

# TN Part C

# FFY2014 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

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

### Executive Summary:

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

### General Supervision System:

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

The Lead Agency in Tennessee for Part C, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is the State Department of Education (DOE). Tennessee's Early Intervention System (TEIS) is administered through the Division of Special Populations and Student Support, out of the Office of Early Learning (OEL) unit.

Early Intervention Service (EIS) programs are defined as the nine TEIS-Point of Entry Offices (TEIS-POEs). Staff in these offices are state employees. Each POE has a District Administrator who reports directly to the state's Part C Coordinator who has oversight for the operation of the POE office. State personnel in these offices are responsible for referrals into the system through exit from the system: 1) Part C eligibility determination and 2) all service coordination activities which include IFSP development, oversight of service delivery, and transition. TEIS-POEs utilize the TEIS Operations and Policy Manuals as resources for daily operations. Staff performance in the TEIS-POEs are measured through individual performance plans using **S**pecific **M**easurable **A**chievable **R**ealistic **T**imely (SMART) goals built upon responsibilities for federal compliance and child results.

In Tennessee the child's official educational record is housed in a real-time, web-based data system. Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) contains demographic information; evaluation/eligibility information; Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP), including the transition plan; contact logs; service logs for delivered services; and an accounts payable section for reimbursement of delivered services.

Monitoring activities are conducted through the following three avenues:

1. **Annual Monitoring:** The Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) enables the Lead Agency to track through desk audits the existence of noncompliance and the verification for the correction of child level noncompliance. Full fiscal year census data from TEIDS are utilized annually for the monitoring of federal compliance Indicators 1, 7, and 8C. Compliance with Indicator 8A is maintained through a TEIDS validation. Compliance with Indicator 8B is addressed through monthly data sharing at the state level between Part C and Part B, 619 preschool. Compliance monitoring and the issuing of written findings, when warranted, occur during September-October for the previous fiscal year.
2. **Dispute Resolution:** Findings of noncompliance may be issued as an outcome of one of the three dispute resolution processes (i.e., administrative complaint, mediation, due process). Identifying noncompliance and issuing a written finding may occur at any time during the year.
3. **Focused Monitoring Activities:** Activities may be either planned or conducted as needed. Planned focused monitoring activities typically arise from possible IDEA or operational issues identified from TEIS state leadership which need further investigation. If warranted, focused monitoring can also be initiated when a particular concern is expressed by someone outside of TEIS. Focused monitoring activities may occur at any time during the year.

A written finding of noncompliance can be issued to an EIS program through any of the monitoring activities described above. When this occurs TEIS issues a letter of finding along with supporting data and a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) template. The Lead Agency utilizes direction from the federal Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP) 09-02 Memorandum and OSEP's (9-8-08) Frequently Asked Questions (FAQS) Regarding Identification and Correction of Noncompliance and Reporting on Correction in the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report when determining correction of noncompliance. When correction has been achieved, TEIS issues a letter confirming correction to the POE. The Lead Agency adheres to the

OSEP's definition for timely correction – as soon as possible, but not more than one year from the date the finding was issued. The 09-02 Memorandum identifies a “two-prong approach” when determining correction. The Lead agency uses the following steps when determining correction as part of its system of general supervision:

1. Child-level correction (prong 1). When child-level noncompliance is discovered (e.g., a child has yet to receive an IFSP service [Indicator 1], have a meeting [Indicators 7 or 8C], or any other child-level compliance issue), the child's TEIDS identification number is recorded within the TEIS-POE's initial CAP template prepared by the Part C Monitoring Coordinator. Immediate attention and correction to any child-level noncompliance is expected. The Part C Monitoring Coordinator verifies correction by reviewing each child's record where noncompliance was identified.
2. Correct implementation of regulatory requirements (prong 2). A subsequent review of data is made relative to the finding in order for the Part C Monitoring Coordinator to verify that the TEIS-POE is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. This entails a review of monthly, census data in TEIDS until 100% compliance is achieved.
3. Pre-finding correction. The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) allows for the correction of noncompliance discovered prior to the issuance of a written letter of finding. If an incident occurs, and when appropriate, the Lead Agency does not issue a finding. Pre-finding correction occurs through a verification of subsequent monthly, census data in TEIDS demonstrating 100% compliance and the correction of any previous child-level noncompliance prior to the issuance of a written finding.
4. Completion of Corrective Action Plans (CAPs). The Lead Agency additionally utilizes a Corrective Action Plan as part of its system of general supervision. The CAP provides the vehicle for the EIS program (TEIS-POE) to identify systemic issues impacting noncompliance addressing those issues through the development and implementation of a plan of correction. As part of the CAP development, the POE conducts a Root Cause Analysis (RCA) related to system issues across all children which led to the noncompliance. Based on the results of the RCA, corrective action steps are developed which include information regarding timelines and the identification of who is responsible for each action step. The Part C Monitoring Coordinator provides technical assistance to the POE for the development of the CAP. The CAP template becomes a monthly reporting and communication tool between the POE and the Part C Monitoring Coordinator. It is used to document progress status until corrective actions/ measures have been implemented. The Lead Agency uses this third step in the correction process to ensure the TEIS-POE leadership have identified and addressed local systemic issues which impact both POE status and state-level compliance.

The Lead Agency also has a mechanism for improvement planning based on annual letters of determination issued to EIS programs (TEIS-POEs). Since spring 2013, program determination algorithms have included both compliance and results indicator data. A rubric is used to calculate determinations: Meets Requirements, Needs Assistance, Needs Intervention, and Needs Substantial Intervention. The Program Monitor provides technical assistance to any POE falling outside "Meets Requirements" for the development of an improvement plan.

Working with the Department of Education's (DOE) legal office, the Lead Agency has processes in place to track, investigate, and resolve disputes filed on behalf of infants and toddlers in TEIS. Part C State Regulations have adopted Part B procedures and timelines for processing all disputes filed. With support from the Part C Coordinator, TEIS-POEs are encouraged to resolve concerns locally through the IFSP process. Administrative complaints filed are investigated and resolved by TEIS personnel with guidance from DOE legal personnel. Requests for mediation and due process are handled by DOE legal personnel, working with the TEIS Executive Director and Part C Coordinator. Data regarding disputes are reported annually to the federal Office of Special Education (OSEP) through the EDFacts Metadata and Process system (EMAPS).

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

**Technical Assistance System:**

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to early intervention service (EIS) programs.

The Lead Agency's technical assistance efforts are led by the TEIS Quality Improvement Manager and staff. The Quality Improvement Team utilizes a professional development calendar that outlines all required training for TEIS-Point of Entry Offices (TEIS-POEs) staff, including:

- Annual conference to provide training and support to TEIS-POE staff, topics selected based on needs assessment and monitoring data
- Quarterly trainings on Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO), TEIS Operations Manual, and Routines-Based Interview (RBI)

In addition to the professional development calendar, the following training/technical assistance activities are provided by the Quality Improvement Team:

- New Hire Training Packet used by TEIS-POE leadership, with the support of the Quality Improvement Team, to provide onboarding training to all new hires
- Online resources available to TEIS-POE leadership, called “Debriefs” on the following topics:
  - Early Childhood Outcomes
  - TEIS Operations Manual
  - Routines Based Interview - Functional Goal Development
  - Transition (Steps to Success and TEIS Transition [C to B])
  - Targeted Case Management (TCM)
  - Family-Centered Early Intervention Services
  - Contact Log Entry
  - Online BDI-2 training for all new hires, which is an addition to the one specifically for the staff (Developmental Specialists) who will be completing developmental evaluations

The Quality Improvement Team is currently developing the following new training/technical assistance resources for TEIS-POE staff:

- Job embedded training to address specific concerns of individual POE staff
- Topics identified by POE leadership during staff meetings

The Quality Improvement Team is responsible for the development and dissemination of the monthly TEIS newsletter entitled, *TEIS Update*. This newsletter is dissemination to EIRAs (service providers), vendors (service providers), TEIS-POEs, State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC membership), the Assistant Commissioner of Special Populations and Student Support, Part B, 619 state staff, Tennessee's Part C federal OSEP contact, and other stakeholders. The newsletter contains updates from the TEIS central office and provides information about upcoming meetings or training.

Attachments			
File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	
No APR attachments found.			

**Professional Development System:**

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

The Lead Agency's professional development system is led by the TEIS Quality Improvement Manager and staff. The Quality Improvement Team is responsible for providing training, support, and technical assistance to ensure staff at Early Intervention Resource Agencies (EIRAs) who provide developmental therapy services complete professional development activities required by their contracts. These activities, outlined below, are designed to support early interventionists (EIs) in providing evidence-based quality services to infants and toddlers and their families receiving early intervention services through TEIS.

- Annual Building Best Practices Conference for EIRA staff. Content is developed by a committee consisting of both TEIS staff and EIRA representatives and is based on latest research in the field of early intervention
- Online Professional Educational and Enrichment Resources (PEER) activities for EIRA staff to learn best practice techniques within the field of early intervention
- Online trainings, topics as follows:
  - Family-Centered Early Intervention
  - Guidelines for Tennessee's data management system Service Log entries
- Contract requirement of 42 hours of training per full time equivalent (FTE) early interventionists (EIs). Training time is pro-rated for staff less than full time.
- EIRA Directors are required to observe one home visit per quarter for each EI working within their agency. The observation is documented on a TEIS developed questionnaire and entered into an online system (Survey Monkey).
- EIRA Directors are required to review EI staff Service Log entries monthly and entering review results into Survey Monkey for monitoring

Attachments			
File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	

No APR attachments found.

**Stakeholder Involvement:**  apply this to all Part C results indicators

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

Tennessee's State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) is the primary stakeholder group for Tennessee's Early Intervention System (TEIS). The SICC was actively engaged in reviewing, considering, and providing input for Annual Performance Report (APR) result indicator targets.

TEIS staff conducted a trend analysis of APR results indicators for the federal fiscal year period of 2006-07 through 2013-14. This trend analysis included Tennessee's targets and data with a comparison to national averages, including national highs and lows. Trend data were shared with TEIS leadership who developed recommended FFY 2013-14 through 2018-19 targets for each results indicator. Target recommendations were presented to the SICC membership during the July 2014 meeting. SICC members and visitors at the SICC meeting (i.e., TEIS staff, Early Intervention Resource Agency [EIRA] representatives [service providers], and TEIS vendors [service providers]) actively participated in a discussion about targets for each results indicator. Both verbal and written feedback were collected. TEIS leadership reviewed and considered all meeting feedback. Some recommended targets were modified based on stakeholder feedback. In other cases stakeholder feedback confirmed proposed targets as recommended.

At the Jan. 21, 2015 SICC meeting the full APR was reviewed. Targets for specific APR results indicators were revisited and additional feedback gathered from both membership and visitors. All results indicator targets were finalized and approved by the SICC membership for FFY 2013-14 through 2018-19.

The FFY 2014-15 APR was reviewed with the SICC chair on Jan. 20, 2016 and with the full council and visitors on Jan. 26. The final APR was reviewed with the TEIS Executive Director and Part C Coordinator on Jan. 29 prior to submission. See attached for a signed copy of the *Annual Report Certification of the Interagency Coordinating Council under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*.

Additionally, stakeholder input was sought relative to the development of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), APR Indicator 11. Detailed information on stakeholder input associated with SSIP Phase II will be submitted to OSEP, April 1, 2016.

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
<a href="#">sicc certification form signed.pdf</a>	Catherine Goodwin		<input type="button" value="R"/>

**Reporting to the Public:**

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2012 performance of each EIS Program or Provider located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2012 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2012 APR in 2014, is available.

Federal report requirements for the performance of each Early Intervention Service (EIS) program (TEIS-POEs) against the state's State Performance Plan (SPP)/ Annual Performance Report (APR) targets are completed and posted on the State's website no later than 120 day following the State's submission of the Annual Performance Report, Feb. 1, 2016. This report is entitled, *Report to the Public*. The State's APR will also be posted at the same location after the close of the federal period of clarification. An email is sent to Tennessee's Part C federal OSEP contact and TEIS-POE leadership informing them of the

## FFY 2014 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

posting and the website link. The TEIS monthly newsletter (i.e., TEIS Update) informs SICC membership and all other TEIS stakeholders. The FFY 2013-14 *Report to the Public* and *Annual Performance Report* are currently available on the state's website under "Reports" at <http://www.tennessee.gov/education/article/teis-reports-and-data>.

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

## Indicator 1: Timely provision of services

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		90.96%	94.98%	89.05%	91.95%	97.26%	97.50%	98.38%	97.81%	97.22%

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 infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
4234	4806	97.22%	100%	96.90%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner)	423
---	-----

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

- State monitoring
- State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015

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

Data account for the timely receipt of all services for a child rather than individual services. For example, if a child had three new services initiated on an Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) and any one of the services were delivered untimely, the child had untimely service delivery. Tennessee defines "timely services" as no longer than 30 days from the date of parent consent on the IFSP for a service."

Data from the Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) included full census data for all Part C eligible infants and

**FFY 2014 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

toddlers across all IFSP types (i.e., initial, six-month, annual, review change). Delays due to exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record were included in both the numerator and the denominator.

Annual data were pulled by the nine Tennessee Early Intervention System Point of Entry (TEIS-POE) Data Managers and were reviewed by TEIS-POE Leadership prior to submission to the TEIS Monitoring Team (i.e., Part C Monitoring Coordinator and Program Monitor). POE data reports accounted for reasons of untimely IFSP service delivery (i.e., exceptional family circumstances or system). A subsequent review of data was completed by the Monitoring Team in order to verify reasons for untimely service delivery.

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

There were no findings of noncompliance were issued in 2013 (FFY 2013-14), monitoring cycle FFY 2012-13, through annual monitoring or any other monitoring activity. Though all nine EIS programs did not report 100% compliance for the fiscal year the Monitoring Team verified that all noncompliance was corrected through a subsequent verification of data prior to the issuance of a written finding of noncompliance (i.e., pre-finding correction). There was no child-level noncompliance found in the EIS programs, both in the fiscal year and in subsequent data verified. All children had IFSP services delivered, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of TEIS.

Refer to APR Introduction: *General Supervision System* regarding how TEIS ensures EIS programs are correctly implementing regulatory requirements and for information on pre-finding correction.

**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 2: Services in Natural Environments

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			75.68%	78.02%	80.36%	82.70%	85.04%	85.04%	85.04%	85.04%
Data		76.00%	77.70%	87.98%	90.03%	86.21%	84.11%	83.85%	82.45%	80.35%

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

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	85.04%	85.04%	85.04%	85.04%	85.04%

Key:

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Tennessee’s State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) is the primary stakeholder group for Tennessee’s Early Intervention System (TEIS). Other stakeholders include TEIS State Leadership, TEIS-Point of Entry (POE) District Administrators and staff, Early Intervention Resource Agency (EIRA) representatives (service providers) and TEIS vendors (service providers) who attend SICC meetings.

Historical data and proposed targets for results indicators were shared and discussed with SICC members in July 2014 at the beginning of the current reporting cycle. Feedback from stakeholders was reviewed and used to establish targets for results indicators. Targets and data are reviewed with the SICC membership annually, most recently in January 2016, and will be modified when warranted based on data and feedback.

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

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/2/2015	<a href="#">Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings</a>	3,536	
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/2/2015	<a href="#">Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs</a>	4,390	

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
3,536	4,390	80.35%	85.04%	80.55%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

### Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Does your State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? No

#### Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A1	2008	Target ≥						74.40%	74.90%	74.90%	74.90%	74.90%
		Data					73.90%	76.70%	75.10%	84.80%	70.99%	74.61%
A2	2008	Target ≥						46.90%	47.40%	47.40%	47.40%	47.40%
		Data					46.40%	41.50%	37.80%	42.50%	34.13%	41.82%
B1	2008	Target ≥						77.90%	78.40%	78.40%	78.40%	78.40%
		Data					77.40%	74.80%	77.30%	86.20%	74.62%	78.69%
B2	2008	Target ≥						44.70%	45.20%	45.20%	45.20%	45.20%
		Data					44.20%	34.40%	36.20%	42.10%	35.46%	39.83%
C1	2008	Target ≥						76.40%	76.90%	76.90%	76.90%	76.90%
		Data					75.90%	76.90%	79.30%	89.00%	77.44%	80.51%
C2	2008	Target ≥						48.90%	49.40%	49.40%	49.40%	49.40%
		Data					48.40%	37.70%	39.60%	40.30%	34.68%	37.64%

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

#### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	74.90%	74.90%	74.90%	74.90%	74.90%
Target A2 ≥	47.40%	47.40%	47.40%	47.40%	47.40%
Target B1 ≥	78.40%	78.40%	78.40%	78.40%	78.40%
Target B2 ≥	45.20%	45.50%	46.00%	46.50%	47.00%
Target C1 ≥	76.90%	76.90%	76.90%	76.90%	76.90%
Target C2 ≥	49.40%	49.40%	49.40%	49.40%	49.40%

Key:

#### Explanation of Changes

2018 target for A2 was blank; data was re-entered.

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Tennessee's State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) is the primary stakeholder group for Tennessee's Early Intervention

**FFY 2014 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

System (TEIS). Other stakeholders include TEIS State Leadership, TEIS-Point of Entry (POE) District Administrators and staff, Early Intervention Resource Agency (EIRA) representatives (service providers) and TEIS vendors (service providers) who attend SICC meetings.

Historical data, current data and targets for results indicators were reviewed with SICC members in July 2014 and January 2015. Members and visitors had opportunity to provide written and verbal feedback regarding data. Targets and data were reviewed with the SICC membership again in January 2016, and will be modified when warranted based on data and feedback.

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

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	2341.00
--	---------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	8.00	0.34%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	534.00	22.89%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	959.00	41.11%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	596.00	25.55%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	236.00	10.12%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$ .	1555.00	2097.00	74.61%	74.90%	74.15%
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$ .	832.00	2333.00	41.82%	47.40%	35.66%

**Explanation of A2 Slippage**

The Lead Agency continues to experience year-to-year fluctuations, which are expected to continue for several years, due to ongoing improvements in the processes for collecting Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) data. In order to improve data quality, the Lead Agency has been modifying ECO collection methods based on guidance from the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), information shared by other states, and national technical assistance (TA) personnel. Variance in ECO data is expected as TEIS continues to recalibrate processes.

Prior to FFY 2014-15, ECO data were collected by service coordinators using professional judgement along with discussions with families and the results of assessment information gathered from providers. Providers were self-selecting their own developmental assessment instruments prior to FFY 2014-15.

In FFY 2014-15 service coordinators were trained to use the Battelle Developmental Inventory, Second Edition (BDI-2) and the corresponding BDI-2 z-scores to anchor ECO discussion with families. The BDI-2 is the evaluation instrument used in Tennessee to determine a child's eligibility for services. BDI-2 is not required to be administered at exit, so there is not an

instrument with which to anchor exit scores. For exit ratings, service coordinators determine ratings using professional judgement along with discussions with families and ongoing assessment information gathered from providers selecting their own developmental assessment instruments.

The Lead Agency provides additional information for work that falls in FFY 2015-16. In October 2015, TEIS began using the Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System for Infants and Children (AEPS) to gather developmental assessment data every six-months, beginning six-months after the initial Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). For FFY 2015-16, TEIS will continue to use BDI-2 z-scores to anchor entrance ECO data collection, and AEPS will be used to anchor ECO data collection at each subsequent six-month and annual IFSP meeting. Future variance in ECO data is anticipated as these additional adjustments are made to the data collection process which are expected to result in improved data quality.

Through the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) process, the Lead Agency has identified ECO data quality as both a root cause for low performance and an improvement strategy. TEIS is currently developing plans to implement AEPS at initial IFSP meetings beginning fall 2016, at which time ECO data will be anchored to a single developmental assessment instrument for every collection point. This change will require the Lead Agency to review and possibly establish new baselines in FFY 2017-18. By FFY 2019-2020, all children assessed prior to the AEPS at entrance will have exited early intervention.

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	11.00	0.47%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	549.00	23.53%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1082.00	46.38%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	564.00	24.17%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	127.00	5.44%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$ .	1646.00	2206.00	78.69%	78.40%	74.61%
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$ .	691.00	2333.00	39.83%	45.20%	29.62%

**Explanation of B1 Slippage**

The Lead Agency continues to experience year-to-year fluctuations, which are expected to continue for several years, due to ongoing improvements in the processes for collecting Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) data. In order to improve data quality, the Lead Agency has been modifying ECO collection methods based on guidance from the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), information shared by other states, and national technical assistance (TA) personnel. Variance in ECO data is expected as TEIS continues to recalibrate processes.

Prior to FFY 2014-15, ECO data were collected by service coordinators using professional judgement along with discussions with families and the results of assessment information gathered from providers. Providers were self-selecting their own developmental assessment instruments prior to FFY 2014-15.

In FFY 2014-15 service coordinators were trained to use the Battelle Developmental Inventory, Second Edition (BDI-2) and the corresponding BDI-2 z-scores to anchor ECO discussion with families. The BDI-2 is the evaluation instrument used in Tennessee to determine a child's eligibility for services. BDI-2 is not required to be administered at exit, so there is not an instrument with which to anchor exit scores. For exit ratings, service coordinators determine ratings using professional judgement along with discussions with families and ongoing assessment information gathered from providers selecting their own developmental assessment instruments.

The Lead Agency provides additional information for work that falls in FFY 2015-16. In October 2015, TEIS began using the Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System for Infants and Children (AEPS) to gather developmental assessment data every six-months, beginning six-months after the initial Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). For FFY 2015-16, TEIS will continue to use BDI-2 z-scores to anchor entrance ECO data collection, and AEPS will be used to anchor ECO data collection at each subsequent six-month and annual IFSP meeting. Future variance in ECO data is anticipated as these additional adjustments are made to the data collection process which are expected to result in improved data quality.

Through the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) process, the Lead Agency has identified ECO data quality as both a root cause for low performance and an improvement strategy. TEIS is currently developing plans to implement AEPS at initial IFSP meetings beginning fall 2016, at which time ECO data will be anchored to a single developmental assessment instrument for every collection point. This change will require the Lead Agency to review and possibly establish new baselines in FFY 2017-18. By FFY 2019-2020, all children assessed prior to the AEPS at entrance will have exited early intervention.

**Explanation of B2 Slippage**

The Lead Agency continues to experience year-to-year fluctuations, which are expected to continue for several years, due to ongoing improvements in the processes for collecting Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) data. In order to improve data quality, the Lead Agency has been modifying ECO collection methods based on guidance from the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), information shared by other states, and national technical assistance (TA) personnel. Variance in ECO data is expected as TEIS continues to recalibrate processes.

Prior to FFY 2014-15, ECO data were collected by service coordinators using professional judgement along with discussions with families and the results of assessment information gathered from providers. Providers were self-selecting their own developmental assessment instruments prior to FFY 2014-15.

In FFY 2014-15 service coordinators were trained to use the Battelle Developmental Inventory, Second Edition (BDI-2) and the corresponding BDI-2 z-scores to anchor ECO discussion with families. The BDI-2 is the evaluation instrument used in Tennessee to determine a child’s eligibility for services. BDI-2 is not required to be administered at exit, so there is not an instrument with which to anchor exit scores. For exit ratings, service coordinators determine ratings using professional judgement along with discussions with families and ongoing assessment information gathered from providers selecting their own developmental assessment instruments.

The Lead Agency provides additional information for work that falls in FFY 2015-16. In October 2015, TEIS began using the Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System for Infants and Children (AEPS) to gather developmental assessment data every six-months, beginning six-months after the initial Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). For FFY 2015-16, TEIS will continue to use BDI-2 z-scores to anchor entrance ECO data collection, and AEPS will be used to anchor ECO data collection at each subsequent six-month and annual IFSP meeting. Future variance in ECO data is anticipated as these additional adjustments are made to the data collection process which are expected to result in improved data quality.

Through the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) process, the Lead Agency has identified ECO data quality as both a root cause for low performance and an improvement strategy. TEIS is currently developing plans to implement AEPS at initial IFSP meetings beginning fall 2016, at which time ECO data will be anchored to a single developmental assessment instrument for every collection point. This change will require the Lead Agency to review and possibly establish new baselines in FFY 2017-18. By FFY 2019-2020, all children assessed prior to the AEPS at entrance will have exited early intervention.

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	14.00	0.60%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	455.00	19.49%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1136.00	48.65%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	597.00	25.57%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	133.00	5.70%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
--	-----------	-------------	----------------	------------------	---------------

**FFY 2014 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$ .	1733.00	2202.00	80.51%	76.90%	78.70%
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$ .	730.00	2335.00	37.64%	49.40%	31.26%

**Explanation of C2 Slippage**

The Lead Agency continues to experience year-to-year fluctuations, which are expected to continue for several years, due to ongoing improvements in the processes for collecting Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) data. In order to improve data quality, the Lead Agency has been modifying ECO collection methods based on guidance from the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), information shared by other states, and national technical assistance (TA) personnel. Variance in ECO data is expected as TEIS continues to recalibrate processes.

Prior to FFY 2014-15, ECO data were collected by service coordinators using professional judgement along with discussions with families and the results of assessment information gathered from providers. Providers were self-selecting their own developmental assessment instruments prior to FFY 2014-15.

In FFY 2014-15 service coordinators were trained to use the Battelle Developmental Inventory, Second Edition (BDI-2) and the corresponding BDI-2 z-scores to anchor ECO discussion with families. The BDI-2 is the evaluation instrument used in Tennessee to determine a child's eligibility for services. BDI-2 is not required to be administered at exit, so there is not an instrument with which to anchor exit scores. For exit ratings, service coordinators determine ratings using professional judgement along with discussions with families and ongoing assessment information gathered from providers selecting their own developmental assessment instruments.

The Lead Agency provides additional information for work that falls in FFY 2015-16. In October 2015, TEIS began using the Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System for Infants and Children (AEPS) to gather developmental assessment data every six-months, beginning six-months after the initial Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). For FFY 2015-16, TEIS will continue to use BDI-2 z-scores to anchor entrance ECO data collection, and AEPS will be used to anchor ECO data collection at each subsequent six-month and annual IFSP meeting. Future variance in ECO data is anticipated as these additional adjustments are made to the data collection process which are expected to result in improved data quality.

Through the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) process, the Lead Agency has identified ECO data quality as both a root cause for low performance and an improvement strategy. TEIS is currently developing plans to implement AEPS at initial IFSP meetings beginning fall 2016, at which time ECO data will be anchored to a single developmental assessment instrument for every collection point. This change will require the Lead Agency to review and possibly establish new baselines in FFY 2017-18. By FFY 2019-2020, all children assessed prior to the AEPS at entrance will have exited early intervention.

**Was sampling used?** No

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

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

Of the 3,624 children who exited TEIS within FFY 2014-15, 2,341 had usable data on at least one outcome and 2,324 had usable data on all three outcomes. Of the 1,283 children who exited without usable ECO data, 807 did not have a minimum of six-months of service between ECO entrance and exit ratings, 471 children exited TEIS without useable ECO data due to missing entrance data and 13 records contained impossible data combinations. These categories of unusable data are not mutually exclusive. The Lead Agency conducted an analysis of unusable data and noted missing entrance data occurred on some children who entered early intervention services prior to the deployment of a database validation in FFY 2013-14, which prevents initial IFSPs from being finalized without entrance ECO scores. The Lead Agency anticipates missing ECO entrance

data will cease to be an issue once all children who entered services prior to the validation have exited TEIS.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

## Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

### Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2013	Target ≥			90.00%	90.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.01%	95.01%	95.01%	90.00%
		Data			94.70%	93.91%	94.47%	94.44%	96.56%	96.42%	95.22%	75.42%
B	2013	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.01%	90.01%	90.01%	93.00%
		Data			90.28%	89.38%	92.86%	92.16%	94.24%	93.44%	94.06%	78.45%
C	2013	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	94.00%	94.00%	94.01%	94.01%	94.01%	90.00%
		Data			94.10%	94.16%	95.77%	95.58%	97.25%	96.23%	96.82%	74.58%

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

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	90.20%	90.40%	90.60%	90.80%	91.00%
Target B ≥	93.20%	93.40%	93.60%	93.80%	94.00%
Target C ≥	90.20%	90.40%	90.60%	90.80%	91.00%

Key:

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Tennessee's State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) is the primary stakeholder group for Tennessee's Early Intervention System (TEIS). Other stakeholders include TEIS State Leadership, TEIS-Point of Entry (POE) District Administrators and staff, Early Intervention Resource Agency (EIRA) representatives (service providers) and TEIS vendors (service providers) who attend SICC meetings.

Historical data, current data and targets for results indicators were reviewed with SICC members in July 2014 and January 2015. Members and visitors had opportunity to provide written and verbal feedback regarding data. Targets and data were reviewed with the SICC membership again in January 2016, and will be modified when warranted based on data and feedback.

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

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

Number of respondent families participating in Part C	836.00
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	767.00
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	836.00
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	766.00
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	836.00
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	732.00
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	836.00

	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	75.42%	90.20%	91.75%
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	78.45%	93.20%	91.63%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	74.58%	90.20%	87.56%

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

The Lead Agency administers a census-based survey to all families with active Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs) who have been in Tennessee's Early Intervention System (TEIS) for a minimum of six-months. In FFY 2013-14, the survey instrument was changed to the Early Childhood Outcomes Family Outcomes Survey Revised (ECO FOS-R) side B and new baselines and targets were established. TEIS uses the calculation methodology recommended by the ECO Center whereby a family must have a mean score of four or higher on all of the items associated with the sub-indicator in order to be considered as having met the criteria for that sub-indicator.

Prior to FFY 2014-15, survey data were collected via a point-in-time mailing for all families with active IFSPs who had been in the TEIS system for a minimum of six-months. Two options to complete the survey were provided: online and paper copy sent through the mail. Both options included English and Spanish formats.

Beginning July 2014, survey administration was modified. Service coordinators were instructed to print and take the survey and cover letter to each six-month and annual IFSP meeting, thus hand delivering the survey to the family instead of the survey being sent through mail. The family was provided a business reply envelope addressed directly to East Tennessee State University, who collects and analyzes survey data. Instructions and a web link were also provided to families, continuing to afford the option for completing a paper or online survey. Each survey has a unique identifier associated with the child. The cover letter provided instructions for completing the survey either in paper or online if preferred. Both paper and online surveys were available in English and Spanish.

In FFY 2014-15, 836 families responded to the survey, representing a 41% increase in the actual number of surveys received from the 529 in FFY 2013-14. This increase was attributed to the change in survey dissemination. The total number of families meeting the criteria to receive the survey in FFY 2014-15 was 5,529. Although there was an overall decrease in the response rate, the increase in total responses resulted in progress toward targets, improved representation, and reduced variance among sub-groups.

Due to the smaller numbers of potential respondents and actual responses by minority race/ethnicities (American Indian, Asian, Black, Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, and Multiple Races) these groups were combined and compared to the majority race/ethnicity (White). The response rate of the combined minority population was 13.2%, which is comparable to the 16.0% rate for the majority population. This gap of 2.8% is an improvement over the previous year's gap of 10.5%.

## FFY 2014 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The level of agreement for White respondents and combined minority populations was nearly identical for sub-indicators A (know your rights) and C (helping your child develop and learn). The combined minority population rated sub-indicator B (communicating your child's needs) slightly lower than the White population.

Levels of confidence were run to compare results of the White and the combined minority population. Across sub-indicators A, B, C White respondents had margins of error (at 95% confidence level) ranging from 1.9 – 2.4, compared with margins of error for the combined minority population from 3.6 – 3.9. A smaller margin of error translates to higher confidence in the data. The margins of error for both the White and combined minority populations improved and the gap between the two groups narrowed from FFY 2013-14 to FFY 2014-15.

**Was sampling used?** 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

### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

**Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			0.80%	0.85%	0.89%	0.89%	0.89%	0.89%	0.89%	0.89%
Data		0.74%	0.71%	0.71%	0.71%	0.69%	0.65%	0.75%	0.74%	0.79%

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

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	0.89%	0.89%	0.89%	0.89%	0.89%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Tennessee’s State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) is the primary stakeholder group for Tennessee’s Early Intervention System (TEIS). Other stakeholders include TEIS State Leadership, TEIS-Point of Entry (POE) District Administrators and staff, Early Intervention Resource Agency (EIRA) representatives (service providers) and TEIS vendors (service providers) who attend SICC meetings.

Historical data and proposed targets for results indicators were shared and discussed with SICC members in July 2014 at the beginning of the current reporting cycle. Feedback from stakeholders was reviewed and used to establish targets for results indicators. Targets and data are reviewed with the SICC membership annually, most recently in January 2016, and will be modified when warranted based on data and feedback.

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

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/2/2015	<a href="#">Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs</a>	606	null
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013	4/3/2014	<a href="#">Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1</a>	79,506	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
606	79,506	0.79%	0.89%	0.76%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

States are required to compare their count data to the national average for this indicator. The national average is calculated each year based on Dec. 1 Federal 618 Child Count Data for the number of children served in 50 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico divided by U.S. Census population estimates for the same age group.

The national average for FFY 2014-15 for this indicator is 1.15%. While there was no slippage from FFY 2013-14, the Lead agency did not meet its State target or the national average.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

**Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			2.00%	2.07%	2.24%	2.37%	2.37%	2.37%	2.37%	2.37%
Data		1.80%	1.68%	1.80%	1.72%	1.65%	1.67%	1.68%	1.66%	1.73%

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

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	2.37%	2.37%	2.37%	2.37%	2.37%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Tennessee’s State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) is the primary stakeholder group for Tennessee’s Early Intervention System (TEIS). Other stakeholders include TEIS State Leadership, TEIS-Point of Entry (POE) District Administrators and staff, Early Intervention Resource Agency (EIRA) representatives (service providers) and TEIS vendors (service providers) who attend SICC meetings.

Historical data and proposed targets for results indicators were shared and discussed with SICC members in July 2014 at the beginning of the current reporting cycle. Feedback from stakeholders was reviewed and used to establish targets for results indicators. Targets and data are reviewed with the SICC membership annually, most recently in January 2016, and will be modified when warranted based on data and feedback.

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

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/2/2015	<a href="#">Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs</a>	4,390	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013	7/2/2015	<a href="#">Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3</a>	240,050	

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
4,390	240,050	1.73%	2.37%	1.83%

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

States are required to compare their child count data to the national average for this indicator. The national average is calculated each year based on Dec. 1 Federal 618 Child Count Data for the number of children served in 50 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico divided by U.S. Census population estimates for the same age group.

The national average for FFY 2014-15 for this indicator is 2.95%. Although progress was made in Tennessee for the number of children served on Dec. 1 from FFY 2013-14, the Lead Agency did not meet its State target or the national average.

While child count reported 4,390 infants and toddlers with Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs) on December 1, 2014 the cumulative child count reported for FFY 2014-15 was 7,150. These were the total number of infants and toddlers who had an active IFSP sometime during the fiscal year.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

## Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		86.00%	90.02%	84.61%	92.44%	91.73%	96.29%	98.30%	98.40%	95.11%

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 eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
3,746	4,181	95.11%	100%	97.06%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline)	312
--	-----

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

- State monitoring
- State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015

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

Data from Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) included full census data were used to determine the percent of Part C eligible infants and toddlers who had eligibility determination and initial IFSP development within 45 days of referral into Tennessee's Early Intervention System (TEIS). Delays due to exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record were included in both the numerator and the denominator.

**FFY 2014 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Annual data were pulled by the nine Tennessee Early Intervention System Point of Entry (TEIS-POE) Data Managers and were reviewed by TEIS-POE Leadership prior to submission to the TEIS Monitoring Team (i.e., Part C Monitoring Coordinator, Program Monitor). POE data reports accounted for reasons of untimely initial IFSP development (i.e., exceptional family circumstances or system). A subsequent review of data was completed by the Monitoring Team in order to verify reasons for untimely initial IFSP development.

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

There were no findings of noncompliance were issued in 2013 (FFY 2013-14), monitoring cycle FFY 2012-13, through annual monitoring or any other monitoring activity. One EIS program had 100% compliance for the fiscal year. For the eight programs not reporting 100% compliance, the Monitoring Team verified that all noncompliance was corrected through a subsequent verification of data prior to the issuance of a written finding (i.e., pre-finding correction). There was no child-level noncompliance found in the eight EIS programs, both in the fiscal year and in subsequent data verified. All children had eligibility determination and initial IFSP development, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of TEIS.

Refer to APR Introduction: *General Supervision System* regarding how TEIS ensures EIS programs are correctly implementing regulatory requirements and for information on pre-finding correction.

**Actions required in FFY 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 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		100%	99.22%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	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

Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday.

- Yes
- No

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
3,624	3,624	100%	100%	100%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services)	null
---	------

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

- State monitoring



Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015

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

The Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) contains a validation that assures all initial Individualized Family Service Plans are developed with a transition outcome/goal, including steps and services. This transition goal must be in place before an Initial IFSP can be saved as final in the child's educational record. The transition goal is reviewed and updated as needed at subsequent IFSP meetings including the formal Local Education Agency (LEA) transition planning conference.

Tennessee's response to OSEP during period of clarification, April 12, 2016:

The Lead Agency has marked "Yes" in the box on the *FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data* page for Indicator 8A ensuring, "Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday." Leaving this box blank was an oversight when the APR was submitted.

The Lead Agency ensured in its February submission that data reflected the correct time period on the *FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data* page under the section entitled, *Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period)* with the timeframe of July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015.

**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 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		81.18%	99.77%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	89.35%

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

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

- Yes
- No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
2,373	2,397	89.35%	100%	99.00%

Number of parents who opted out (this number will be subtracted from the number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B when calculating the FFY 2014 Data)	null
---	------

Describe the method used to collect these data

Monthly data are pulled from the Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) in the State central office and shared with Local Education Agencies (LEAs) and the State Education Agency (SEA) for the notification of all children served by TEIS who reach the age of transition (i.e., nine months to not fewer than 90 days prior to third birthday) and are potentially eligible for Part B, 619 special education preschool services. Contact information on these children was sent to the LEA where the child resides so the LEA can contact and make preparations for toddlers who may be potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

**Do you have a written opt-out policy? No**

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

- State monitoring
- State database

**Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).**

July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015

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

As reported in the Lead Agency's FFY 2013-14 Annual Performance Report (APR), measures were taken in the State's central office to correct the method in which child notification data had previously been pulled from the Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS). Noncompliance was discovered in FFY 2014-15 as FFY 2013-14 data were being pulled and analyzed for the FFY 2013-14 APR.

In January 2015 (FFY 2014-15), monthly notifications were instituted replacing former quarterly notifications. January – April 2015 data were pulled to verify that the new process was correctly implementing notification for all children. This review resulted in 100% compliance across all nine EIS programs (i.e., TEIS-POEs).

Full census data for all children who reached the age of transition were pulled at the end of FFY 2014-15. These data confirmed that the new monthly process was effective as all children received timely notification except the 24 children found during the first six-months of FFY 2014-15 when the noncompliance was discovered.

Notification Timeframe: July 1-Dec. 31, 2014		Notification Timeframe: Jan. 1-June 30, 2015		Full Fiscal Timeframe: July 1-June 30, 2015	
# Timely	# Untimely	# Timely	# Untimely	# Timely	# Untimely
1145	24	1228	0	2373	24
Total Notification = 1169		Total Notifications = 1228		Total Notifications = 2397	

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

Though the process of sending SEA/LEA notification is a function of the TEIS central office, findings of noncompliance were issued for all nine EIS programs (i.e., TEIS-POEs) in January 2015 (FFY 2014-15) in order for the central office to ensure its correction of noncompliance occurred in all EIS programs.

As earlier detailed, all noncompliance for timely LEA/SEA notification has been corrected through subsequent reviews of data for the effectiveness of the monthly process implemented. The Monitoring Team verified there was no child-level noncompliance. All toddlers who reached the age of transition had LEA/SEA notification, although late, unless the child was

no longer within the jurisdiction of TEIS.

Refer to APR Introduction: General Supervision System regarding how TEIS ensures EIS programs are correctly implementing regulatory requirements.

**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	null	0

## Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		88.08%	87.34%	88.05%	95.03%	94.09%	96.02%	98.76%	98.31%	98.06%

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

Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services

- Yes
- No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
1,906	2,397	98.06%	100%	98.05%

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference (this number will be subtracted from the number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B when calculating the FFY 2014 Data)	290
---	-----

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B)

160

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

- State monitoring
- State database

**Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).**

July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015

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

Data account for the timely Local Education Agency (LEA) transition planning conferences for which there was parent consent. Data from the Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) included full census data for all Part C eligible toddlers who reached the age of transition (i.e., at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday).

Annual data were pulled by the nine Tennessee Early Intervention System Point of Entry (TEIS-POE) Data Managers and were reviewed by TEIS-POE Leadership prior to submission to the TEIS Monitoring Team (i.e., Part C Monitoring Coordinator and Program Monitor). POE data reports accounted for reasons of untimely LEA transition planning conferences (i.e., exceptional family circumstances or system). A subsequent review of data was completed by the Monitoring Team in order to verify reasons for untimely conferences.

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

There were no findings of noncompliance were issued in 2013 (FFY 2013-14), monitoring cycle FFY 2012-13, through annual monitoring or any other monitoring activity. Two EIS programs had 100% compliance for the fiscal year. For the seven programs not reporting 100% compliance, the Monitoring Team verified that all noncompliance was corrected prior to the issuance of a written finding (i.e., pre-finding correction). There was no child-level noncompliance found in these EIS programs in both fiscal year data and in the subsequent data verified. All children had LEA transition planning conferences, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of TEIS.

Refer to APR Introduction: General Supervision System regarding how TEIS ensures EIS programs are correctly implementing regulatory requirements and for information on pre-finding correction.

**Actions required in FFY 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 9: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

### Historical Data

Baseline Data:

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

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

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥					

Key:

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. Information regarding resolution sessions was shared with the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) membership, January 2016.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	<a href="#">3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</a>	n	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	<a href="#">3.1 Number of resolution sessions</a>	n	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
0	1			0%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

There was one resolution session held in FFY 2014-15 as a result of a due process hearing request. The resolution session did not result in a settlement. The request for a due process hearing was later withdrawn by the parent.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

## Indicator 10: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥										
Data				50.00%	100%	100%			100%	

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

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥					

Key:

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

There were no requests for mediation during FFY 2014-15. States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. Information regarding mediations was shared with the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) membership and visitors, January 2016.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	<a href="#">2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	<a href="#">2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	<a href="#">2.1 Mediations held</a>	n	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
0	0	0			

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

## Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

### Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014
Target		45.20%
Data	39.83%	29.62%

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

### FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	45.50%	46.00%	46.50%	47.00%

Key:

### Description of Measure

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

### Overview

SSIP Phase II Report, both the narrative and logic models for the implementation and evaluation plan are attached below:

1. SSIP Phase II Report\_FINAL (Word)
2. Attachement 1: Implementation and Evaluation Plan\_FINAL (Excel, read only)

**Data Analysis**

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

**Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity**

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in EIS programs and/or EIS providers to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and other early learning initiatives, such as Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge and the Home Visiting program and describe the extent that these new initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

**State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and Their Families**

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child- or family-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increase the rate of growth in infants and toddlers demonstrating positive social-emotional skills) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increase the percentage reported under child outcome B under Indicator 3 of the SPP/APR (knowledge and skills) and increase the percentage trend reported for families under Indicator 4 (helping their child develop and learn)).

*Statement*

*Description*

**Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies**

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

### Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in EIS programs and/or EIS providers, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

[TN Part C Theory of Action](#) TN Part C Theory of Action

Illustration



Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

### 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.

### 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.

### 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.

### 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.

**Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

---

This indicator is not applicable.