TN
Part B

FFY2014
State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

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

The State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) documents and evaluates state implementation of special education on an annual basis. Every state is required to develop a plan describing how improvements will be made to special education programs, how special education programs will be assessed, and the targets for the 17 indicators of performance. These indicators focus on information specific to students with disabilities (SWDs) and can be either compliance-based or results-based. A summary of each indicator, the results from FFY 2013, the results for FFY 2014, and the targets set for FFY 2014 have been provided in the table below.

Indicators	FFY 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Data	FFY 2014 Target	Target Met?
Indicator 1: Graduation Rate for SWDs	67.33%	69.02%	69.37%	No
Indicator 2: Dropout Rate for SWDs	3.36%	3.62%	3.37%	No
Indicator 3A: Assessments: AYP/AMO Targets for SWDs	* NA	* NA	* NA	* NA
Indicator 3B: Assessments: Participation for SWDs	**Reading:** 98.95% **Math:** 98.91%	**Reading:** 99.02% **Math:** 98.99%	**Reading:** 95% **Math:** 95%	**Reading:** Yes **Math:** Yes
Indicator 3C: Assessments: Proficiency for SWDs	**Reading:** 29.08% **Math:** 30.33%	**Reading:** 21.05% **Math:** 27.5%	**Reading:** 32.08% **Math:** 33.33%	**Reading:** No **Math:** No
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion Rate for SWDs (*% of LEAs with significant discrepancy*)	7.41%	** 17.39%	2.40%	No
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion Rate for SWDs by Race/Ethnicity (*% of LEAs with significant discrepancy*)	0%	0%	0%	Yes
Indicator 5: Educational Environments (*Ages 6-21*)	**Sections:** **A:** 66.07%	**Sections:** **A: 70**.06%	**Sections:** **A:** 67.5%	**Sections:** **A:** Yes

	B: 11.27% **C:** 1.76%	**B:** 10.74% **C:** 1.79%	**B:** 11.4% **C:** 1.6%	**B:** Yes **C:** No
Indicator 6: Early Childhood Environments (*Ages 3-5*)	**Sections:** **A:** *** NA **B:** *** NA	**Sections:** **A:** 26.53% **B:** 35.62%	**Sections:** **A:** 28.5% **B:** 39.2%	**Sections:** **A:** No **B:** Yes
Indicator 7: Early Childhood Outcomes (*Ages 3-5*)	**Outcomes:** **A1:** 90.17% **A2:** 57.84% **B1:** 89.21% **B2:** 55.6% **C1:** 90.63% **C2:** 68.13%	**Outcomes**: **A1:** 90.52% **A2:** 59.21% **B1:** 89.51% **B2:** 57.59% **C1:** 91.33% **C2:** 69.4%	**Outcomes:** **A1:** 92.76% **A2:** 58.6% **B1:** 90.56% **B2:** 57.6% **C1:** 93.66% **C2:** 69.4%	**Outcomes:** **A1:** No **A2:** Yes **B1:** No **B2:** No **C1:** No **C2:** Yes
Indicator 8: Parent Involvement	90.4%	90.87%	93%	No
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation (*all disabilities*)	0%	0%	0%	Yes
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation (*high-incidence disabilities*)	2.21%	2.74%	0%	Yes
Indicator 11: Child Find	94.6%	94.81%	100%	No

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition	98.53%	97.53%	100%	No
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition	100%	73.68%	100%	No
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes	**Sections:** **A:** 21.27% **B:** 55.59% **C:** 67.70%	**Sections:** **A:** 22.1% **B:** 58.22% **C:** 69.26%	**Sections:** **A:** 23.75% **B:** 59% **C:** 68.75%	**Sections:** **A:** No **B:** No **C:** Yes
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions	75%	54.17%	10%	Yes
Indicator 16: Mediation	87.5%	82.35%	71%	Yes
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan	67.33%	56.69%	70.33%	No

** = No longer required under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)*

*** = Increase in "n" size requirements led to overall decrease in LEAs included, which yielded fewer eligible LEAs and reduced the denominator in the calculation*

**** = Data not reported for FFY 2013 due to change in data collection methods; FFY 2014 will serve as the baseline year*

Technical Assistance for Tennessee

Tennessee was determined to need assistance in both the FFY 2012 and FFY 2013 periods. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.F § 300.604(a), if a state is determined to need assistance for two consecutive years, there are several actions the Secretary of Education can request the state to take. In accordance with the determination letter sent for the FFY 2013 SPP/APR submission, the Secretary advised that Tennessee utilize available sources of technical assistance to get support in areas of need, particularly those elements and/or indicators for which the state received a score of zero on the results-driven accountability matrix. Tennessee Department of Education staff have been in contact with several government-funded technical assistance centers and the state's OSEP liaison to get support and guidance in relevant areas.

In the results-driven accountability matrix utilized by OSEP for the last two determinations, Tennessee received scores of zero on: the participation rates of students with disabilities (SWDs) on statewide reading and math assessments in grade 8; the

participation rates of SWDs on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reading assessment in grade 8; the percentage of SWDs in grade 4 scoring at or above basic on the NAEP reading assessment; and the percentage of SWDs in grades 4 and 8 scoring at or above basic on the NAEP math assessment. To address these areas of concern, the department has worked to develop new initiatives to improve outcomes for SWDs. These initiatives are manifest in the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and throughout the development of these initiatives, the department has had significant contact with the aforementioned technical assistance resources. Tennessee's SSIP relates directly to assessment outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities (SLD) in grades 3-8 and is thus extremely pertinent to the flagged elements/indicators. Since the majority of SWDs taking the statewide and NAEP assessments are those with an SLD, focusing on improvement activities relevant to this subgroup should produce positive results on the overall elements/indicators of performance listed in OSEP's determination matrix.

Both the IDEA Data Center and SRI International have been extremely helpful with engaging in conversations about the SSIP and the new initiatives. They have provided suggestions about how to most effectively implement new strategies and have reviewed drafts of the SSIP. Communication has taken place through phone calls, webinars, and emails. Their vast input was invaluable to develop the most comprehensive and viable SSIP possible. The OSEP liaison for Tennessee was also heavily involved in the conversations relative to the SSIP and provided excellent guidance and support. As a result of the guidance sought on the SSIP, Tennessee decided to utilize a sampling method to identify districts participating in SSIP-related activities. This was encouraged in conversations with technical assistance and OSEP staff and done to provide high quality support districts with the use of new practices to improve assessment outcomes for SWDs (particularly those with an SLD). Also, the department worked to align State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) funds with the SSIP to create sustainable support, which both OSEP and technical assistance staff promoted.

In addition to the work relative to assessments, the department also reached out to the OSEP liaison to receive guidance and technical assistance on ensuring SWDs are held to rigorous yet achievable standards that align to the state academic standards. The Special Education Framework refined by the department over the last several years encourages educators to develop goals intended to close skill deficit gaps rather than solely focusing on state academic standards. This was done not to imply that those standards are irrelevant for SWDs, but that deficits must be attenuated to ensure students can access the standards. Tennessee developed a guidance document based on the conversations with OSEP relative to goal development to support districts and alleviate questions and concerns. As well, to further align to OSEP's guidance, in the summer of 2016 the department will be developing an area in the statewide IEP data management system where educators can enter the impact of deficits on mastery of state academic standards and how these standards will be addressed. All this work has been done with the intent to close gaps for SWDs and ensure they are able to succeed academically and demonstrate positive outcomes. Addressing skill deficits can lead to students increasingly accessing standards and excelling on statewide assessments that test those very standards.

While Indicators 9 and 10 were not identified with a zero on OSEP's determinations matrix, the department also reached out to both technical assistance center staff and the OSEP liaison for Tennessee to get guidance on the metrics used to calculate the disproportionality. For years the minimum "n" size utilized for Indicators 9 and 10 yielded instances of false positives, in which districts were found discrepant in a particular racial/ethnic group based on one student. These districts were required to fill out a lengthy and thorough self-assessment to determine if they were truly demonstrating disproportionality in identification of SWDs. While the assessment is a valuable tool for all districts to use, it can be cumbersome and time-consuming, thus putting an undue burden on districts that may in fact have no disproportionality. Accordingly, the department had several conversations with experts across technical assistance centers and within OSEP to review and consider revision of the "n" size. Based on these communications and the research done by Tennessee, the "n" size was adjusted to better identify actual disproportionality and abated the number of districts identified to complete a self-assessment.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

145

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

General Supervision System:

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

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

Monitoring System

Over the last three years there has been a shift in responsibility of monitoring IDEA Part B within the department. While the division of special populations and student support still monitors specific indicators from the SPP/APR (4A, 4B, 9, and 10) through reviews of policies, procedures, and practices, all other monitoring is completed by the office of consolidated planning and monitoring (CPM). The monitoring system developed by CPM for IDEA Part B utilizes a two-step approach that was piloted with only the 16 LEAs identified through CPM's risk assessment tool (more information on this below) in the 2013-14 SY. In the 2014-15 SY, the process was expanded to include even more LEAs. In the 2015-16 SY the process was expanded to include all LEAs.

In the first step of this monitoring system, LEAs are given 10 randomly selected student records. These 10 records are representative of the disability category make-up of each individual LEA for viable sampling. The LEAs must assess these 10 records using the rubric available in the Web-based Monitoring System (WBMS) and receive training and support on how to assess these records. A copy of this monitoring rubric, titled "IEP Review Protocol," has been attached to this page. The results of this review are captured in WBMS and made available to state monitors.

The second step entails state monitors assessing these same 10 student records via desktop auditing. These monitors use the exact same rubric as the school LEAs do in their own self-assessments. The results of both reviews are compared and LEAs are notified of discrepancies between the two rubrics or findings of noncompliance. Experts within the division of special populations and student support also analyze some of the 10 student records for quality of transition plans and evaluations.

This monitoring system is a stark contrast to the previous cyclical model of monitoring in which LEAs were only monitored either on-site or through desktop auditing every four years. As well, under this new system, monitoring has evolved from being primarily compliance-driven to include results and student performance in the process. In light of this shift, the department has had richer conversations with LEAs that have gone beyond legal requirements and have included analysis of the quality and integrity of education to improve outcomes for students in Tennessee. In response to this new focus on performance, CPM developed a results-based monitoring process which provides a framework for best practices and can be used as a self-assessment instrument for any LEA or school.

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

- Gathering assessment and growth data on LEAs and their schools by proficiency levels, subjects, and subgroups.
- Reviewing LEAs' consolidated applications and budgets for IDEA and ESEA; reviewing LEAs' strategic plans.
- Developing a measurement/assessment of risk for LEAs based on identified indicators (not referring solely to SPP/APR indicators). Such indicators might be tied to (but are certainly not limited to) finance, teacher results, rates of graduation, and subgroup performance. It is important to note that some of the IDEA Part B indicators selected to measure risk are developed by CPM in conjunction with the division of special populations and student support. This ensures that the priorities of the division of special populations and student support are clearly aligned with these risk indicators and that a common message is being delivered to LEAs from all divisions within the department. Local determinations are used as one of the primary indicators of risk.

Once LEAs are selected for results-based monitoring predicated on the aforementioned criteria, they are subject to more intensive monitoring in various areas, including IDEA Part B. On-site monitoring of IEPs and thorough file reviews are required for these flagged LEAs and at least two schools will be visited for a minimum of two hours. A proportionate number of IEPs are pulled for monitoring for every identified LEA based on the demographics of SWDs in LEAS, including students' disability

categories, students' age/grade, the number of students with transition plans in place, and other factors as specified. The IEPs reviewed are intended to reflect the actual makeup of SWDs within LEAs.

These IEPS are not just evaluated for compliance (e.g., documents were completed within an appropriate timeframe, paperwork was provided to family, and meetings were held with necessary parties in attendance) but also for the quality of the plan. The instructional programming team within the division of special populations and student support assesses narratives, present levels, and goals in the IEPs to ensure that they are thorough, supported by current data, and measurable, respectively. This careful analysis of the quality of the IEPs is intended to ensure that SWDs are receiving instructionally appropriate services that address their specific areas of deficit.

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

Local Determinations

While local determinations in many ways serve as an aspect of monitoring, the recent shift to a more robust determinations process in Tennessee warrants a dedicated section. Since the FFY 2011 APR, the department has employed a local determinations process focused not only on compliance indicators but also on results. Considering both types of indicators in the determinations process allows for a more holistic view of LEA performance on the APR. As well, this process supports not only the overall goals of the 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 manifest in the heavy weighting of results-based indicators 1, 3, and 5A. Other indicators that are solely compliance focused might have a lesser weight, however, the fluidity of this determinations process allows the weights to be shifted year to year rather than remain static.

The actual local determination assigned to each LEA is based on overall points allocated once the weights of each indicator are calculated. Each LEA is provided a detailed table listing their actual data for each indicator included in the determinations process, how they compare against the state, and whether they met the state-established target. Rather than have LEAs develop separate improvement activities for individual indicators and submit them piecemeal to the department, those LEAs in “needs assistance” and “needs intervention” determination assignments must develop an improvement plan that addresses flagged indicators. These plans are to be submitted through the LEA consolidated applications and plans (ePlan system). This reduces 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 plans rather than being disparate and disconnected.

For those LEAs found in “needs intervention,", a site visit to conduct a needs assessment is required. Staff from the division of special populations and student support visit LEAs to address those indicators “flagged” in the determinations process. Using a uniform protocol (see attached “Needs Assessment Protocol”), relevant LEA staff are asked about district-wide practices and procedures that might impact each of the flagged indicators. Data from the APR fiscal year and current data are used to inform the discussion.

The intent of the visit are for LEAs to be held accountable to data from a previous year, but not to fixate on this old data that cannot not be altered. Instead, the focus is on discussing LEAs’ current data, where they would like their future data to be, and how the department can be a thought partner in helping them attain their goals. School-specific visits are also done in conjunction with the visits with central office staff and administrators to better flesh out the LEA as a whole and get input from other parties. Improvement plans are developed based on these visits with both recommended and required tasks that address each of the flagged indicators.

Dispute Resolution

The department's office of general council is responsible for overseeing dispute resolution throughout the course of each year. This includes investigation and resolution of administrative complaints as well as mediations and due process requests and/or

hearings. Signed written complaints should have reports issued and be resolved within the allotted 60-day timeline or the agreed upon extended timeline (could be due to exceptional circumstances relative to the particular complaint or because the parent/individual/organization and department agree to extend the timeline to engage in mediation or alternative forms of dispute resolution). Due process requests are to be documented by the office of general council and if requests are fully adjudicated, this must be done within the 45-day timeline or the agreed upon extended timeline (an extension can be approved by hearing officer at the request of either party).

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
needs assessment protocol.pdf	Rachel Wilkinson		Remove
iep review protocol.xlsx	Rachel Wilkinson		Remove

Technical Assistance System:

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

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

Identifying Initiatives

In recent years, the department has gone to great lengths to address the historically poor student performance in LEAs across the state. New initiatives and policies in effect, like college and career ready standards, Response to Intervention and Instruction (RTI^2), and Instructionally Appropriate IEPs, were informed by data like results on statewide assessment and NAEP exams, graduation rates, and post-school outcomes for all students and subgroups, . The dearth of students being appropriately prepared for the rigors of college, the number of students relegated to IEPs before actual supports and intervention are provided to address areas of need, and the writing of weak IEPs that don't address SWDs' areas of deficit all have contributed to the development of such initiatives. By using data to drive these initiatives, the department has accurately pinpointed areas of concern and will continue to measure their success and viability. As well, the department has sought the input of stakeholders by developing task-forces throughout the state to weigh in on initiatives and contribute to their development.

Training on Initiatives

The 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. For example, the former division of curriculum and instruction provided no-cost training to support teachers in grades pre-K through 12 in an effort to increase understanding of the new college and career ready standards. These wide-scale trainings offered in the summers of 2012, 2013, and 2014 were attended by approximately 60,000 educators. The department sought the input of teachers and LEA leaders to develop the content of these courses to ensure that they were relevant and relatable to educators throughout the state. While this training was not special education specific, it reached all educators who routinely work with students with disabilities.

The instructional programming team within the division of special populations and student support conducts the majority of instructional technical assistance and professional development for special education staff within Tennessee. This includes developing a special education framework to assist teachers in the writing of Instructionally Appropriate IEPs and collaborating with the former division of curriculum and instruction to provide training and support relative to RTI^2. Each member of the instructional programming team has a particular area of expertise, ranging from speech/language therapy to high school transition, so that the team can offer a wide gamut of professional development and technical assistance to LEAs in all areas of special education. As well, the data services team provides professional development and routine technical assistance to LEAs on the use of data to inform instructional decision-making and the effective use of the statewide IEP data management system (EasyIEP).

Identifying LEAs for Technical Assistance/Professional Development

While much 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 and student support uses the annual local determinations as a barometer of whether LEAs are successfully improving the outcomes of SWDs and are compliant with federal and state regulations. While those LEAs in the determination category of “meets requirements” are welcome to receive technical assistance or professional development if requested, the department focuses much of its resources and efforts on providing support to those LEAs in “needs assistance” and “needs intervention” determination categories. Those “needs assistance” LEAs are required to develop an improvement plan that may include some department staff providing direct training regarding areas of need.

As is detailed in the “General Supervision” section, those “needs intervention” LEAs are required to complete a cursory improvement plan in the statewide ePlan system. Subsequently, site visits are scheduled in which division of special populations and student support staff visit identified LEAs and meet with central office staff and administrators to discuss indicators “flagged” in the determinations process. Data gathered through the LEA-submitted improvement plan, the data from the APR period in question, and the most current data are discussed at the site visit to ensure accountability for past data while focusing on current data and how to improve it in the future. These visits are more to conduct a needs assessment and support LEAs than to “monitor” them.

Based on the visit, LEAs are provided department staff notes and a finalized improvement plan that pulls information from the LEA-submitted plan and the information gleaned from the site visit. This improvement plan has both recommended and required activities that address each of the flagged indicators. Many of these activities entail having technical assistance and professional development training for staff. Using the determinations as a system by which the department can identify those LEAs requiring the most intensive technical assistance and professional development has been beneficial for both LEAs and the department. The indicators in the APR help staff in LEAs pinpoint areas of deficit or concern and allow the department to focus on and localize supports in the areas of greatest need within these LEAs.

In the 2015-16 SY, Tennessee was awarded the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG), and intends to use the funds to provide support and trainings relative to the goals identified in the department's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). LEAs will have the opportunity to apply for participation in grant-related activities; such activities will include supports and trainings from department and SPDG-funded staff. As well, LEAs will be asked to nominate special education coaches who will provide on-site support to LEA staff. A mini-grant will also be awarded to those LEAs selected to participate in these activities to supplement costs of materials related to trainings. A copy of the information and application for SPDG has been attached ("Application to Participate").

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
application to participate.docx	Rachel Wilkinson		Remove

Professional Development System:

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

Please see Technical Assistance System section.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part B results indicators

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 Students with Disabilities Advisory Council 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. The department routinely presents at quarterly Council meetings on all the APR's indicators. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, it's relevance to 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 presented information 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 2013 - FFY 2014, feedback from the Council was solicited during a presentation. Information on the tentative targets was shared with Council members with rationale of how the data was 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. Tennessee 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. A presentation, titled "APR Determinations and Targets," which as used during a Council meeting in 2014, has been attached for reference. During this presentation, the FFY 2012 APR and a discussion about setting targets for FFY 2013 - FFY 2014 took place. The latter is particularly important as it reflects the way in which the Council was engaged in the process and the way data to inform the targets was communicated to stakeholders.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education supervisors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education director conferences. At these conferences, data from the APR and how local determinations were made is annually 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, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. Additionally, representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT) and parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP) are also engaged.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
apr determinations and targets.pptx	Rachel Wilkinson		Remove

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2013 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 2013 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 2013 APR in 2015, is available.

The department reports annually to the public on the performance of the state and each LEA through the state website: http://www.tennessee.gov/education/article/special-education-data-services-reports. Reports provided on this site include the full SPPs and APRs for the past six years, a spreadsheet with detailed data for the each LEA on every indicator as compared to state averages and targets the SPP/APR (a copy of this spreadsheet from the FFY 2013 APR has been attached for reference, entitled "2013-14 LEA APR Indicator Summary"), and OSEP's letter of determination for the state for the most recent APR. Specific data from individual indicators (such as Indicator 3) can be found on the Tennessee state report card at: http://www.tennessee.gov/education/topic/report-card.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
2013-14 lea apr indicator summary.xlsx	Rachel Wilkinson		Remove

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			49.20%	56.90%	60.90%	64.70%	69.40%	86.70%	68.90%	69.30%
Data		47.70%	55.40%	59.40%	63.20%	67.90%	85.20%	67.40%	72.80%	67.33%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	69.37%	69.37%	69.37%	69.37%	69.37%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

The target for FFY 2014 is the target graduation percentage for the SWDs subgroup, as per the ESEA Flexibility Waiver (previous flexibility waiver prior to the one approved in 2015). Because the Waiver's calculation for graduation targets is predicated of previous year's data, the targets for subsequent years will have to be updated annually to reflect new targets in place. In the meantime, the target for FFY 2014 was entered for FFY 2014 - FFY 2018. In FFY 2014, graduation targets were set by the following calculation:

Graduation Target = Graduation Rate for Previous Year + Graduation Rate Growth Goal
The Graduation Rate Growth Goal is determined via the following calculation:
Graduation Rate Growth Goal = (100-Graduation Rate for Previous Year)/16

For FFY 2014, the following was the calculation for graduation target based on actual data:

Graduation Rate Growth Goal: (100% - 67.33%)/16 = 2.04

Graduation Target: 67.33% + 2.04% = 69.37%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

☑ Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Stakeholder input was solicited for these targets by the Division of Data and Research when developing the previous ESEA Flexibility Waiver and again when finalizing the new Waiver. This information and the annual resetting of this target have been shared with stakeholders referenced in "Stakeholder Involvement" in the General Supervision section. Please refer to this section for any further information about stakeholder input solicited by the division of special populations and student support.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	5,707	
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	8,269	null
SY 2013-14 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	12/2/2015	2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	69.02%	Calculate

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2014 Data
5,707	8,269	67.33%	69.37%	69.02%

Graduation Conditions Field

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

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

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

Number of cohort members graduating with a regular high school diploma by the of the 2013-14 SY = **5,707**

Number of first-time 9th graders in the fall of 2010 + students transferring in - students transferring out - students emigrating out - students who are deceased = **8,269**

5,707 / 8,269 = 69.02%

This formula was developed by the National Governors Association (NGA) in 2005 and adopted by Tennessee in the 2011-12 SY. Previously an event exit rate for a single year, not a cohort, was utilized. This change in calculation of graduation rate for all students was done in accordance with the ESEA Flexibility Waiver (Waiver prior to the one approved in 2015). Attached to this indicator is a document titled "NGA Grad Rate" that breaks down the information on the cohort graduation rate calculation process in further detail.

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			18.30%	14.90%	15.40%	13.49%	1.80%	2.70%	8.10%	3.42%
Data		19.80%	16.40%	16.90%	14.99%	3.30%	4.20%	9.60%	3.47%	3.36%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

☐ Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of high school students with IEPs	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
1,186	32,801	3.36%	3.37%	3.62%

☑ **Use a different calculation methodology**

☐ Change numerator description in data table

☐ Change denominator description in data table

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

The data used to calculate the dropout rate provided above did not come from data in the Ed*Facts* file C009 but instead was based on data submitted for Ed*Facts* file C032. 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 Ed*Facts* file C032 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 Ed*Facts* file C032:

> "The unduplicated number of dropouts [students who were enrolled in school at some time during the school year, yet were not enrolled the following school year, but were expected to be in membership (i.e., were not reported as

dropouts the year before); did not graduate from high school (graduates include students who received a GED without dropping out of school) or complete a state or district-approved educational program; and who did not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: (1) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district-approved educational program, (2) temporary school-recognized absence due to suspension or illness, or (3) death]."

The grade parameters established for Indicator 2 (only including the students in grades 9-12 who were classified as dropouts) were applied to the data in the Ed*Facts* file C032. The denominator of this dropout calculation is the number of students with disabilities in grades 9-12 enrolled during the 2013-14 SY as based on the census information collected in the Ed*Facts* file C002. Thus, the calculation of dropouts for FFY 2014 was as follows:

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

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

1066/31,715 = 3.36%

Explanation of Slippage

There has been an increased effort within the department over the last several years to accurately reflect the exit reasons in the statewide data management system (EIS), so information that might have previously been incorrectly coded with another exit reason (typically "moved, known to be continuing") is being more accurately reported. Additionally, accountability processes in place for both ensuring accurate graduation rates and dropout rates have likely aided this effort to improve data quality. LEAs are now required to code students who may have left with no notice or requests from subsequent LEAs as dropouts, and only during an appeals process where LEAs can contest these dropouts can decisions be reversed. In light of these measures, the count of reported dropouts might have increased based on more accurate data entry.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

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

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

The following communication from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) details that based on the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), AMOs will not be required to be reported on for this APR:

AMOs and Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)

In accordance with a February 27, 2015, letter from the Director of ED's Office of State Support, many States that implemented new assessments in the 2014–2015 school year are preparing to submit new AMOs for ED's review and approval in January 2016. However, the ESSA requires States to "establish ambitious State-designed long-term goals…for all students and separately for each subgroup of students" instead of AMOs. ED wants to support State efforts to prepare for this transition; therefore, in accordance with ED's authority to ensure an orderly transition to the ESSA, ED will not require States to submit AMOs (for school years 2014–2015 or 2015–2016) in January 2016 for ED's review and approval, nor will ED require States to report performance against AMOs for the 2014–2015 or 2015–2016 school years. Additionally, ED will not require States to hold districts accountable for their performance against AMAOs 1, 2, and 3 under Title III of the ESEA for the 2014–2015 or 2015–2016 school years.

Please note, however, that all States and districts must continue to publish report cards, including report cards for the 2014–2015 school year (if those report cards have not yet been published), for the 2015–2016 school year, and beyond. Report cards must continue to include information that shows how a district's student achievement on the State assessments compares to students and subgroups of students in the State as a whole. At the school level, the district must include information that shows how a school's student achievement on the State assessments compares to students and subgroups of students in the district and in the State as a whole. However, consistent with ED's authority to ensure an orderly transition to the ESSA, report cards need not include the information required under ESEA section 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii).

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

This indicator is not applicable.

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Overall	2011	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		98.00%	104.20%	99.10%	92.70%	99.20%	99.20%	99.10%	99.60%	98.95%
Math	A Overall	2011	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		99.00%	95.90%	99.10%	99.40%	99.10%	99.30%	99.20%	99.70%	98.91%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

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

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

Data Source: SY 2014-15 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 12/23/2015

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	9789	10181	10206	10170	9964	9694	424	6998	784	117	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	3017	2404	1839	1515	1361	1296	136	2549	66	24	

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	5907	6862	7405	7640	7565	7281	159	4189	80	32	
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	794	855	900	934	945	1021	97	102	620	59	

Data Source: SY 2014-15 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 12/23/1015

Math assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	9819	10221	10224	10193	9978	9709	4134	3688	294	131	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	3015	2402	1837	1516	1363	1341	1556	1196	68	32	
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	5910	6856	7405	7629	7556	7222	1809	2288	112	40	
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	824	893	916	957	958	1030	718	109	90	53	

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	68,327	67,654	98.95%	95.00%	99.02%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	68,391	67,701	98.91%	95.00%	98.99%

Public Reporting Information

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

Assessment information for all students, including SWDs, can be found on Tennessee's State Report Card at: https://www.tn.gov/education/topic/report-card. The data for the 2014-15 SY assessments 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: http://www.tennessee.gov/education/article/special-education-data-services-reports.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The variation in participation on the reading and math assessments in grades 9-11 occurs because Tennessee's End of Course (EOC) exams are staggered at different times for different subject areas. For example, many SWDs take the Algebra I EOC in 9th grade; however, the English II EOC, which is used in accountability calculations, is not taken by many SWDs until 10th grade. Thus, the participation in the English II EOC is low in 9th grade as many students are taking the English I EOC, which is not included in accountability calculations.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Overall	2011	Target ≥			74.70%	79.00%	79.40%	81.50%	83.30%	41.50%	44.40%	34.80%
			Data		71.50%	77.27%	78.69%	77.96%	24.90%	38.50%	41.40%	31.80%	29.08%
Math	A Overall	2011	Target ≥			61.40%	65.20%	68.60%	71.70%	74.50%	34.20%	39.80%	31.30%
			Data		59.47%	58.40%	67.42%	67.74%	19.90%	31.20%	36.80%	31.30%	30.33%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

☑ Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

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

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

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

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

Data Source: SY 2014-15 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 12/23/2015

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	9718	10121	10144	10089	9871	9598	392	6840	766	115	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	936	755	532	399	335	281	9	728	11	6	
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	399	571	659	700	552	522	8	566	6	n	
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	788	847	895	923	938	1013	94	99	612	59	

Data Source: SY 2014-15 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 42361

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	9749	10151	10158	10102	9877	9593	4083	3593	270	125	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1575	920	818	374	323	332	719	231	9	6	
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1051	776	1691	685	788	842	584	446	9	n	
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	802	881	902	936	941	1016	707	106	89	53	

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	67,654	14,244	29.08%	32.08%	21.05%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

In the 2014-15 SY, the Modified Academic Achievement Standards (MAAS) assessment was no longer permitted. Accordingly, all students previously assigned to take the modified assessment were required to take the regular reading assessment. There has been a decline in proficiency rates for the reading assessment over the last two years, during which the MAAS was phased out. In the 2012-13 SY, there were over 17,000 students taking the MAAS who were not included in the calculation for the regular reading assessment. At that time, the proficiency rate was 31.80%. In the 2013-14 SY, there were over 14,000 students taking the MAAS who were not included in the calculation for the regular reading assessment. At that time, the proficiency rate was 29.08%. In the 2014-15 SY, no students took the MAAS and the proficiency rate dropped to 21.05%. These students, who might have been previously excluded from core instruction in reading as they were given an assessment with modified standards, will now be included more to ensure they are getting access to the core content from the subject matter expert. Accordingly, this access will benefit students and improve the proficiency rates in coming years.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	67,701	18,615	30.33%	33.33%	27.50%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

In the 2014-15 SY, the Modified Academic Achievement Standards (MAAS) assessment was no longer permitted. This meant that all students previously assigned to take the modified assessment were required to take the regular math assessment. There has been a decline in proficiency rates for the math assessment over the last two years, during which the MAAS was phased out. In the 2012-13 SY, there were over 17,000 students taking the MAAS who were not included in the calculation for the regular math assessment. At that time, the proficiency rate was 31.30%. In the 2013-14 SY, there were over 14,000 students taking the MAAS who were not included in the calculation for the regular math assessment. At that time, the proficiency rate was 30.33%. In the 2014-15 SY, no students took the MAAS, and the proficiency rate dropped to 27.50%. These students, who might have been previously excluded from core instruction in math as they were given an assessment with modified standards, will now be included more to ensure they are getting access to the core content from the subject matter expert. Accordingly, this access will benefit students and improve the proficiency rates in coming years.

Public Reporting Information

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

Assessment information for all students, including SWDs, can be found on Tennessee's State Report Card at: https://www.tn.gov/education/topic/report-card. The data for the 2014-15 SY assessments 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: http://www.tennessee.gov/education/article/special-education-data-services-reports.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The variation in proficiency counts on the reading and math assessments in grades 9-11 occurs because Tennessee's End of Course (EOC) exams are staggered at different times for different subject areas. For example, many SWDs take the Algebra I EOC in 9th grade; however, the English II EOC, which is used in accountability calculations, is not taken by many SWDs until 10th grade. Thus, the participation in the English II EOC is low in 9th grade as many students are taking the English I EOC, which is not included in accountability calculations.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			25.50%	22.50%	25.50%	26.50%	32.80%	18.00%	1.00%	2.60%
Data		30.00%	26.47%	28.00%	28.00%	33.82%	19.00%	1.90%	0.74%	7.41%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

☑ Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

NOTE: The change to the "n" size, which is noted in the definition of significant discrepancy under the "FFY 14 Data" tab, was based on input from stakeholders, particularly LEA special education supervisors and superintendents, who expressed concern that "n" sizes of less than five students were yielding false positives and putting undue burden on LEAs to complete a self-assessment when no issue was actually present. The department reflected on this and revised the "n" size. Staff conducted number comparisons, compared data to previous years, and contacted technical assistance centers and OSEP staff for comments or suggestions. Both the technical assistance centers and OSEP concurred that the increased "n" size seemed appropriate.

For further information about the engagement of stakeholders, please refer to "Stakeholder Involvement" in the General Supervision section.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

○ Number of districts in the State

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

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
4	23	7.41%	2.40%	17.39%

Explanation of Slippage

While the percentage of LEAs suspending/expelling SWDs for greater than 10 days went up in the 2013-14 SY, this is largely attributed to the decrease in the overall number of LEAs meeting the department's new minimum "n" size requirement utilized for the first time in the FFY 2014 APR (5 or more students suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days). Indeed, it is this change in "n" size and reduction in the denominator, rather than to a larger amount of LEAs demonstrating significant discrepancy, that best explains the slippage. Two of the four LEAs identified with significant discrepancy FFY 2014 were also identified in FFY 2013. What is promising, however, is that the suspension/expulsion rate for SWDs in these two LEAs drastically declined over the course of a school year. In District 1, the suspension/expulsion rate for SWDs went from 8.13% in FFY 2013 to 2.98% in FFY 2014. In District 2, the suspension/expulsion rate for SWDs went from 12.5% in FFY 2013 to 7.22% in FFY 2014.

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

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The department utilizes a percentage 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. An LEA is found significantly discrepant if 2.50% or more of the SWDs are suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days. For FFY 2014, there was a change in the way "n" sizes were set for LEAs to be identified with significant discrepancy. While the calculation of suspension/expulsion rates aforementioned remain the same, to qualify for significant discrepancy an LEA must have both 2.50% or more of SWDs suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days **AND** there must be 5 or more students suspended/expelled. Previously the "n" size was two. For the FFY 2014, this change in "n" size did *not* eliminate any LEAs that might have otherwise been included prior to the "n" size change. This change was done to mitigate situations in which false positives might lead to over-identification of LEAs due to small numbers of students.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

Once the department compares the discrepancy rates of all LEAs, those identified as significantly discrepant (have a suspension/expulsion rate for SWDs of 2.50% or greater **AND** have an "n" size of 5 or more SWDs suspended/expelled) 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. Once the self-assessment has been submitted to the department and analyzed, if it is determined that many of these are contributors then revision and technical assistance/support are required.

A copy of the file review form used for LEAs to complete an evaluation of their disciplinary practices has been attached below and is entitled "FINAL Indicator 4 Review." Those LEAs identified for file reviews are provided this form and given a list of their data for the FFY 2014 year. This form allows department staff to thoroughly review LEA's policies, procedures, and practices to ensure the appropriate development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and

supports, and adherence to procedural safeguards.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

Number of districts in the State

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

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
6	0	23	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

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 product of this calculation is the rate ratio. To be considered significantly discrepant for this indicator, the rate ratio for an LEA must be 2.0 or greater and the LEA must meet the "n" size requirement. While historically the "n" size requirement has been for 2 or more students suspended/expelled, in FFY 2014 this was increased to a minimum of 5 students. This change was done to align with Indicator 4A's calculation and to mitigate situations

in which false positives might lead to over-identification of LEAs due to small numbers of students. Under this new modification, to qualify for significant discrepancy, an LEA must have both a rate ratio of 2.0 **AND** there must be 5 or more students suspended/expelled.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The change to the "n" size noted in the definition above was based on input from stakeholders, particularly LEA special education supervisors and superintendents, who expressed concern that "n" sizes of less than five students were yielding false positives and putting undue burden on LEAs to complete a self-assessment when no issue was actually present. The department reflected on this and revised the "n" size. Staff conducted number comparisons, compared data to previous years, and contacted technical assistance centers and OSEP staff for comments or suggestions. Both the technical assistance centers and OSEP concurred that the increased "n" size seemed appropriate.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

Once the department compares the discrepancy rates of all LEAs, those identified as significantly discrepant (have a rate ratio of 2.00 or greater **AND** have an "n" size of 5 or more SWDs suspended/expelled) 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. Once the self-assessment has been submitted to the department and analyzed, if it is determined that many of these are contributors then revision and technical assistance/support are required.

A copy of the file review form used for LEAs to complete an evaluation of their disciplinary practices has been attached below and is entitled "FINAL Indicator 4 Review." Those LEAs identified for file reviews are provided this form and given a list of their data for the FFY 2014 year. This form allows department staff to thoroughly review LEA's policies, procedures, and practices to ensure the appropriate development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and adherence to procedural safeguards.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2005	Target ≥			53.50%	54.00%	54.50%	55.00%	55.50%	60.00%	60.50%	65.50%
		Data		53.48%	63.44%	56.31%	59.15%	62.33%	63.40%	63.40%	63.41%	66.07%
B	2005	Target ≤			14.50%	14.00%	13.50%	62.33%	12.50%	12.00%	11.50%	11.50%
		Data		14.69%	10.90%	13.52%	13.24%	12.64%	12.40%	12.30%	11.92%	11.27%
C	2005	Target ≤			4.00%	4.00%	3.71%	2.10%	2.08%	2.06%	2.04%	1.70%
		Data		1.89%	1.76%	1.98%	1.77%	1.75%	1.90%	1.80%	1.80%	1.76%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	6/4/2015	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	118,202	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	82,818	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec	7/2/2015	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	12,692	null

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
C002; Data group 74)				
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	1,014	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	366	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	730	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	82,818	118,202	66.07%	67.50%	70.06%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	12,692	118,202	11.27%	11.40%	10.74%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	2,110	118,202	1.76%	1.60%	1.79%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2014	Target ≥									9.80%	
		Data								NVR	8.70%	
B	2014	Target ≤									12.80%	
		Data								13.30%	13.80%	

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	28.50%	30.00%	32.00%	34.00%	36.00%
Target B ≤	39.20%	34.00%	29.00%	24.00%	20.00%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

Prior to December 1, 2014, the department was not confident in the quality or veracity of the environment data collected for Indicator 6. Over the last several years, staff worked with technical assistance centers, contracted with outside vendors, and met with staff across numerous states as well as staff internally to develop a system that would better capture the data relevant to this indicator. December 1, 2014 served as the baseline year in which the new system to gather environment data for those students ages 3-5 had been employed within the state for over a year. Based on the more accurate data gleaned from this period, the new targets for FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 were established.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

As reported in the FFY 2013 APR, there were recognized problems with the Indicator 6 data collection system which led to incorrect Measurement A and B percentages. The department worked with the data collection vendor to redesign the data collection process so valid and reliable data could be collected. As FFY 2014 is the first year of valid and reliable data, it will serve as the state's baseline for Indicator 6 (FFY 2014 will be selected as the baseline year in subsequent APRs). Discussions regarding Indicator 6 data have taken place with Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA) staff, 619 staff from other states, and LEA staff within the state. A review of Tennessee data in relation to Indicator 6 data from other states was also conducted. In addition, a department statewide strategic plan that included targets for improvement in preschool inclusion was developed and shared with partner agencies and LEAs inviting feedback across the state.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	12,527	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	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	3,324	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	4,368	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b2. Number of children attending separate school	90	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	3,324	12,527		28.50%	26.53%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	4,462	12,527		39.20%	35.62%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

The State did not provide FFY 2013 data for this indicator and the State must provide the required data for FFY 2014 in the FFY 2014 APR.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

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

In light of these baseline data pulls from Dec. 1, 2014, the department was able to create accurate targets and feels that the data gathered were far more valid and indicative of actual state trends. The data from this Dec. 1, 2014 pull are what have been reported under the "FFY14 Data" tab.

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A1	2009	Target ≥						91.70%	92.20%	92.20%	92.70%	92.70%
		Data						91.70%	90.80%	90.00%	88.00%	90.17%
A2	2009	Target ≥						57.40%	57.90%	57.90%	58.40%	58.00%
		Data						57.40%	61.30%	59.50%	57.80%	57.84%
B1	2009	Target ≥						89.50%	90.00%	90.00%	90.50%	90.50%
		Data						89.50%	89.40%	88.90%	87.00%	89.21%
B2	2009	Target ≥						55.70%	56.20%	56.20%	56.70%	57.00%
		Data						55.70%	59.20%	56.90%	55.50%	55.60%
C1	2009	Target ≥						92.60%	93.10%	93.10%	93.60%	93.60%
		Data						92.60%	91.30%	89.60%	88.60%	90.63%
C2	2009	Target ≥						68.00%	68.50%	68.50%	69.00%	69.00%
		Data						68.00%	71.10%	69.20%	68.30%	68.13%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

☑ Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Early intervention stakeholders, including a consultant from outside of Tennessee familiar with national early childhood outcomes (ECO) data, as well as IDEA 611 staff, took time to review the annual data for Tennessee for each outcome. Overall, Tennessee's data has been strong and remained consistent, particularly when compared to national ECO data. While there will be continued effort to promote improvements related to ECO; the consensus was that increasing target percentages needed to be modest in order to be realistic.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	5573.00

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	38.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	397.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1838.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2316.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	984.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	4154.00	4589.00	90.17%	92.76%	90.52%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	3300.00	5573.00	57.84%	58.60%	59.21%

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	59.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	426.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1870.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2267.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	931.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	4137.00	4622.00	89.21%	90.56%	89.51%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	3198.00	5553.00	55.60%	57.60%	57.59%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	52.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	296.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1346.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2320.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1522.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	3666.00	4014.00	90.63%	93.66%	91.33%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	3842.00	5536.00	68.13%	69.40%	69.40%

Was sampling used? No

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			93.00%	93.00%	94.00%	96.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	92.75%
Data		92.00%	92.10%	97.00%	89.40%	91.30%	91.10%	91.00%	97.30%	90.40%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
4639.00	5105.00	90.40%	93.00%	90.87%

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

The surveys disseminated for pre-K students are identical to those disseminated to school age students. As well, the surveys collected for pre-K students are analyzed and collated under the same methodology employed for school age students. Thus, the validity and reliability for those in pre-K is identical to those who are school age and allows for continuity across all grade bands to ensure all the information collected is valid, reliable, and cohesive. For this reporting period, a grade level break out was completed in Excel and it was found that surveys were disseminated to: 643 P3 (three year old students in pre-K) students with 179 responses from the family and 1011 P4 (four year old students in pre-K) students with 249 responses from the family.

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

demographics of the State.

During FFY 2014 school year, the *Parent Survey* was administered to all parents of SWDs ages 3 through 21 in 37 LEAs selected by the OSEP-approved sampling process. Tennessee's three largest LEAs participate in this survey each year with different schools, representative of the district as a whole, sampled every year. In FFY 2014, a total of 30,533 surveys were distributed to parents. There were 5,273 survey responses with usable data for a response rate of 17.3%, a 1.1% increase from the previous school year.
Item one on the survey queried parents regarding the LEA's facilitation of parent involvement. Of the 5,105 parents responding to item one, 90.87% (4,639/5,105) agreed that the schools facilitated their involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. The department's target of 93% was not met.
The department contracts with East Tennessee State University (ETSU) to administer the survey through two different methods. The methods of soliciting parent surveys are described below:

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

2. Mailing of survey packets to special education directors - Special education directors are mailed quantities of paper surveys with 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.

Federal Fiscal Year	Parent Response Rate
Surveys Conducted by School Districts*	
2006	33.00%
2007	28.20%
Surveys Conducted by State Contractor**	
2008	15.30%
2009	18.50%
2010	17.90%
2011	18.90%
2012	18.30%
2013	16.20%
2014	17.30%

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

**In FFY 2008, the department began utilizing three methods to distribute surveys (electronic, direct US mail, and take home surveys). A sampling of students was used instead of a census method and a lower response rate resulted. From FFY 2009 through FFY 2014, electronic and take home surveys have continued to be utilized with minimal change in response rate.

The table below provides summary representativeness data on all FFY 2014 *Parent Survey* respondents. The calculation, borrowed from the National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO), compares the respondent pool of parents against the targeted group of parents. This is done to determine whether the respondents represent the entire group of parents that could have responded to the survey. The difference row compares the two proportions (target proportion against respondent proportion) by selected attributes including: child disability, child gender, and child minority race/ethnicity. 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 minority students were underrepresented in the respondent group (-8.81%) as were parents of children with learning disabilities (-5.15%). Parents of students from all other (non-listed) disability groups were overrepresented by the respondents (5.36%). See respondent disaggregation in the table below:

NPSO Response Totals	Overall	LD	ED	ID	AO	Female	Minority
Target Pool Totals	30,533	11,564	729	1,667	16,573	10,168	9,606
Respondents Totals	5,273	1,581	93	341	3,258	1,857	1,326
Target Pool Representation		37.87%	2.39%	5.46%	54.28%	33.30%	31.46%
Respondent Representation		29.98%	1.76%	6.47%	61.79%	35.22%	25.15%
Difference		**-7.89%**	**-0.62%**	**1.01%**	**7.51%**	**1.92%**	**-6.31%**

The department will continue working in the 2015-16 SY to ensure that the population of those surveyed is representative of the population of the state as a whole. There will be increased efforts to more consistently remind LEAs selected to disseminate the survey to continue eliciting responses from parents. This will come in the form of emails from ETSU to district 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.

Was sampling used? Yes
Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

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

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

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

LEAs are sampled based on their locations in the state so that all regions are represented and it is ensured that every four years 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 district is surveyed each year, but that different schools within the LEA are selected every four years (similar to the process used for sampling smaller LEAs). To sample these three large LEAs, percentages of high schools,
middle schools, and elementary schools are determined for each LEA. Then the number of schools in each school 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 district.

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		1.50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

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

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	0	145	0%	0%	0%

☑ **All races and ethnicities were included in the review**

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

Disproportionate representation is defined as the "extent to which membership in a given group affects the probability of being placed in a specific education category" (Oswald, et al. 1999). Disproportionality is predicated on the comparison of a subgroup, such as race/ethnicity 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 race/ethnicity data. For FFY 2014, the methodology listed below was used to calculate and examine data to measure disproportionate representation (particularly overrepresentation) in special education. Note that there has been an update in the "n" sizes used in the criteria that was employed for the first time

in FFY 2014.

Calculation Criteria

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

a. Both a RRR and a WRR of 3.00 or 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 meets the minimum "n" size of 50 students ; and,

c. Count of students with disabilities meets the minimum "n" size of 45 students. *Note: the "n" of 45 is the "n" size historically used for previous measures of adequate yearly progress (AYP) for student subgroups. This established "n" size and the reasoning for it can be found Tennessee's initial NCLB Accountability Workbook, which states: "In calculating AYP for student subgroups, 45 or more students must be included to assure high levels of reliability."*

d. Count of students with disabilities in a specific racial/ethnic group meets the minimum "n" size of 5 students. Note: this new "n" size requirement was employed for the first time in FFY 2014.

Data Sources:

The October 1, 2014 Membership data (from Ed*Facts* file C052) and December 1, 2014 IDEA Child Count data (from the statewide IEP data management system, EasyIEP, which populates Ed*Facts* file C002) were used in the disproportionate representation calculations for each of Tennessee's 145 school districts. Those LEA's found disproportionate were required to complete a self-assessment and determine if policies, procedures, and or practices resulted in inappropriate identification. A copy of this self assessment ("Self-Assessment Ind 9 and 10") has been attached.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		1.50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1.47%	2.21%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

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

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
23	4	145	2.21%	0%	2.76%

Explanation of Slippage

Four districts were determined to disproportionately identify students with disabilities based on race due to inappropriate policies, practices, and procedures. This was determined through an analysis of the districts' self-assessments of differentiated instructional practices, intervention procedures, and referral, evaluation, and eligibility processes. A copy of this self assessment ("Self-Assessment Ind 9 and 10") has been attached. The increase in identified districts could be due to revisions to the "n" size used in identifying disproportionate representation to accurately reflect district practices (see the methodology outlined below). This revised "n" size successfully weeded out those districts who had fewer than five students in a racial/ethnic group with one of the high-incidence disabilities and allowed the director of eligibility to better hone in the remaining districts with more significant areas of concern. Overall, the department saw in increase in districts identifying students with speech/language impairments from their majority race, indicating potential over-identification. It should be noted that the reported year was the first year of RTI2 implementation. The department is carefully monitoring the referral and evaluation procedures to ensure that students are not inappropriately identified to avoid RTI procedures.

☑ **All races and ethnicities were included in the review**

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

Disproportionate representation is defined as the "extent to which membership in a given group affects the probability of being placed in a specific education category" (Oswald, et al. 1999). Disproportionality is predicated on the comparison of a subgroup, such as race/ethnicity 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 race/ethnicity data. For FFY 2014, the methodology listed below was used to calculate and examine data to measure disproportionate representation (particularly overrepresentation) in special education. Note that there has been an update in the "n" sizes used in the criteria that was employed for the first time in FFY 2014.

Calculation Criteria

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

a. Both a RRR and a WRR of 3.00 or higher. *Note: both RRRs and WRRs were generated for all LEAs based on the number of students receiving special education and related services in each LEA within each of the seven racial/ethnic categories*;

b. Racial/ethnic subgroup enrollment meets the minimum "n" size of 50 students ; and,

c. Count of students with disabilities in the specific disability category meets the minimum "n" size of 20 students.

d. Count of students with disabilities in a specific racial/ethnic group meets the minimum "n" size of 5 students. *Note: this new "n" size requirement was employed for the first time in FFY 2014.*

Data Sources

The October 1, 2014 Membership data (from Ed*Facts* file C052) and December 1, 2014 IDEA Child Count data (from the statewide IEP data management system, EasyIEP, which populates Ed*Facts* file C002) were used in the disproportionate representation calculations for each of Tennessee's 145 school districts. Those LEA's found disproportionate were required to complete a self-assessment and determine if policies, procedures, and or practices resulted in inappropriate identification. A copy of this self assessment ("Self-Assessment Ind 9 and 10") has been attached.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The three LEAs found noncompliant in FFY 2013 were required to undergo site visits. The director of eligibility led these visits and conducted interviews with LEA staff regarding the LEA's policies and procedures. Some questions were asked about how LEA practices might relate to the identified disproportionate representation. As well, schools were visited within the LEA and were observed to see the policies, procedures, and practices in effect. The director of eligibility also pulled a sampling of student eligibility documents and IEPs to assess how they were written and determine if the documents reflected inappropriate polices, procedures, and practices employed in the LEA. All information and concerns gleaned from these site visits were provided to LEA staff via written communication subsequent to the visits. The three LEAs were required to develop action plans based on these site visits and had to periodically submit evidence of activities completed throughout the 2013-14 SY to address findings of noncompliance and disproportionate representation. The TDOE staff also continuously provided technical assistance as necessary and reviewed additional student IEPs and eligibility documents from the three LEAs to confirm that the correct regulatory practices were being followed regarding appropriate identification of SWDs.

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

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

Indicator 11: Child Find

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		89.00%	82.00%	90.20%	96.00%	96.25%	95.30%	97.90%	97.90%	94.60%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
24,418	23,151	94.60%	100%	94.81%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	1,267

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.

Of the 24,418 students for whom parent consent to evaluate was received in FFY 2014, 1,267 students did not have their evaluations completed with the 60 calendar day timeline. These 1,267 students did not have an approved timeline extension requests OR they exceeded the timeline agreed upon in the timeline extension request OR they did not complete any timeline extension request and the eligibility exceeded the 60 calendar day timeline.

In Tennessee, districts can request timeline extensions for three approved reasons, and this request is submitted through the EasyIEP system. The director of eligibility reviews and approves or denies these requests; if they are approved and evaluations are completed within the approved timeframe delineated in the extension request, these students are not considered out of compliance.* However, in instances in which extension requests are approved and the eligibility is not completed in the agreed timeframe, or the requests are denied by the director of eligibility, these students are considered out of compliance. The three approved timeline extension reasons are:

1. More time is needed in order to collect adequate response to intervention (RTI) data for the purpose of determining the presence of a specific learning disability.
2. The parent repeatedly failed or refused to produce the child for the evaluation.

3. The child transferred from the district that obtained consent prior to an eligibility determination. The receiving district has made progress toward completing the evaluation.

In FFY 2014, 64 of the 1,267 noncompliant students for whom timeline extensions were requested were declined based on the nature of the request or the reason for delay. There were 128 out of the 1,267 noncompliant students who exceeded the 60 calendar day timeline prior to exit and then exited before eligibilities were completed. Of the 128 students, 118 had eligibilities completed in another district after exiting the school district where the referral was originally made. The remaining 10 students transferred out-of-state and completion of eligibility documents could not be tracked. There were 27 out of the 1,267 noncompliant students who still did not have eligibilities established as of December 2015. These students' LEAs were contacted by the director of eligibility (Prong 1) to resolve outstanding eligibilities. The remaining 1,048 noncompliant students had eligibilities established outside of the 60 calendar timeline and did not have extension requests completed **OR** had extension requests approved but the eligibility date exceeded the agreed upon timeline. The number of days beyond the established timeline ranged from 1 to 332 days.

When LEAs complete eligibilities after the 60 calendar timeline, they are required in the EasyIEP system to provide a reason why. The list of reasons are:

1. Limited access to professional staff (e.g., staff shortages, staff illness, in-service trainings, vacancies, holiday schedules, etc.).
2. Student or family language caused delays in testing/meeting (including need for interpreter).
3. Student transferred to another district.
4. Student transferred within district.
5. Waiting on specialist(s) (reports, second assessment, observation data, review, medical data, etc.).
6. Excessive student absences resulted in rescheduling of assessment(s).
7. Parent did not show for scheduled meeting. Or parent cancelled scheduled meeting too late—no time to reschedule within 60 calendar days. Or parent requested to schedule meeting outside of timeline
8. Student/parent serious medical issues (e.g., hospitalization, surgery recuperation) required postponement and/or rescheduling.
9. Repeated attempts to contact parents failed (minimum 3 unsuccessful mailings plus repeated phone calls).
10. Other (not listed above)

**Rather than being excluded from the compliance calculations, those students with acceptable reasons for delay who had eligibilities completed within the approved timeframe are included in both the numerator and denominator the compliance percentage calculation detailed above.*

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

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

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

- ( ) **State monitoring**
- (●) **State database that includes data for the entire reporting year**

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

The department collected data on initial consents for eligibility determinations for all students with signed consent forms during FFY 2014 (July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015). Data were collected though the EasyIEP system for all of Tennessee's 145 LEAs. FFY 2014 was the sixth year these student-level data were collected through EasyIEP. The student-level data obtained through EasyIEP include:

- Student name and basic demographics
- LEA
- Date of initial consent for eligibility determination
- Date of eligibility determination
- Eligibility determination (eligible or ineligible)

- Days from date of initial parent consent to date of eligibility determination
- LEA in which initial consent was signed

Where applicable, the following were also collected:

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1,604	1,604	0	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

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

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

Prong 1

The EasyIEP system is used to collect the data necessary to determine timely evaluation. This system was also used to follow-up on all instances of FFY 2013 student-level noncompliance instances when the eligibility determination exceeded established timelines. The department initially provided the LEAs with instances of noncompliance a listing of their FFY 2013 students where initial eligibility was late and still open (eligibility not yet determined). These LEAs were required to research individual students and update EasyIEP if the eligibility determination had been completed (with the corresponding reason for delay). In the case of students whose eligibility determinations were still pending, LEAs were required to determine eligibility as soon as possible. By assessing all LEA's instances of noncompliance on a case by case basis, the department was able to ensure that all noncompliance was accounted for and have LEAs verify their own information. The response from LEAs and their completion of requisite documentation afforded the department the opportunity to ascertain that LEAs with noncompliance were correctly implementing regulatory requirements. In all 1,604 instances, the eligibility or an explanation/correction of other issue (e.g., mistakenly entered consent form, mistyping of date, etc.) was completed for children whose initial evaluation was not timely.

Prong 2

For those LEAs with 1 or more of the 1,604 late student evaluations during FFY 2013, the department staff conducted data pulls of written parental permissions signed in FFY 2014 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 eligibility in FFY 2013, the department required them to demonstrate 100% compliance for initial eligibility determinations for a minimum of 30 consecutive days in FFY 2014. For LEAs with more than 500 initial referrals for eligibility in FFY 2013, the department required them to demonstrate 100% compliance for initial eligibility determinations for a minimum of 10 consecutive days in FFY 2014. 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 2013 had been corrected (Prong 2), the finding was closed.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		99.00%	47.10%	84.70%	95.00%	98.80%	98.30%	98.50%	98.71%	98.53%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	3,326
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	434
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,541
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.	994
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	318

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. [c/(a-b-d-e)]x100	1,541	1,580	98.53%	100%	97.53%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	39

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

There were 39 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. The range of days beyond the third birthday until eligibility was determined or an IEP was developed and implemented was 3 days to 379 days. Reasons for delays included: parent preferred schedules, inclement weather, late referrals from Part C, and

school system staff training issues related to early childhood transition policies and procedures.

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

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

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

Data were pulled from the Part C state database, Tennessee's Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) and the EasyIEP system. 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.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
21	21	0	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

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.

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 2013 developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for all 21 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 non-eligibility was determined. This information was reviewed and verified by the department's early childhood data manager and the IDEA 619 coordinator.

Prong 2

The department conducted a subsequent review of additional data to determine that all LEAs with noncompliance for FFY 2013 were subsequently correctly implementing 34 CFR 300.124(b). Monthly data were pulled from the Part C TEIDS system and the Part B EasyIEP system. These data were collected, merged, compared, and analyzed in a unified data table for a monthly report to determine if identified LEAs showed any children who had untimely IEPs. Through the monthly data review process, the department verified that all LEAs achieved 100% compliance in the review of additional data and were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for Indicator 12 in a timely manner.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		60.00%	31.00%	50.00%		50.03%	73.30%	87.20%	87.60%	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
14	19	100%	100%	73.68%

Explanation of Slippage

In FFY 2014, a smaller sample of student records was selected by the office of consolidated planning and monitoring (CPM), which is the division that manages monitoring of Indicator 13 documents. Because the sample size was so small, instances of noncompliance had a much more deleterious effect on the compliance percentage overall than a larger sample might have. Additionally, three of the five student records that had noncompliance relative to the transition portion of the IEP were from one LEA that was newly established in the 2014-15 SY.

In FFY 2015, each LEA in the state (145 LEAs total) will have at least one record monitored for students aged 16 and above to ensure the IEPs contain each of the required components for secondary transition. At a minimum, there will be 145 records in the coming APR year which will better capture the completion and quality of transition plans/goals written across the state. This increase in the number of records monitored should provide more viable data for this indicator as a whole.

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

- (●) **State monitoring**
- ( ) **State database that includes data for the entire reporting year**

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

to collect these data.

For FFY 2014, CPM completed the monitoring requirements of this indicator. Analyses of IEPs were done via desktop monitoring by CPM staff for a sample of school districts.

Review Item	Total Records	Compliant	Noncompliant	Percentage
Student Invitation to Meeting	19	18	1	97.74%
Agency Invitation to Meeting	19	19	0	100.00%
Measurable Postsecondary Goals	19	16	3	84.21%
Secondary Transition Annual IEP Goals	19	16	3	84.21%
Age-Appropriate Transition	19	16	3	84.21%
Academic and Functional Achievement	19	16	3	84.21%
Courses of Study	19	17	2	89.47%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2009	Target ≥							22.50%	23.00%	23.50%	23.50%
		Data						22.00%	16.80%	15.00%	18.30%	21.27%
B	2009	Target ≥							57.50%	58.00%	58.50%	58.50%
		Data						57.00%	51.40%	50.90%	52.30%	55.59%
C	2009	Target ≥							66.50%	67.00%	67.50%	68.00%
		Data						65.00%	63.40%	60.30%	66.10%	67.70%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 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	706.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	156.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	255.00
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)	45.00
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).	33.00

	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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	156.00	706.00	21.27%	23.75%	22.10%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	411.00	706.00	55.59%	59.00%	58.22%
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)	489.00	706.00	67.70%	68.75%	69.26%

Was sampling used? Yes
Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

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

The LEAs are sampled based on their locations in the state so that all regions are represented and it is ensured that every four years an LEA will complete the survey. This sampling is done via the National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO) Sampling Calculator on a four year sampling cycle. To ensure there is no potential bias or misrepresentation that can sometimes arise from student sampling, all students with disabilities within each selected LEA who exited school by (a) graduating with a regular diploma, (b) 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. The LEA staff use an online secure website to enter the data collected through the telephone surveys. The web survey data are housed at ETSU and data are automatically compiled for analysis and reporting by ETSU to the department.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			52.00%	3.00%	4.00%	5.00%	6.00%	7.00%	8.00%	9.00%
Data		50.00%	55.00%	16.70%	60.00%	56.00%	68.42%	69.23%	56.76%	75.00%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	13	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	24	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
13	24	75.00%	10.00%	54.17%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 16: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			52.50%	55.00%	57.50%	60.00%	62.50%	65.00%	67.50%	70.00%
Data		56.00%	67.00%	73.90%	83.33%	76.20%	86.96%	73.68%	84.62%	87.50%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	8	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	6	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1 Mediations held	17	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
8	6	17	87.50%	71.00%	82.35%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014
Target ≥		70.33%
Data	67.33%	56.68%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	73.33%	76.33%	79.33%	82.33%

Key:

Description of Measure

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Overview

Data Analysis

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

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

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

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

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

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

Statement

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

Description

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

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

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

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

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

TN Theory of Action GraphicTN Theory of Action Graphic

Illustration

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

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

Infrastructure Development

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

Please see pages 6-22 in the attached "SSIP Phase 2 TN FINAL" document provided below.

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

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

Please see pages 23-61 in the attached "SSIP Phase 2 TN FINAL" document provided below.

Evaluation

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

Please see pages 62-108 in the attached "SSIP Phase 2 TN FINAL" document provided below.

Technical Assistance and Support

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

Please see pages 109-110 in the attached "SSIP Phase 2 TN FINAL" document provided below.

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

This indicator is not applicable.