs facilitated their involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. The department's target of 94.25% was not met.

The table below provides a summary of representativeness data on all FFY 2019 Parent Survey respondents. The calculation, from the National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO), compares the respondent pool of parents 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. For this Parent Survey, parents of children with specific learning disabilities were underrepresented in the respondent group (-8.98%) and parents of students from all other (non-listed) disability groups were overrepresented by the respondents (6.94%).

_____SLD / ___ED ___ / ___ID ___ / ___AO ___ / Female / Minority

Target Leaver Representation: ___27.74% / 2.46% / 6.61% / 63.19% / 33.90% / 38.96%
 Respondent Representation: ___18.76% / 2.21% / 8.90% / 70.12% / 32.71% / 38.95%
 Difference: _____-8.98% / -0.25% / 2.29% / 6.94% / -1.19% / -0.01%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Tennessee has reset the baseline in FFY 2019 to account for the changes to the Parent Survey. As mentioned in the "Provide reasons for slippage" section above, the number of questions was reduced, question language was modified, and a different Likert scale was installed. These changes to the survey tool warrant new baseline measurement to ensure consistency moving forward.

Further, COVID-19 had a major impact on FFY 2019's survey administration. Also detailed above, the department was not able to distribute and collect paper surveys. Instead, postcards with survey information were mailed directly to parents of SWDs. This change resulted in a much lower response rate than previous years, potentially affecting the reliability of FFY 2019 data.

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2019 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR

The department will continue working in the 2020-21 school year to ensure that the population of parents surveyed is representative of the population of children receiving special education services in Tennessee. Efforts from the 2019-20 school year to remedy some of the noteworthy over/underrepresentation manifested in a large decrease in underrepresentation of responses from families of nonwhite minority students (improvement of 9.88% in representativeness to only 0.01% underrepresented) and a small reduction of underrepresentation of responses from families of students with an emotional disturbance (decrease of 0.54% in underrepresentation).

The table below provides a summary of representativeness data on all FFY 2019 Parent Survey respondents. The calculation, from the National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO), compares the respondent pool of parents 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. For this Parent Survey, parents of children with specific learning disabilities were underrepresented in the respondent group (-8.98%) and parents of students from all other (non-listed) disability groups were overrepresented by the respondents (6.94%).

_____ SLD / __ED__ / __ID__ / __AO__ / Female / Minority

Target Leaver Representation: __27.74% / 2.46% / 6.61% / 63.19% / 33.90% / 38.96%
Respondent Representation: __18.76% / 2.21% / 8.90% / 70.12% / 32.71% / 38.95%
Difference: _____-8.98% / -0.25% / 2.29% / 6.94% / -1.19% / -0.01%

8 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2020 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.

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 FFY 2018, 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, etc. 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 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

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 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, etc.) 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), 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
2016	0.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	0%

FFY 2019 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 and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
2	0	142	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

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 2019, 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, 2019 Membership data (from EdFacts file FS052) and December 1, 2019 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 146 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.

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 neither LEA's policies, procedures, and practices contributed to the disproportionate representation.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Child count/educational environment data used for FS002 and Indicator 9 was pulled on December 1, 2019. Membership data used for FS052 and Indicator 9 pulled on October 1, 2019. Therefore, none of the data used for Indicator 9 was affected by COVID-19.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

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 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

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 618 data for FFY 2019, 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, etc. 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 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

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 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, etc.) 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), 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
2016	2.82%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	2.76%	2.76%	2.82%	5.07%	2.90%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	0%

FFY 2019 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.

5

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
29	6	141	2.90%	0%	4.26%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Tennessee had three more LEAs in FFY 2019 meeting the "n" and/or "cell size" than the previous year, FFY 2018. Tennessee also had four more LEAs identified with a disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and two more districts that had this disproportionate representation as the result of inappropriate identification. These increased numbers led to a 1.36% increase in the data from FFY 2018 to FFY 2019.

COVID-19 had an impact on Tennessee's Indicator 10 data, as self-assessments were completed during October of 2020, when districts were contending with staff shortages, supervisors sick or on quarantine, and an overall decreased capacity while meeting the needs of students in multiple settings. For this reason, district staff reported that they were not able to devote as much time to Indicator 10 self-assessment tasks as they had in the past, which affected the quality of data being submitted for the SEA review.

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). Disproportionate representation is predicated on the comparison of a subgroup, such as race/ethnicity, within an LEA to the entire LEA population as a whole. Should an LEA be identifying students for special education services in a subgroup at a greater percentage than 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 race/ethnicity data. For FFY 2019, the methodology listed below was used to calculate and examine data to measure disproportionate representation (particularly overrepresentation) in special education.

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

- 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;
- Racial/ethnic subgroup enrollment (target group denominator) meets a minimum "n" size of 50 students;
- Count of students with disabilities meets a minimum of 45 students; and
- 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, 2019 Membership data (from EdFacts file FS052) and December 1, 2019 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 146 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 neither LEA's 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)

Child count/educational environment data used for FS002 and Indicator 10 was pulled on December 1, 2019. Membership data used for FS052 and Indicator 10 was pulled on October 1, 2019. Therefore, none of the data used for Indicator 10 was affected by COVID-19.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	0	0

FFY 2018 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 four LEAs identified with disproportionate representation, based on self-assessments submitted to the department in FFY 2018, were required to undergo site visits the subsequent school year. The director of school psychology services led these visits 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 eligibility documentation.

All information gleaned from these site visits was provided to LEA staff via written communication after the site visits. The four LEAs were required to develop action plans based on these site visits and had to periodically submit evidence of activities completed throughout the 2019-20 SY to address findings of potential contributing factors to disproportionate representation. Department staff continuously provided technical assistance as necessary to the seven LEAs, giving them priority at relevant trainings and offering professional development opportunities tailored to the LEAs. All LEAs also completed any required trainings with their district staff to ensure knowledge and understanding of compliant policies, practices, and procedures.

Of all the file reviews conducted and information collected through sight visits for the four LEAs identified with disproportionate representation in FFY 2018, individual student file noncompliance with practices possibly leading to disproportionate identification was found in all four. (additional information about individual instances of noncompliance outlined below). For the four LEAs, the director of school psychology services and the corresponding regional support staff reviewed additional eligibility documents, after corrections of instances of noncompliance, for other students in the same identified areas, to confirm that the correct regulatory practices were being followed regarding appropriate identification of students with disabilities. The randomly sampled files reviewed after notifications and corrections of noncompliance in these four LEAs revealed that the identified areas of noncompliance in previous student files had been addressed and were in compliance. Additionally, the results of the 2019-2020 SY LEA self-monitoring process were reviewed by state monitors to assess outcomes for LEAs identified as noncompliant in FFY 2018. Findings indicated initial evaluation reports that were submitted for each of the four districts met required standards for all evaluations reviewed; therefore, all districts demonstrated compliance in this area and no concerns were noted.

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 conducted site visits and student file reviews in the four LEAs identified with disproportionate representation. As a result of these file reviews, all four LEAs were identified as having noncompliant records that may have led to disproportionate representation. Two of the districts did not include/upload systematic observations or the exclusionary factors. The other two districts had incomplete evaluations that may not have adequately identify the correct disability (or ruled out others).

Using the statewide IEP data management system employed by all LEAs in Tennessee and correspondence via email with these two LEAs, SEA staff were able to review the files with noncompliance. The districts were required to fix each case of noncompliance, either by uploading critical documents or through IEP meetings/re-evaluations. Updated evaluation reports were completed as part of reevaluations. It was confirmed by the SEA staff that all noncompliant files were addressed and corrected as appropriate.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the six districts identified in FFY 2019 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 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 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 2019.

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 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, etc.) 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), 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	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	94.81%	95.16%	95.24%	94.28%	94.88%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
25,744	23,397	94.88%	100%	90.88%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

In FFY 2019, LEAs across the state received 5,356 fewer parental consents to evaluate students than the previous year (FFY 2018). LEAs also had 755 additional students who exceeded the state-established timeline for completing evaluations. This resulted in a slippage of 4 percent (94.88% to 90.88%) from FFY 2018 to FFY 2019. LEAs will conduct a root cause analysis and identify revisions to policies, practices, and procedures to address areas of noncompliance.

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

2,347

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 (EasyIEP), to mark the end of the evaluation process. Per OSEP's letter to Geary (<https://www2.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/memosdcltrs/geary112012sandydisaster4q2012.pdf>), and in response to the emergence of COVID-19 and the devastation caused by tornadoes in Middle Tennessee in early March 2020, the Tennessee State Board of Education (TNSBE) passed an emergency rule to establish a state defined evaluation timeline for the 2019-20 school year (<https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/stateboardofeducation/documents/2020-sbe-meetings/april-9%2c-2020-sbe-conference-call-meeting/4-9-20%20III%20A%203%200520-01-09-.24%20Special%20Education-Evaluations%20Clean%20Copy.pdf>). This rule effectively extended the initial evaluation timelines of any students who received initial consent between January 3, 2020 (60 days prior to the March 3, 2020 date established in the rule) and the end date of any stay at home "order, declaration, or recommendation" in their LEA. The Division of Special Populations released guidance detailing how new timeline lengths are calculated for students who received initial consent during the affected timeframe (https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/health-&-safety/Special%20Education%20Emergency%20Rules%204.16.20_FINAL.pdf). LEAs also had access to a department-developed timeline calculator (https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/health-&-safety/SBEEmergencyRule_COVID_EvalTimeline_Calculator_Final_Locked.xlsx) to help them understand which students had extended timelines and how long they had to complete evaluations under the TNSBE emergency rule. For the analysis of Indicator 11 data, the department collected LEA order start and end dates from each of its 146 LEAs and used that information to calculate extended timelines for each student affected by the TNSBE rule.

Of the 25,744 students for whom parent consent to evaluate was granted in FFY 2019, 2,347 students did not have their evaluations completed within the 60 calendar day or state-established timeline. These 2,347 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 475 days, with many evaluations still open because of the disruption caused by COVID-19.

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 (EasyIEP). 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.

Rather than being excluded from the compliance calculations, those students with acceptable reasons for delay who had evaluations completed with an approved timeline extension request are included in both the numerator and denominator the compliance percentage calculation detailed above.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

What is the State's timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).

The state used a 60 calendar day timeline for all evaluations except those that were affected by the state-defined initial evaluation timeline per the TNSBE emergency rule, which was passed in response to the emergence of COVID-19 and the devastation caused by tornadoes in Middle Tennessee in early March 2020 (<https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/stateboardofeducation/documents/2020-sbe-meetings/april-9%2c-2020-sbe-conference-call-meeting/4-9-20%20III%20A%203%200520-01-09-.24%20Special%20Education-Evaluations%20Clean%20Copy.pdf>). This rule effectively extended the initial evaluation timelines of any students who received initial consent between January 3, 2020 (60 days prior to the March 3, 2020 date established in the rule) and the end date of any stay at home "order, declaration, or recommendation" in their LEA. The Division of Special Populations released guidance detailing how new timeline lengths are calculated for students who received initial consent (https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/health-&-safety/Special%20Education%20Emergency%20Rules%204.16.20_FINAL.pdf). A total of 8,360 students had their initial evaluation timeline extended as a result of the TNSBE emergency rule, with 7,066 of those cases being compliant with the new timeline.

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 2019 (July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2020). Data were collected through the statewide IEP data management system for all of Tennessee's 146 LEAs. FFY 2019 was the eleventh 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 (or SBE emergency rule extended) 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 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1,592	1,589	1	2

FFY 2018 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 LEAs with 1 or more of the 1,592 late student evaluations during FFY 2018, the department staff conducted data pulls of parental permissions signed in FFY 2018 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 2018, the department required them to demonstrate 100% compliance for initial evaluations for a minimum of 30 consecutive days in FFY 2018. For LEAs with more than 500 initial referrals for evaluation in FFY 2018, the department required them to demonstrate 100% compliance for initial evaluation determinations for a minimum of 10 consecutive days in FFY 2019. After the department verified that the LEA was 100% compliant for at least a 30 day or 10 day time period and that all student-level noncompliance from FFY 2018 had been corrected (Prong 1), the finding was closed.

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

Prong 1

The statewide IEP data management system (EasyIEP) is used to collect the data necessary to determine timely evaluation. This system was also used to follow-up on all instances of FFY 2018 student-level noncompliance instances when the evaluation exceeded established timelines. The department initially provided the LEAs with instances of noncompliance a listing of their FFY 2018 students for whom the initial evaluation was late and still open. These LEAs were required to research individual students and update EasyIEP if the evaluation had been completed (with the corresponding reason for delay). In the case of students whose evaluations were still pending, LEAs were required to complete the evaluation as soon as possible. In all 1,589 instances, the evaluation or correction of other issues (e.g., mistakenly entered consent form, mistyping of date, etc.) was completed for children whose initial evaluation was not timely within one year. In one instance, the noncompliance was addressed, but not until after one year. As of February 1, 2021, there are two students whose evaluations are still open. The department is conducting an investigation to ensure that these instances of noncompliance are addressed promptly.

FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

As mentioned in the Prong 1 description, the director of data services is conducting an investigation that includes contacting LEA special education supervisors to ensure that individual instances of noncompliance from FFY 2018 (i.e., open and overdue evaluations) are addressed immediately.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the remaining two uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance

identified in FFY 2018: (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 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

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.

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.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of 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, etc.) 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), 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	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.53%	97.53%	99.06%	96.37%	96.88%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	5,963
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	691

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,920
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.	2,374
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	368
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.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 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.	1,920	2,530	96.88%	100%	75.89%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

There were 610 records that were determined to be out of compliance. Out of those 610 records, 566 were clearly impacted by the COVID-19 disruption with birthdays between March 15 and June 30, 2020. COVID-19 created substantial problems for LEAs and families being able to meet in person, which negatively affected the ability to complete the necessary components of the evaluation and determine eligibility/non-eligibility in a timely manner. Tennessee still has a number of LEAs that have not yet returned to in-person instruction or other activities.

The remaining 44 records that were out of compliance occurred during the "pre-COVID-19" window from July 1, 2019 through March 14. This 44 is less than the total of 72 from the previous reporting cycle (FFY 2018). In addition, the overall "n" size (data point "a." above) increased by 697 children from FFY 2018 to FFY 2019, which means that certain LEAs had more Part C to Part B transition children to evaluate.

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

610

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 610 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 or did not have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. Of the 610 children, 561 had documentation and/or eligibility information completed by Feb. 1, 2021. With some eligibility determinations still outstanding, the range of days beyond the third birthday until eligibility was determined or an IEP was developed and implemented could not be calculated. Reasons for delays included: parent preferred schedules, inclement weather, late referrals from Part C, school system staff training issues related to early childhood transition policies and procedures, and the general disruption caused by statewide COVID-19 school closures.

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 (EasyIEP). 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)

In order to minimize potential gaps in services as a result of COVID-19 delays, the department has collaborated with TEIS (Part C) to offer a temporary continuation of developmental therapy services. These services, provided by TEIS, are available to children previously served under TEIS who do not yet have eligibility/non-eligibility determined.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
72	72	0	0

FFY 2018 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 technical assistance on the policies and procedures for early childhood transition were provided as a presentation to each LEA with a finding of noncompliance. Regional 619 preschool consultants provided training and submitted verification of LEA personnel attending the presentation to the 619 preschool coordinator. Sign-in sheets for LEA personnel taking part in the training were submitted to the 619 preschool coordinator.

In addition, the department conducted a subsequent review of additional data to determine that all LEAs with noncompliance for FFY 2018 were

subsequently correctly implementing 34 CFR 300.124(b). Data were pulled routinely 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 no noncompliance and it was determined these LEAs were correctly implementing regulatory requirements.

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

Prong 1:

The department verified that each LEA with noncompliance for FFY 2018 developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for all 72 children for whom implementation of the IEP was untimely. The data from the Part B EasyIEP system identified the date in which the IEP was developed or a noneligibility was determined. This information was reviewed and verified by the department's IDEA 619 coordinator and 619 consultants.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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 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 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, etc.) 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), 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	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	73.68%	71.84%	72.52%	74.03%	65.12%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
320	394	65.12%	100%	81.22%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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 2019, staff from the office of federal programs and oversight (FPO) completed the monitoring requirements of this indicator. Analyses of student documents/records were done via an IEP self-monitoring platform embedded in the statewide IEP data management system (EasyIEP), where individual student documents can be reviewed for completion and accuracy. LEAs were required to complete thorough evaluations of their students' documents and evaluate the compliance elements for Indicator 13. After LEAs completed the self assessment, staff from FPO completed a secondary review. LEAs were subsequently notified and required to address areas identified with noncompliance.

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 9th grade or age 14, the Individualized Education Program (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 of the 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 of the components of Indicator 13 completed.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The FFY 2019 IEP review and LEA self-assessment process was not affected by COVID-19; however, LEAs were given additional time to correct noncompliance identified in FFY 2019, which will be noted in the FFY 2020 APR.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
30	30	0	0

FFY 2018 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 30 findings of noncompliance outlined for Indicator 13 in FFY 2018 were corrected at the beginning of the FFY 2019 school year. Compliance Action Plans (CAPs) were developed for each individual incidence of noncompliance, and LEAs were required to demonstrate corrected, compliant records (see information below in Prong 1 section). Upon completion of these corrections (required to be completed within 365 days), the department conducted a random sampling of student records with secondary transition plans in the LEAs with one or more findings of noncompliance to determine whether the specific areas of noncompliance identified in the original monitoring file reviews were evident in subsequently completed student documents. Upon completion of this second round of file reviews, it was found that all reviewed records randomly reviewed were in compliance, and the LEA was correctly implementing the appropriate regulatory requirements for this indicator.

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

Prong 1

The 30 findings of noncompliance outlined for Indicator 13 in FFY 2018 were corrected within the FFY 2019 school year. Compliance Action Plans (CAPs) were developed for each individual incidence of noncompliance, and the LEAs with one or more of the 30 instances of noncompliance were required to correct the records with noncompliance within 365 days. These corrected documents were subject to review by state monitors. It was confirmed through this subsequent monitoring of the updated records that the documents were now compliant and meeting monitoring criteria within the requisite 365 day timeline. Upon state verification and approval of these corrected records, LEAs with previous noncompliance again had records reviewed, as outlined above in the description of Prong 2.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Post-school outcomes: Percent 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.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

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 [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2020 on students who left school during 2018-2019, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2018-2019 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” in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, due February 2021:

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, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). 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, etc.).

II. Data Reporting

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.

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 should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

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	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2009	Target >=	23.75%	24.00%	24.25%	24.50%	26.00%
A	22.00%	Data	22.10%	33.93%	21.17%	26.11%	21.99%
B	2009	Target >=	59.00%	59.50%	60.00%	60.50%	61.00%
B	57.00%	Data	58.22%	64.43%	54.60%	61.08%	33.30%
C	2009	Target >=	68.75%	69.50%	70.25%	71.00%	71.00%
C	65.00%	Data	69.26%	73.32%	64.62%	71.13%	74.63%

FFY 2019 Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	26.50%
Target B >=	62.00%
Target C >=	72.50%

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 through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the Council 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 Council meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. 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.

The Council is also consulted on the targets set for specified indicators in the SPP/APR whenever they are changed or updated (except for indicators that are calculated through accountability processes and compliance indicators). When targets were required to be set for FFY 2018 - FFY 2024, feedback from the Council was solicited during a dedicated presentation. Information on the tentative targets was shared with Council members with rationale for how the data were gathered, why it was chosen, and whether they thought there might be more viable data to consider. Information gleaned from this session was then used when setting the final targets. The department plans to replicate and expand this target-setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. In general, the department works to ensure that the Council is as informed as possible about anything relative to the SPP/APR as they capture a powerful and crucial snapshot of the stakeholder community.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education directors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education director study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR 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, directors are delivered important updates around Division of Special Populations activities and have the opportunity to 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, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT) and parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP).

Finally, the department has convened a new advisory group that includes 15 special education supervisors (and other district staff, as relevant/necessary). This collaborative is intended to provide feedback on large-scale proposed updates, changes, regulations, and other important matters, with topic-focused meetings taking place throughout the school year. This group is yet another vehicle by which to solicit invaluable stakeholder feedback and further augment the information provided by all the other aforementioned stakeholders.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	1,068
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	275
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	393
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)	43
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).	82

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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	275	1,068	21.99%	26.50%	25.75%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	668	1,068	33.30%	62.00%	62.55%	Met Target	No Slippage
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)	793	1,068	74.63%	72.50%	74.25%	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.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	NO

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

The LEAs are sampled based on their locations in the state so that all regions are represented and it is ensured that every four years an LEA will complete the survey. This sampling is done via the National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO) Sampling Calculator on a four year sampling cycle. To ensure there is no potential bias or misrepresentation that can sometimes arise from student sampling, all students with disabilities within each selected LEA who exited school by (a) graduating with a regular diploma, (b) 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 selected for the survey are representative of the state and the application of the same survey collection process and same questions regarding post-school outcomes certifies that the results of the survey are comparable and will yield valid and reliable estimates. By including all students in the sampled LEAs, there is no opportunity for bias in the students selected for the survey and it can be certain that the makeup of the SWDs population is being wholly reflected.

The department contracts with Eastern Tennessee State University (ETSU) to disseminate, collect, and collate survey results. To complete the survey, LEA staff contact students who exited by telephone, in-person visits, mail, or email. 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.

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

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.

The table below provides a summary of representativeness data on all FFY 2019 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 minority 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 mostly representative; however, nonwhite minority students were slightly underrepresented in the respondent group (-4.62%).

_____SLD / ___ED___ / ___ID___ / ___AO___ / Female / Minority / ELL / Dropout

Target Leaver Representation: 51.24% / 5.33% / 8.03% / 35.40% / 35.40% / 38.70% / 0.00% / 8.52%

Respondent Representation: ___49.81% / 5.24% / 8.80% / 36.14% / 35.11% / 34.08% / 0.00% / 5.71%

Difference: _____-1.42% / -0.09% / 0.78% / 0.74% / -0.29% / -4.62% / 0.00% / -2.81%

Question	Yes / No
Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?	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.

While most of the demographics of the survey respondents are representative of the overall cohort of students pulled in this sampling, there was one group - students of minority racial/ethnic groups (i.e., nonwhite students) - that was not completely representative. 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 make contact with 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 has this student and family contact information transfer from student information systems into the statewide IEP data management system (EasyIEP) nightly. Once in the system, users can augment, delete, add, and update the contact information as appropriate, and this 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 state EasyIEP system, as well as the diligent efforts of the senior director of special populations 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 seeing an increase in the response rate for three straight years, there was a dropoff from FFY 2017 to FFY 2018 (60.08% to 48.36%). However, the response rate for FFY 2019 (58.71%) has returned to the level close to what was captured in FFY 2017. Tennessee continues to focus on increasing this number. The department anticipates that as the response rate climbs, gaps in representation will narrow.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID-19 had a minimal impact on Indicator 14 data, as the post-school survey is conducted by telephone or other "remote" methods (e.g., e-mail, mail).

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2019 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR

14 - OSEP Response

14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2020 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.

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 (EMAPS)).

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, targets and improvement activities, 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 not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	35
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	23

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 through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the Council 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 Council meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. 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.

The Council is also consulted on the targets set for specified indicators in the SPP/APR whenever they are changed or updated (except for indicators that are calculated through accountability processes and compliance indicators). When targets were required to be set for FFY 2018 - FFY 2024, feedback from the Council was solicited during a dedicated presentation. Information on the tentative targets was shared with Council members with rationale for how the data were gathered, why it was chosen, and whether they thought there might be more viable data to consider. Information gleaned from this session was then used when setting the final targets. The department plans to replicate and expand this target-setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. In general, the department works to ensure that the Council is as informed as possible about anything relative to the SPP/APR as they capture a powerful and crucial snapshot of the stakeholder community.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education directors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education director study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR 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, directors are delivered important updates around Division of Special Populations activities and have the opportunity to 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, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT) and parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP).

Finally, the department has convened a new advisory group that includes 15 special education supervisors (and other district staff, as relevant/necessary). This collaborative is intended to provide feedback on large-scale proposed updates, changes, regulations, and other important matters, with topic-focused meetings taking place throughout the school year. This group is yet another vehicle by which to solicit invaluable stakeholder feedback and further augment the information provided by all the other aforementioned stakeholders.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	50.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	10.00%	11.00%	12.00%	13.00%	14.00%
Data	54.17%	65.12%	69.23%	66.67%	47.27%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	15.00%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
23	35	47.27%	15.00%	65.71%	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 (EMAPS)).

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 resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, 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 not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1 Mediations held	12
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	6
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2

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 through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the Council 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 Council meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. 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.

The Council is also consulted on the targets set for specified indicators in the SPP/APR whenever they are changed or updated (except for indicators that are calculated through accountability processes and compliance indicators). When targets were required to be set for FFY 2018 - FFY 2024, feedback from the Council was solicited during a dedicated presentation. Information on the tentative targets was shared with Council members with rationale for how the data were gathered, why it was chosen, and whether they thought there might be more viable data to consider. Information gleaned from this session was then used when setting the final targets. The department plans to replicate and expand this target-setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. In general, the department works to ensure that the Council is as informed as possible about anything relative to the SPP/APR as they capture a powerful and crucial snapshot of the stakeholder community.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education directors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education director study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR 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, directors are delivered important updates around Division of Special Populations activities and have the opportunity to 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, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT) and parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP).

Finally, the department has convened a new advisory group that includes 15 special education supervisors (and other district staff, as relevant/necessary). This collaborative is intended to provide feedback on large-scale proposed updates, changes, regulations, and other important

matters, with topic-focused meetings taking place throughout the school year. This group is yet another vehicle by which to solicit invaluable stakeholder feedback and further augment the information provided by all the other aforementioned stakeholders.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	56.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	71.00%	72.00%	73.00%	74.00%	75.00%
Data	82.35%	77.27%	31.25%	53.85%	70.59%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	76.00%

FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
6	2	12	70.59%	76.00%	66.67%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Tennessee had 34 new requests for mediation. This was an increase from the 25 mediation requests received in FFY 2018. Twelve mediations were held, resulting in eight mediation agreements. The remaining four were unresolved at mediation. This decline in the percent of mediations that resulted in agreements led to a 3.92% slippage from FFY 2018 to FFY 2019.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID-19 had a minimal impact on mediation data, as the department continued its mediations in a virtual setting (rather than in-person).

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

16 - 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 Analysis for Special Populations

Email:

Zachary.Stone@tn.gov

Phone:

(615) 532-9702

Submitted on:

04/29/21 8:34:45 AM