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# Introduction

**Instructions**

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State’s systems designed to drive improved results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and to ensure that the Lead Agency (LA) meets the requirements of Part C of the IDEA. This introduction must include descriptions of the State’s General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

## Intro - Indicator Data

**Executive Summary**

The 2019-20 Annual Performance Report (APR) for Tennessee's Early Intervention System (TEIS) demonstrates continued performance on compliance and results indicators, including sustained growth in the percentage of the population served and improvements in family outcomes while navigating the challenges of delivering services safely to vulnerable populations during the unprecedented COVID-19 global pandemic.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

On March 16, 2020, TEIS suspended face-to-face visits with families in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. This suspension included service coordination, eligibility evaluations, ongoing assessment, and developmental therapy. Vendor agencies (e.g., Speech Therapy, Physical Therapy, Occupational Therapy) were strongly encouraged to suspend face-to-face service delivery as well. TEIS supported the use of teleconference service delivery, and implemented modified procedures for eligibility evaluation, and ongoing assessment/early childhood outcomes data collection. The impact of this suspension of face-to-face visits will be discussed as they apply to specific indicators.

**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.**

For federal fiscal year (FFY) 2019-20, the lead agency in Tennessee for Part C, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) was the Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE). Tennessee Early Intervention System (TEIS) transferred lead agency from TDOE to the Department of Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (DIDD) effective July 1, 2020. The activities in this annual performance report were conducted under the supervision of TDOE.

Early intervention service (EIS) programs are defined as the nine TEIS point of entry offices (TEIS POEs). Each POE has a district administrator who reports directly to the state’s director-Part C coordinator. State personnel in these offices are responsible for the following activities from referral into the system through exit from the system: 1) Part C eligibility determination and 2) all service coordination activities which include Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) development, oversight of service delivery, and transition. TEIS POEs utilize the TEIS operations manual and TEIS policy manual as resources for daily operations.

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 Plans (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 avenues:
1. Annual monitoring: TEIDS enables the lead agency to track through desk audits the existence of noncompliance and the verification for the correction of noncompliance. Fiscal year census data from TEIDS were 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 data sharing at the state level between Part C and Part B, 619 preschool state education agency (SEA) and local education agencies (LEAs). Compliance monitoring and the issuing of written findings, when warranted, occur during Nov.-Dec. 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. Focused monitoring may occur at any time during the year.

A finding of noncompliance can be issued to an EIS program through any of the monitoring activities described above. When this occurs TEIS issues a written letter of finding along with supporting data. 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 written letter confirming correction to the program. The lead agency adheres to OSEP's definition for timely correction—as soon as possible, but not more than one year from the date the written finding was issued.

The 09-02 memorandum identifies a “two-prong approach” when determining correction of noncompliance. The following steps are used when determining correction:
1. Child-level correction (prong 1). When noncompliance is discovered (e.g., a child has yet to receive an IFSP service [Indicator 1] or have a meeting [Indicators 7 and 8C]), the Part C monitoring coordinator provides the child’s TEIDS identification number to the POE district administrator who oversees actions to correct the noncompliance, informing the monitoring coordinator who then verifies correction by reviewing the child’s record in TEIDS.
2. Correct implementation of regulatory requirements (prong 2). A subsequent review of data is made for the monitoring coordinator to verify that the TEIS POE is correctly implementing the specific indicator regulatory requirements. This entails a review of monthly census data in TEIDS until 100% compliance is achieved.
3. Pre-finding correction. OSEP allows for the correction of noncompliance 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.

**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 system to support EIS programs (i.e., TEIS point of entry offices [TEIS POEs]) is led primarily by results-driven accountability (RDA) team personnel: the quality improvement manager and staff along with technical assistance from two direct service coordinators (DSCs).

The quality improvement team (QIT) utilizes a professional development calendar outlining required training for TEIS POE personnel, including:
• Building Best Practices (BBP) Conference is an annual conference provided by the lead agency. The BBP conference scheduled for April 2020 was planned with speakers and sessions dedicated to Family Guided Routines Based Intervention (FGRBI) model for POEs and Early Intervention Resource Agencies (EIRAs); however, due to COVID-19 conference was cancelled. Jennifer Brown, PhD, CCC-SLP, FGRBI Proprietor/Consultant provided a full-day virtual training to a group of district administrators, program coordinators, and early intervention providers in June 2020. Ongoing collaboration and support for FGRBI will be provided by Jennifer Brown and Dana Childress, Ph.D., Early Intervention Professional Development Consultant in the next fiscal year for support in training and implementation of the model in POE offices and Early Intervention Resource Agencies (EIRAs).
• Quarterly training to TEIS POEs when needed on early childhood outcomes (ECO); TEIS operations manual; Routines-Based Interview (RBI), IFSP functional goal development; and the family report with the Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System for Infants and Toddlers (AEPS). The QIT provided trainings as needed as well new hire training to POE offices across the state during April – June 2020. Additionally, the QIT provided ongoing technical assistance training to those POE offices that needed support due to COVID-19 and all meetings going virtual on topics such as WebEx and Adobe Sign.

In addition to the professional development calendar, the following training and technical assistance activities were provided by the QIT:
• New hire training packet. Training used by TEIS POE leadership, with the support from QIT staff to onboard new hires. In FFY 2018-19, the QIT revised the training to better address the needs of service coordinators during their first year of employment. TEIS district administrators provided feedback for revisions. The revised new hire training was launched in 2019-20, and QIT support was provided to newly hired staff across the state. Surveys were sent to staff and POE leadership after modules were completed to collect information on the usefulness, relevance and ease in navigation of the new hire training, as staff began taking on more responsibilities and applying these concepts in the field. The feedback from the surveys will be used to make necessary changes and/or additions and improve future training and development for POE staff.
• Professional Education and Enrichment Resources (PEERs). PEERs are self-reflective learning activities required by service coordinators as part of their individual professional development. In FFY 2018-19, the QIT began work to cross-walk PEER activities with the Division of Early Childhood (DEC) Recommended Practices, and with TN’s service delivery model, Family Guided Routines-Based Intervention (FGRBI). The QIT began research of various avenues (e.g., podcasts, blogs) to provide these enrichment resources to service coordinators for their professional development. In 2019-20, PEER activities were still available for staff to refer to for professional development; however, no new PEERs were developed as the TEIS training focus shifted to FGRBI implementation. The format for delivering PEER is being reviewed so as the to be in alignment with Department of Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (DIDD) current training practices (e.g. podcasts, blogs).
• Service coordinator credential. In FFY 2018-19, the QIT began development on a competency-based course and assessment for staff providing service coordination. The expected roll-out for the first cohort of service coordinators was in 2021, however, with TEIS’s transition to DIDD, the format for delivering the Service Coordinator Credential is being reviewed so as to be in alignment with DIDD’s current training practices. The Service Coordinator Credential will be re-evaluated in the future to determine the best way to move forward.
• The QIT continually seeks to develop training and technical assistance resources. Examples of resources available to TEIS POEs:
o Job embedded training addressing specific needs of individual POE personnel
o Information on topics identified by TEIS district leadership during staff meetings
o Family assessment training with a focus on interview skills and family engagement techniques
o Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) teaming to support service coordinators and evaluators during Initial IFSP development
o Access to technical assistance through a formal request process that ensures the understanding of the request and tracks technical assistance provided by the QIT.

In FFY 2019-20, Direct Services Coordinators (DSCs) provided specific technical assistance to TEIS POE leadership through such activities as:
• Attended periodic leadership and staff meetings to answer questions and/or provide training as needed or requested by a district administrator. Examples of topics included:
o Describing the service of developmental therapy to families.
o Engaging families in the IFSP process using open-ended questioning.
o Determining services to discuss with families at the initial IFSP meeting.
o Discussing FGRBI for service coordination, what the concepts mean in IFSP and TCM meetings
o Giving and receiving feedback, conversation, and listening training was provided relative to FGRBI model for all POE leadership. Each POE and EIRA developed mini trainings for each topic. Each EIRA and POE received 9 mini trainings to be completed with early interventionists and service coordinators in these areas.
• Attended TEIS POE and EIRA meetings to develop district plans to promote improved IFSP team function. Facilitated the implementation of this work by verifying the completion of plan steps developed:
o Provided information and guidance to EIRAs about how to include POE staff in meetings provided via telehealth so IFSP teams could continue to meet during the pandemic.
o Assisted in the development of agency protocols for the administration of the AEPS ongoing assessment by EIRAs for the improvement of IFSP team function after the pandemic.
• Facilitated activities specific to Family Guided Routines-Based Intervention (FGRBI) implementation:
o Provided a day long training session on FGRBI to ensure TEIS leadership and POE staff understand the concepts and can verbalize how FGRBI will positively impact children and families.
o Provided guidance to TEIS leadership and personnel about the FGRBI approach for TEIS service delivery and how to “set the stage” with families.
o Provided joint quarterly training to Early Intervention Resource Agency (EIRA) directors and POE leadership on FGRBI and TEIDS documentation as it related to service delivery.
o Participated in local interagency coordinating council (ICC) meetings for each TEIS district and provided updates on the implementation of FGRBI work efforts.
o Provided specific training on both FGRBI and teleintervention to participants.
o Attended staff meetings for all EIRAs to assist program supervisors with training and observation regarding “setting the stage” within the FGRBI service delivery approach.
o Provided numerous training sessions, individualized technical assistance services, and resources to POEs and EIRAs on the use of teleintervention with families.
o Developed and implemented a survey of 227 families’ perception of services provided by TEIS through teleintervention. Shared results with EIRA and POE leadership at a state EIRA office hours call.

**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 for service providers is led primarily by the results-driven accountability (RDA) team. In FFY 2018-19 TEIS began work on the implementation of the service delivery model of Family Guided Routines-Based Intervention (FGRBI) with the 35 contracted Early Intervention Resource Agencies (EIRAs) who provide the service of developmental therapy.

EIRAs and TEIS POEs are divided geographically for ease of agency access and travel by the Direct Services Coordinators (DSCs). In 2019-20, the professional development activities supported by DSCs included:
• Regular meetings with EIRA directors addressing such topics as:
o FGRBI implementation, including coaching strategies
o How to “grow” staff in specific areas where needed
o TEIDS documentation for developmental therapy service delivery log entries
o Leadership skills
o Collecting data based on home visit observations to lead professional development plans
• Attending EIRA staff meetings addressing such topics as:
o Engaging parents during home visits by using open-ended questions
o Coaching parents versus coaching the child during home visits along with being intentional with coaching strategies
o Understanding the criteria to meet fidelity for the four indicators in “Setting the Stage”, one components of the FGRBI model of service delivery
o How to engage families in a virtual visit
o Using coaching through teleintervention
o How to really engage a family through gathering updates
o Coaching from the outside (Dyadic coaching)
• Joint quarterly training to EIRA directors and TEIS POE leadership focused on how to determine if you are making an impact through professional development with staff.
• Quarterly training where EIRA directors and DAs per district worked together to develop joint mini-trainings on specific topics related to FGRBI for use with their staff.
• Observations of both EIRA directors and early interventionists during home visits, providing feedback on the FGRBI approach, including coaching strategies.

In FFY 2019-20, professional development supported by the TEIS quality improvement team (QIT) included:
• Building Best Practices (BBP) Conference mentioned in the TA section above.
• Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System for Infants and Children (AEPS). The AEPS is used to track child progress and for the collection of early childhood outcomes (ECO) ratings. The AEPS is administered by EIRA early interventionists. In FFY 2018-19, a train-the-trainer curriculum was developed for EIRA personnel. This curriculum enables two members from each EIRA to be trained on the AEPS so they, in turn, train their agency’s new early interventions (EIs) and also provide additional training to existing personnel as needed. The QIT held three regional train-the-trainer events in September 2019. Each EIRA had two representatives trained as trainers and are currently training their own staff as needed. The QIT helped support and train those agencies who have lost staff since September 2019.

EIRAs have several contract requirements for which the QIT provides support:
• 42 hours of annual training per full-time equivalent (FTE). Training time is pro-rated for staff less than full time. Online training is made available for such topics as family-centered early intervention, and guidelines for TEIDS service log entries. The PEER activities mentioned in the TA section may also be utilized to complete required training hours.
• Early Intervention (EI) Credential. All EIRA early interventionists providing home- and community-based developmental therapy services are required to complete the EI credential, a competency-based course and assessment. All EIRA supervisors completed the credential on/before June 30, 2017. New cohorts for the EI credential continue once a year for new agency personnel, with a total of 36 individuals (34 early interventionists and two directors) completing the credential in 2019-20. The credential addresses Division of Early Childhood (DEC) recommended practices and federal regulations through the following topic areas:
o Foundations
Federal law
Division of Early Childhood (DEC) recommended practices
o Supporting children
AEPS
Tennessee Early Learning Developmental Standards (TN-ELDS)
Early childhood outcomes (ECO)
o Supporting families
Coaching and collaboration
o Working with the TEIS community
TEIS guidelines and processes

**Stakeholder Involvement:**

**The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP/APR, and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 11, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).**

Tennessee's state interagency coordinating council (SICC) is the primary stakeholder group for Tennessee's Early Intervention System (TEIS). Stakeholders consist of SICC members and visitors in attendance during quarterly meetings (i.e., TEIS staff, service providers, community).

The draft Annual Performance Report (APR) was formally reviewed with TEIS state leadership and other state personnel, December 17th. Late December, portions of the draft were sent for review by Tennessee’s OSEP state contact, Charles Kniseley. The draft APR was reviewed with the SICC Chairperson, January 21st, prior to its review with full SICC membership. Status of FFY 2019-20 data compared to federal and state targets was shared and discussed with SICC membership and attending visitors during the January 26th SICC meeting. Modifications to state targets were determined unnecessary for the upcoming fiscal year. Targets for FFY 2020-21 will remain the same as 2019 targets.

See attachments for a copy of the Annual Report Certification of the Interagency Coordinating Council under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

TEIS leadership established representative stakeholder groups in FFY 2015-16 to periodically access for feedback and/or input on various projects (e.g., TEIS operational procedure development, professional training development, State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) work). Committees were established through a self-nomination process with TEIS ensuring statewide coverage across several factors such as rural/urban and program size.

During 2019-20 the TEIS review committee met in August and October to provide input on a revised family assessment, and the three committees met jointly in December 2019 to provide input to TEIS on improvements to the data system. With TEIS’s transition to DIDD, the TEIS review committees were officially disbanded in May 2020. The new lead agency, DIDD is establishing more formal advisory groups to replace the stakeholder committees, starting with an Early Intervention Resource Agency (EIRA) Advisory Group, which took applications prior to TEIS’s transition but was not formalized until after July 1, 2020.

In addition to the stakeholder committees, throughout 2019-20 TEIS has utilized stakeholder input from the Tennessee Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (TNAAP) in supporting eligibility procedures. In December 2019, TNAAP worked with TEIS to form a committee of stakeholders, consisting of pediatricians, neonatologists, and other experts to provide input for expanding the TEIS diagnosis list for children with prenatal drug exposure. In March 2020, TNAAP pediatricians helped TEIS to develop an alternative method for eligibility evaluation that could be delivered remotely utilizing materials the parent would likely have in their homes. The pediatricians delivered the training to TEIS evaluators statewide and have been available to support any ongoing follow-up needed.

In addition, a small group of EIRA directors provided assistance in developing procedures for modifying ongoing assessment using the Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System (AEPS) remotely to collect ongoing progress and early childhood outcomes data from families using teleconference technology. This new methodology was deployed in May 2020.

In March 2019, the TEIS newsletter changed from once a month to twice monthly in order to provide more regular information to stakeholders, particularly through the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, TEIS added weekly calls with providers in March, which switched to bi-weekly. These calls provide an opportunity for providers to share information, ask questions, and discuss service delivery.

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

YES

**Reporting to the Public:**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2018 performance of each EIS Program located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State’s submission of its FFY 2018 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the State’s SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2018 APR in 2020, is available.**

Federal report requirements for the performance of each early intervention service (EIS) program (i.e., the nine TEIS POEs) compared to the state’s SPP/APR targets are completed and posted on the state’s website no later than 120 days following the state’s submission of the APR on February 1. This report is entitled, Report to the Public. The state’s APR is also posted at the same location after the close of the federal period of clarification. An email is sent to Tennessee's OSEP state contact and TEIS POE leadership informing them of the posting and the website link. The TEIS monthly newsletter (TEIS Update) informs stakeholders of the postings. Currently, the 2020 Report to the Public (FYY 2018-19 data) and the 2018-19 Annual Performance Report are available on the State’s website under “Reports” at https://www.tn.gov/didd/for-consumers/tennessee-early-intervention-system-teis/reports---data.html.

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

OSEP notes that one or more of the attachments included in the State’s FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education’s IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

## Intro - OSEP Response

The State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) submitted to the Secretary its annual report that is required under IDEA section 641(e)(1)(D) and 34 C.F.R. §303.604(c). The SICC noted it has elected to support the State lead agency’s submission of its SPP/APR as its annual report in lieu of submitting a separate report. OSEP accepts the SICC form, which will not be posted publicly with the State’s SPP/APR documents.

## Intro - Required Actions

# Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers with Individual Family Service Plans (IFSPs) who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Include the State’s criteria for “timely” receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Account for untimely receipt of services, including the reasons for delays.

**Instructions**

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select early intervention service (EIS) programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. States report in both the numerator and denominator under Indicator 1 on the number of children for whom the State ensured the timely initiation of new services identified on the IFSP. Include the timely initiation of new early intervention services from both initial IFSPs and subsequent IFSPs. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

The State’s timeliness measure for this indicator must be either: (1) a time period that runs from when the parent consents to IFSP services; or (2) the IFSP initiation date (established by the IFSP Team, including the parent).

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child’s record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in the Office of Special Education Programs’ (OSEP’s) response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 90.96% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 96.90% | 97.67% | 96.36% | 92.09% | 97.70% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6,553 | 8,095 | 97.70% | 100% | 97.76% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**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" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.***

1,361

**Include your State’s criteria for “timely” receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).**

Tennessee defines "timely service delivery" as no longer than 30 calendar days from the date of parent consent on the Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) for a service."

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 IFSP and any one of the services were delivered untimely, the child had untimely service delivery.

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

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, 2019-June 30, 2020

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

Census data from the Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) were used to determine the percent of Part C eligible infants and toddlers who had timely IFSP service delivery across all IFSP types (i.e., initial, six-month, annual, review change).

The Statistical Analyst 3 (SA3) pulled data from TEIDS. Data were researched by three statistical analyst 2s (SA2s) for reasons where IFSP services were delivered untimely. SA2s provided researched data to assigned TEIS Point of Entry (POE) district leadership for review before the SA3 compiled and submitted final indicator reports to the Part C monitoring coordinator and district leadership. Data accounted for reasons for untimely service delivery (i.e., exceptional family circumstances or system).

Documented exceptional family circumstances for delays in timely service delivery include: child/family sickness, family vacation/holiday, family’s preferred schedule, family “no show” for a timely scheduled appointment/visit, family forgot about a timely scheduled appointment/visit, provider waiting for physician or medical authorization for a service, weather related events (e.g., snow, ice, tornado, flood), state or local disaster recovery (e.g., flood, tornado, ice storm), state or national pandemic (e.g., Coronavirus/COVID-19).

System issues for delays include: service coordinator delay in notifying a provider that a service was added to an IFSP, provider delay in beginning service, difficulty in locating a provider, lack of provider availability, lack of documentation about the reason for delay.

**If needed, provide additional information about this indicator here.**

COVID-19 did not impact the state’s ability to collect data required for this indicator nor did it impact data completeness, validity, and reliability for this indicator. The same process was used as described in section, “Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period” for the collection of data used for annual monitoring and the development of the FFY 2019-20 APR.

As previously stated, TN defines timely service delivery as, “no longer than 30 calendar days from the date of parent consent on the Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) for a service.” For FFY 2019-20, impact on timely service delivery could be seen in services added to an IFSP between February and June. The first case of COVID-19 was diagnosed on March 5 in Tennessee. An additional column was added to the data research template used by statistical analyst 2s (SA2s) to capture information about COVID-19 impact on untimely IFSPs service delivery in the analysis of data.

TEIS used OSEP guidance to code untimely service delivery as “untimely/ exceptional family circumstances” when documentation was found in the child’s record (TEIDS) where the untimeliness was due to COVID-19. If there was any question about documentation, the coding of “Yes” for COVID-19 impact was not used.

Breakdown of exceptional family circumstances data for FFY 2019-20:
# of delays not due to COVID-19: 900
# of delays due to COVID-19: 461 (33.87%)
Total # of delays: 1,361

Breakdown of COVID-19 delays by service:
Developmental Therapy: 304
Occupational Therapy: 40
Physical Therapy: 29
Speech Therapy: 88
Total: 461

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

In FFY 18 there were four findings of noncompliance identified for indicator 1. No findings were issued through dispute resolution processes. There were no focused monitoring activities planned or initiated from a concern brought to TEIS leadership.

Four of the nine EIS programs had a finding of noncompliance issued in 2018 (FFY 2018-19) through annual monitoring (monitoring cycle FFY 2017-18). All four findings were corrected timely (i.e., as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from the written notice of finding). The Part C monitoring coordinator verified the four programs were correctly implementing regulatory requirements for IFSP service delivery through a review of subsequent monthly data in TEIDS, demonstrating 100% compliance (prong 2 correction).

In FFY 2018-19, two of the nine EIS programs utilized a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) and were working toward correction for findings made in FFY 2017-18. These findings were corrected, however untimely, in FFY 2018. The Part C monitoring coordinator verified the two programs were correctly implementing regulatory requirements for IFSP service delivery through review of subsequent monthly data in TEIDS, demonstrating 100% compliance (prong 2 correction). These two findings were reported in the FFY 2018-19 APR submission.

Three of the nine EIS programs did not have a finding of noncompliance. All three programs had pre-finding correction. For programs with pre-finding correction, the Part C monitoring coordinator verified that the programs were correctly implementing regulatory requirements, by a review of subsequent monthly data in TEIDS demonstrating 100% compliance prior to the issuance of written findings of noncompliance. All children had timely IFSP service delivery (prong 2, pre-finding correction).

Pre-finding correction for prong 2 occurs by verifying subsequent monthly census data in TEIDS demonstrate 100% compliance for timely service delivery prior to the issuance of written finding of noncompliance. Refer to Introduction: General Supervision System regarding how TEIS ensures EIS programs are correctly implementing regulatory requirements and for information about pre-finding correction.

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

In FFY 18 there were four findings of noncompliance identified for indicator 1. No findings were issued through dispute resolution processes. There were no focused monitoring activities planned or initiated from a concern brought to TEIS leadership.

Four of the nine EIS programs had a finding of noncompliance issued in 2018 (FFY 2018-19) through annual monitoring (monitoring cycle FFY 2017-18). All four findings were corrected timely (i.e., as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from the written notice of finding). The Part C monitoring coordinator verified there was no remaining child-level noncompliance in fiscal year data. All individual children had IFSP services delivered, however late, unless they were no longer under the jurisdiction of TEIS. There was no child-level noncompliance found in subsequent monthly data reviewed when verifying correction for the indicator. Data demonstrated 100% compliance. All individual children had timely IFSP service delivery (prong 1, pre-finding correction).

In FFY 2018-19, two of the nine EIS programs utilized a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) and were working toward correction for findings made in FFY 2017-18. These findings were corrected, however untimely, in FFY 2018. The Part C monitoring coordinator verified the two programs had no remaining child-level noncompliance in fiscal year data. All individual children had IFSP services delivered, however late, unless they were no longer under the jurisdiction of TEIS. There was no child-level noncompliance found in subsequent monthly data reviewed when verifying correction for the indicator. Data demonstrated 100%. All individual children had timely IFSP service delivery. These two findings were reported in the FFY 2018-19 APR submission.

Three of the nine EIS programs did not have a finding of noncompliance. All three programs had pre-finding correction. For programs with pre-finding correction, the Part C monitoring coordinator verified the programs had no remaining child-level noncompliance in fiscal year data. All individual children had IFSP services delivered, however late, unless the child was no longer under the jurisdiction of TEIS. There was no child-level noncompliance found in subsequent monthly data reviewed prior to the issuance of written findings of noncompliance. Data demonstrated 100%. All children had timely IFSP service delivery (prong 1, pre-finding correction).

Pre-finding correction for prong 1 occurs by verifying that fiscal year and subsequent monthly census data contain no child-level noncompliance prior to the issuance of a written finding of noncompliance. Refer to Introduction: General Supervision System regarding how TEIS ensures there is no individual child-level noncompliance and for information about pre-finding correction.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

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

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

## 1 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

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

# Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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)

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

**Instructions**

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

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

The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State’s 618 data reported in Table 2. If not, explain.

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 76.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target>= | 85.04% | 85.04% | 85.04% | 85.04% | 85.04% |
| Data | 80.55% | 83.42% | 84.66% | 83.65% | 83.24% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target>= | 85.04% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Tennessee's state interagency coordinating council (SICC) is the primary stakeholder group for Tennessee's Early Intervention System (TEIS). Stakeholders consist of SICC members and visitors in attendance during quarterly meetings (i.e., TEIS staff, service providers, community).

The draft Annual Performance Report (APR) was formally reviewed with TEIS state leadership and other state personnel, December 17th. Late December, portions of the draft were sent for review by Tennessee’s OSEP state contact, Charles Kniseley. The draft APR was reviewed with the SICC Chairperson, January 21st, prior to its review with full SICC membership. Status of FFY 2019-20 data compared to federal and state targets was shared and discussed with SICC membership and attending visitors during the January 26th SICC meeting. Modifications to state targets were determined unnecessary for the upcoming fiscal year. Targets for FFY 2020-21 will remain the same as 2019 targets.

See attachments for a copy of the Annual Report Certification of the Interagency Coordinating Council under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

TEIS leadership established representative stakeholder groups in FFY 2015-16 to periodically access for feedback and/or input on various projects (e.g., TEIS operational procedure development, professional training development, State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) work). Committees were established through a self-nomination process with TEIS ensuring statewide coverage across several factors such as rural/urban and program size.

During 2019-20 the TEIS review committee met in August and October to provide input on a revised family assessment, and the three committees met jointly in December 2019 to provide input to TEIS on improvements to the data system. With TEIS’s transition to DIDD, the TEIS review committees were officially disbanded in May 2020. The new lead agency, DIDD is establishing more formal advisory groups to replace the stakeholder committees, starting with an Early Intervention Resource Agency (EIRA) Advisory Group, which took applications prior to TEIS’s transition but was not formalized until after July 1, 2020.

In addition to the stakeholder committees, throughout 2019-20 TEIS has utilized stakeholder input from the Tennessee Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (TNAAP) in supporting eligibility procedures. In December 2019, TNAAP worked with TEIS to form a committee of stakeholders, consisting of pediatricians, neonatologists, and other experts to provide input for expanding the TEIS diagnosis list for children with prenatal drug exposure. In March 2020, TNAAP pediatricians helped TEIS to develop an alternative method for eligibility evaluation that could be delivered remotely utilizing materials the parent would likely have in their homes. The pediatricians delivered the training to TEIS evaluators statewide and have been available to support any ongoing follow-up needed.

In addition, a small group of EIRA directors provided assistance in developing procedures for modifying ongoing assessment using the Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System (AEPS) remotely to collect ongoing progress and early childhood outcomes data from families using teleconference technology. This new methodology was deployed in May 2020.

In March 2019, the TEIS newsletter changed from once a month to twice monthly in order to provide more regular information to stakeholders, particularly through the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, TEIS added weekly calls with providers in March, which switched to bi-weekly. These calls provide an opportunity for providers to share information, ask questions, and discuss service delivery.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/08/2020 | Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings | 6,919 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/08/2020 | Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs | 8,307 |

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6,919 | 8,307 | 83.24% | 85.04% | 83.29% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

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

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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)

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Outcomes:

 A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

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

 C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

**Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:**

**Summary Statement 1:** Of those infants and toddlers who entered early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in category (d)) divided by (# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2:**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e)) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

**Instructions**

**Sampling of infants and toddlers with IFSPs** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement, include in the numerator and denominator only infants and toddlers with IFSPs who received early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Report: (1) the number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State’s Part C exiting data under Section 618 of the IDEA; and (2) the number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements.

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

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

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

If the 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), the State must report data in two ways. First, it must report on all eligible children but exclude its at-risk infants and toddlers (i.e., include just those infants and toddlers experiencing developmental delay (or “developmentally delayed children”) or having a diagnosed physical or mental condition that has a high probability of resulting in developmental delay (or “children with diagnosed conditions”)). Second, the State must separately report outcome data on either: (1) just its at-risk infants and toddlers; or (2) aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C (including developmentally delayed children, children with diagnosed conditions, and at-risk infants and toddlers).

## 3 - Indicator Data

**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)? (yes/no)**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Tennessee's state interagency coordinating council (SICC) is the primary stakeholder group for Tennessee's Early Intervention System (TEIS). Stakeholders consist of SICC members and visitors in attendance during quarterly meetings (i.e., TEIS staff, service providers, community).

The draft Annual Performance Report (APR) was formally reviewed with TEIS state leadership and other state personnel, December 17th. Late December, portions of the draft were sent for review by Tennessee’s OSEP state contact, Charles Kniseley. The draft APR was reviewed with the SICC Chairperson, January 21st, prior to its review with full SICC membership. Status of FFY 2019-20 data compared to federal and state targets was shared and discussed with SICC membership and attending visitors during the January 26th SICC meeting. Modifications to state targets were determined unnecessary for the upcoming fiscal year. Targets for FFY 2020-21 will remain the same as 2019 targets.

See attachments for a copy of the Annual Report Certification of the Interagency Coordinating Council under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

TEIS leadership established representative stakeholder groups in FFY 2015-16 to periodically access for feedback and/or input on various projects (e.g., TEIS operational procedure development, professional training development, State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) work). Committees were established through a self-nomination process with TEIS ensuring statewide coverage across several factors such as rural/urban and program size.

During 2019-20 the TEIS review committee met in August and October to provide input on a revised family assessment, and the three committees met jointly in December 2019 to provide input to TEIS on improvements to the data system. With TEIS’s transition to DIDD, the TEIS review committees were officially disbanded in May 2020. The new lead agency, DIDD is establishing more formal advisory groups to replace the stakeholder committees, starting with an Early Intervention Resource Agency (EIRA) Advisory Group, which took applications prior to TEIS’s transition but was not formalized until after July 1, 2020.

In addition to the stakeholder committees, throughout 2019-20 TEIS has utilized stakeholder input from the Tennessee Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (TNAAP) in supporting eligibility procedures. In December 2019, TNAAP worked with TEIS to form a committee of stakeholders, consisting of pediatricians, neonatologists, and other experts to provide input for expanding the TEIS diagnosis list for children with prenatal drug exposure. In March 2020, TNAAP pediatricians helped TEIS to develop an alternative method for eligibility evaluation that could be delivered remotely utilizing materials the parent would likely have in their homes. The pediatricians delivered the training to TEIS evaluators statewide and have been available to support any ongoing follow-up needed.

In addition, a small group of EIRA directors provided assistance in developing procedures for modifying ongoing assessment using the Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System (AEPS) remotely to collect ongoing progress and early childhood outcomes data from families using teleconference technology. This new methodology was deployed in May 2020.

In March 2019, the TEIS newsletter changed from once a month to twice monthly in order to provide more regular information to stakeholders, particularly through the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, TEIS added weekly calls with providers in March, which switched to bi-weekly. These calls provide an opportunity for providers to share information, ask questions, and discuss service delivery.

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A1** | 2016 | Target>= | 74.90% | 74.90% |  | 59.00% | 59.00% |
| **A1** | 56.86% | Data | 74.15% | 68.41% | 56.86% | 58.06% | 64.60% |
| **A2** | 2016 | Target>= | 47.40% | 47.40% |  | 52.00% | 52.00% |
| **A2** | 49.54% | Data | 35.66% | 43.93% | 49.54% | 48.23% | 48.15% |
| **B1** | 2016 | Target>= | 78.40% | 78.40% |  | 58.00% | 58.00% |
| **B1** | 56.01% | Data | 74.61% | 72.01% | 56.01% | 48.23% | 48.20% |
| **B2** | 2016 | Target>= | 45.20% | 45.50% |  | 34.00% | 34.00% |
| **B2** | 31.93% | Data | 29.62% | 29.11% | 31.93% | 31.55% | 32.44% |
| **C1** | 2016 | Target>= | 76.90% | 76.90% |  | 67.50% | 67.50% |
| **C1** | 65.32% | Data | 78.70% | 76.31% | 65.32% | 60.54% | 62.50% |
| **C2** | 2016 | Target>= | 49.40% | 49.40% |  | 53.00% | 53.00% |
| **C2** | 51.20% | Data | 31.26% | 37.41% | 51.20% | 56.05% | 58.28% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A1>= | 59.00% |
| Target A2>= | 52.00% |
| Target B1>= | 58.00% |
| Target B2>= | 34.00% |
| Target C1>= | 67.50% |
| Target C2>= | 53.00% |

 **FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed**

5,158

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

| **Outcome A Progress Category** | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 21 | 0.41% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 1,474 | 28.58% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 1,356 | 26.29% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,650 | 31.99% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 657 | 12.74% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 3,006 | 4,501 | 64.60% | 59.00% | 66.79% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| 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 | 2,307 | 5,158 | 48.15% | 52.00% | 44.73% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable**

Analysis was conducted to determine reasons for slippage between 2018-19 and 2019-20. The most significant difference noted was the length of time between the last ECO rating and the child’s exit. This is due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. As described in the additional information below, TEIS collects ECO data along with ongoing progress using the AEPS assessment every six months, in conjunction with the IFSP review cycle. The most recent ECO collected at the time of the child’s exit is used as their exit ECO rating. As described in the Introduction to the APR and in the additional information for this indicator, TEIS suspended face-to-face visits with families on March 16, 2020 and switched to a teleconference service delivery format. AEPS assessments/ECO ratings were resumed late May 2020 for families who could participate in teleconference. However, this resulted in delays in completing AEPS ratings and obtaining ECO ratings for children. While there were some children with missing records due to COVID, the most notable difference is the length of time between the child’s most recent ECO rating and their exit. In 2018-19, there were 192 children with ECO ratings greater than 183 days (six months) at the time of their exit. This number is comparable to 2017-18, where there were 176. In 2019-20, TEIS had 848 children with ECO ratings greater than 183 days at the time of their exit from TEIS. This means the progress ratings do not fully capture the progress the children made during their time in services which is resulting in slippage for this indicator.

Further analysis was conducted for other possible reasons for slippage, comparing 2018-19 to 2019-20 for length of time in the program, exit reasons, and at the point of entry office (POE) level. There was a slight difference noted that the average length of time in the program was one month shorter. This is likely also attributable to the COVID-19 pandemic and the suspension of face-to-face visits as the months of April-May 2020 showed an average age at exit one to two months lower than the monthly averages for the remainder of the 2019-20 year. Some families opted to voluntarily withdraw from the program due to the circumstances at that time, which meant children had less time in the program to demonstrate progress. The month of June 2020 shows that the average age at exit was returning to pre-COVID level. Exit reason analysis revealed an increase in the percent of children exiting with Part B eligibility not determined, also due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the suspension of eligibility evaluations for Part B but otherwise no significant changes from 2018-19.

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

| **Outcome B Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 25 | 0.48% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 2,568 | 49.79% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 1,033 | 20.03% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,192 | 23.11% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 340 | 6.59% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 2,225 | 4,818 | 48.20% | 58.00% | 46.18% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| 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 | 1,532 | 5,158 | 32.44% | 34.00% | 29.70% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable**

Analysis was conducted to determine reasons for slippage between 2018-19 and 2019-20. The most significant difference noted was the length of time between the last ECO rating and the child’s exit. This is due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. As described in the additional information below, TEIS collects ECO data along with ongoing progress using the AEPS assessment every six months, in conjunction with the IFSP review cycle. The most recent ECO collected at the time of the child’s exit is used as their exit ECO rating. As described in the Introduction to the APR and in the additional information for this indicator, TEIS suspended face-to-face visits with families on March 16, 2020 and switched to a teleconference service delivery format. AEPS assessments/ECO ratings were resumed late May 2020 for families who could participate in teleconference. However, this resulted in delays in completing AEPS ratings and obtaining ECO ratings for children. While there were some children with missing records due to COVID, the most notable difference is the length of time between the child’s most recent ECO rating and their exit. In 2018-19, there were 192 children with ECO ratings greater than 183 days (six months) at the time of their exit. This number is comparable to 2017-18, where there were 176. In 2019-20, TEIS had 848 children with ECO ratings greater than 183 days at the time of their exit from TEIS. This means the progress ratings do not fully capture the progress the children made during their time in services which is resulting in slippage for this indicator.

Further analysis was conducted for other possible reasons for slippage, comparing 2018-19 to 2019-20 for length of time in the program, exit reasons, and at the point of entry office (POE) level. There was a slight difference noted that the average length of time in the program was one month shorter. This is likely also attributable to the COVID-19 pandemic and the suspension of face-to-face visits as the months of April-May 2020 showed an average age at exit one to two months lower than the monthly averages for the remainder of the 2019-20 year. Some families opted to voluntarily withdraw from the program due to the circumstances at that time, which meant children had less time in the program to demonstrate progress. The month of June 2020 shows that the average age at exit was returning to pre-COVID level. Exit reason analysis revealed an increase in the percent of children exiting with Part B eligibility not determined, also due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the suspension of eligibility evaluations for Part B but otherwise no significant changes from 2018-19.

**Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable**

Analysis was conducted to determine reasons for slippage between 2018-19 and 2019-20. The most significant difference noted was the length of time between the last ECO rating and the child’s exit. This is due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. As described in the additional information below, TEIS collects ECO data along with ongoing progress using the AEPS assessment every six months, in conjunction with the IFSP review cycle. The most recent ECO collected at the time of the child’s exit is used as their exit ECO rating. As described in the Introduction to the APR and in the additional information for this indicator, TEIS suspended face-to-face visits with families on March 16, 2020 and switched to a teleconference service delivery format. AEPS assessments/ECO ratings were resumed late May 2020 for families who could participate in teleconference. However, this resulted in delays in completing AEPS ratings and obtaining ECO ratings for children. While there were some children with missing records due to COVID, the most notable difference is the length of time between the child’s most recent ECO rating and their exit. In 2018-19, there were 192 children with ECO ratings greater than 183 days (six months) at the time of their exit. This number is comparable to 2017-18, where there were 176. In 2019-20, TEIS had 848 children with ECO ratings greater than 183 days at the time of their exit from TEIS. This means the progress ratings do not fully capture the progress the children made during their time in services which is resulting in slippage for this indicator.

Further analysis was conducted for other possible reasons for slippage, comparing 2018-19 to 2019-20 for length of time in the program, exit reasons, and at the point of entry office (POE) level. There was a slight difference noted that the average length of time in the program was one month shorter. This is likely also attributable to the COVID-19 pandemic and the suspension of face-to-face visits as the months of April-May 2020 showed an average age at exit one to two months lower than the monthly averages for the remainder of the 2019-20 year. Some families opted to voluntarily withdraw from the program due to the circumstances at that time, which meant children had less time in the program to demonstrate progress. The month of June 2020 shows that the average age at exit was returning to pre-COVID level. Exit reason analysis revealed an increase in the percent of children exiting with Part B eligibility not determined, also due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the suspension of eligibility evaluations for Part B but otherwise no significant changes from 2018-19.

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

| **Outcome C Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 15 | 0.29% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 1,431 | 27.74% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 835 | 16.19% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,657 | 32.12% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,220 | 23.65% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 2,492 | 3,938 | 62.50% | 67.50% | 63.28% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| 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 | 2,877 | 5,158 | 58.28% | 53.00% | 55.78% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**The number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program**.

| **Question** | **Number** |
| --- | --- |
| The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State’s part C exiting 618 data | 7,476 |
| The number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program. | 2,055 |

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used?  | NO |

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

YES

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

The Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System for Infants and Children (AEPS) was utilized in FFY 2019-20 to collect Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) entrance, ongoing, and exit ratings. Developmental assessment data from the AEPS, are gathered beginning with the initial individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) and for every six-month and annual IFSP review that follows.

Early interventionists who provide the IFSP service of developmental therapy or contracted agencies with staff who meet the same criteria as early interventionists are responsible for administering the AEPS developmental assessment. They provide the assessment progress report, including ECO ratings, to TEIS service coordinators who enter the ECO ratings into TEIDS, which houses the child’s education record.

The AEPS is utilized as the developmental assessment instrument because 1) it is a developmental assessment tool that has been cross-walked with the federal office of special education programs (OSEP) childhood outcomes; 2) it contains a curriculum component for program planning; and 3) it is aligned with the Tennessee Department of Education’s Tennessee–Early Learning Developmental Standards (TN-ELDS) which provide a continuum of research-based developmental milestones from birth through age five.

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

Face-to-face visits with families were suspended on March 16, 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. This impacted the completion of AEPS assessments to collect initial and ongoing ECO data using the AEPS assessment, as this assessment is administered using a combination of parent report and direct observation. The initial Brooks Publishing recommendations for completing the AEPS using teleconference included the sharing of video, which the lead agency’s legal department advised against due to privacy concerns. TEIS staff worked with a committee of EIRA directors to develop an alternative method using live teleconference. Guidance for completing AEPS assessments using this revised method was released statewide on May 19, 2020.

The revised procedures for completing initial and ongoing AEPS assessments and collecting ECO data initiated in May 2020 are only for use with families who can participate in teleconference sessions as observation of the child is a requirement. Therefore, the lead agency does have missing ECO data for children due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The lead agency considered other options, such as implementing an alternative methodology for collecting the data that would not utilize the AEPS, but ultimately decided that since 2019-20 was to be the first full year with both entrance and ECO ratings collected via the AEPS, it was in the state’s best interest to maintain the reliability and validity of the ECO data to the best of our ability. FFY 2019-20 was the fourth full year of early childhood outcomes (ECO) data collection utilizing the AEPS for both ECO entrance and exit ratings and the first full year in which all records where ECO was collected using previous methods were filtered out of the system. Please see TEIS’s State Systemic Improvement Plan for additional information on the lead agency’s work on improving ECO data validity and reliability. https://www.tn.gov/didd/for-consumers/tennessee-early-intervention-system-teis/reports---data.html

## 3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3 - OSEP Response

## 3 - Required Actions

# Indicator 4: Family Involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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)

**Data Source**

State selected data source. State must describe the data source in the SPP/APR.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children’s needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling of families participating in Part C is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

Report the number of families to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the infant or toddler, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the families responding are not representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to families (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person), if a survey was used, and how responses were collected.

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

## 4 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline**  | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2013 | Target>= | 90.20% | 90.40% | 90.60% | 90.60% | 90.60% |
| A | 75.42% | Data | 91.75% | 91.37% | 88.00% | 84.99% | 97.38% |
| B | 2013 | Target>= | 93.20% | 93.40% | 93.60% | 93.60% | 93.60% |
| B | 78.45% | Data | 91.63% | 92.76% | 91.25% | 85.90% | 97.34% |
| C | 2013 | Target>= | 90.20% | 90.40% | 90.60% | 90.60% | 90.60% |
| C | 74.58% | Data | 87.56% | 91.99% | 86.58% | 81.03% | 94.95% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A>= | 90.60% |
| Target B>= | 93.60% |
| Target C>= | 90.60% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Tennessee's state interagency coordinating council (SICC) is the primary stakeholder group for Tennessee's Early Intervention System (TEIS). Stakeholders consist of SICC members and visitors in attendance during quarterly meetings (i.e., TEIS staff, service providers, community).

The draft Annual Performance Report (APR) was formally reviewed with TEIS state leadership and other state personnel, December 17th. Late December, portions of the draft were sent for review by Tennessee’s OSEP state contact, Charles Kniseley. The draft APR was reviewed with the SICC Chairperson, January 21st, prior to its review with full SICC membership. Status of FFY 2019-20 data compared to federal and state targets was shared and discussed with SICC membership and attending visitors during the January 26th SICC meeting. Modifications to state targets were determined unnecessary for the upcoming fiscal year. Targets for FFY 2020-21 will remain the same as 2019 targets.

See attachments for a copy of the Annual Report Certification of the Interagency Coordinating Council under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

TEIS leadership established representative stakeholder groups in FFY 2015-16 to periodically access for feedback and/or input on various projects (e.g., TEIS operational procedure development, professional training development, State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) work). Committees were established through a self-nomination process with TEIS ensuring statewide coverage across several factors such as rural/urban and program size.

During 2019-20 the TEIS review committee met in August and October to provide input on a revised family assessment, and the three committees met jointly in December 2019 to provide input to TEIS on improvements to the data system. With TEIS’s transition to DIDD, the TEIS review committees were officially disbanded in May 2020. The new lead agency, DIDD is establishing more formal advisory groups to replace the stakeholder committees, starting with an Early Intervention Resource Agency (EIRA) Advisory Group, which took applications prior to TEIS’s transition but was not formalized until after July 1, 2020.

In addition to the stakeholder committees, throughout 2019-20 TEIS has utilized stakeholder input from the Tennessee Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (TNAAP) in supporting eligibility procedures. In December 2019, TNAAP worked with TEIS to form a committee of stakeholders, consisting of pediatricians, neonatologists, and other experts to provide input for expanding the TEIS diagnosis list for children with prenatal drug exposure. In March 2020, TNAAP pediatricians helped TEIS to develop an alternative method for eligibility evaluation that could be delivered remotely utilizing materials the parent would likely have in their homes. The pediatricians delivered the training to TEIS evaluators statewide and have been available to support any ongoing follow-up needed.

In addition, a small group of EIRA directors provided assistance in developing procedures for modifying ongoing assessment using the Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System (AEPS) remotely to collect ongoing progress and early childhood outcomes data from families using teleconference technology. This new methodology was deployed in May 2020.

In March 2019, the TEIS newsletter changed from once a month to twice monthly in order to provide more regular information to stakeholders, particularly through the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, TEIS added weekly calls with providers in March, which switched to bi-weekly. These calls provide an opportunity for providers to share information, ask questions, and discuss service delivery.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The number of families to whom surveys were distributed | 4,837 |
| Number of respondent families participating in Part C  | 2,814 |
| A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 2,765 |
| A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 2,814 |
| 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 | 2,747 |
| B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs | 2,809 |
| 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 | 2,705 |
| C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn | 2,810 |

| **Measure** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2) | 97.38% | 90.60% | 98.26% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2) | 97.34% | 93.60% | 97.79% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2) | 94.95% | 90.60% | 96.26% | Met Target | No Slippage |

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used?  | NO |

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a collection tool used? | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised collection tool?  | NO |
| The demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program. | YES |

**Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.**

FFY 2019-20 family outcome survey results are representative of population groups served by TEIS when analyzed by geography and race/ethnicity demographics of the populations served. The response rate for the survey was 58.18% with 2814 of 4837 surveys returned. Geographically, all TEIS point of entry offices were represented in the data collection.

Representativeness based on race/ethnicity demographics were evaluated using a confidence interval calculation of 95% across the three sub-indicators (4A, 4B, and 4C). The lower the confidence interval (CI) percentage, the greater the level confidence can be attributed to the data for a given demographic sub-group.

The lead agency reports a good overall confidence range (CI) of 0.31-0.45% across the three sub-outcomes when reviewed as a state. This represents an improvement from FFY 2018-19 survey results where the overall confidence range for the state was 0.49-0.68%. State representativeness reported by each sub-indicator:
• Outcome A (know their rights), 0.31%, compared with 2018-19 which was 0.49%
• Outcome B (communicate their child’s needs), 0.35%, compared with 2018-19 which was 0.50%
• Outcome C (help their child develop and learn), 0.45%, compared with 2018-19 which was 0.68%

When comparing the past two years to the 2017-18 data, which was prior to the new HOPE process (see section below, “Provide additional information about this indicator”), the representativeness has improved dramatically for both the state and each race/ethnic sub-group under the new HOPE process, which was one of primary goals of the revised data collection process. The CI range for 2017-18 data was 2.05%-2.25% across the three sub-indicators.

Below, representativeness is broken out from highest to lowest confidence for family outcome survey results representing a particular race/ethnicity group across the three sub-outcomes A, B, and C:
• • White: confidence interval (CI) range, 0.30-0.46%. Improvement in CI compared to 2018-19 where survey data reported a range of 0.52-0.73%
• Black or African American: CI range, 1.21-1.82%. Improvement in CI compared to 2018-19 where survey data reported a range of 1.60-2.44%.
• Hispanic/Latino: CI range, 1.42-1.67%. Improvement in CI compared to 2018-19 where survey data reported a range of 2.12-2.52%.
• Asian: CI range, 4.59-6.34%. Slight decline in CI compared to 2018-19 where survey data reported a range of 2.65-5.87%. This variance is due to low population numbers (106 possible in 2019-20 and 136 in 2018-19).
• Two or more races: CI range,1.28-3.43%. Improvement in CI compared to 2018-19 where survey data reported a range of 2.94-3.77%.
• Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander: CI range, 3.39-10.72%. Improvement in CI compared to 2018-19 where survey data reported a range of 8.90-8.90%. This variance is due to low population numbers (12 possible surveys in 2019-20 and 19 in 2018-19).
• American Indian or Alaska Native: there were no families of children in this race/ethnicity group surveyed.

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

Since FFY 2013-14, TEIS has utilized the Early Childhood Outcomes Family Outcomes Survey Revised (ECO FOS-R) side B. 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 to be considered as having met the criteria for that particular sub-indicator. The lead agency continues to contract with East Tennessee State University (ETSU) to support the collection and analysis of survey data.

TEIS has worked the past six years to improve both its survey response rate and representativeness. In FFY 2017-18, the lead agency initiated a pilot in spring 2017 to study the feasibility of using an interview process with families as a means for collecting family outcome information. The pilot had positive results for both increasing the overall response rate and representativeness of respondents by population groups for participant families. Service coordinators who participated in the pilot recommended moving forward with this method of family outcomes data collection. As a result of the pilot, FFY 2018-19 utilized service coordinators to collect family outcomes data through various methodologies.

In January 2019, TEIS launched its new family outcomes data collection process called, Help Our Parents Excel (HOPE). TEIS service coordinators received training on 1) purpose of the survey, 2) data collection process, 3) survey methodology, 4) federal indicator 4: family outcomes, 5) ECO FOS-R survey instrument, 6) reliability and validity measures, and 7) potential for and minimizing bias.

Service coordinators collected family outcomes data for each family on their caseload with at least six months of service. Data were collected between January and April 2020. It is notable that face-to-face services were suspended in mid-March 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic, which unexpectedly eliminated in-person options for survey completion.

Service coordinators were allowed to use professional judgment regarding the timeframe and method most appropriate to the families on their caseload. Survey data were collected one time for each family during the collection timeframe. Surveys were available in English and Spanish. If other languages were needed, service coordinators were directed to the Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA) Center’s website for surveys in additional languages. The avenues were available for the completion of surveys include phone, mail, online, paper, and by service coordinator interview. The family may opt to utilize service coordinator direct support to complete the survey or they may prefer methods that communicate directly with ETSU. Due to necessity, completion via teleconference was also an option in the latter part of the collection window.

The lead agency is pleased to report that the revised process called HOPE has resulted in the following improvements:
• The statewide response rate for 2019-20 was 58.18%, which is the highest in TEIS history. This was an inc2018-19 was 36.54%, which is the highest in TEIS history. This was a 21.64% increase to the 2018-19 response rate of 36.54%. Prior to the HOPE process, response rates ranged from 9.22% to 25.91%.
• The representativeness of the survey improved in both the response rate for each population group and the confidence interval calculations for each group when comparing the data for the last two years to the years prior to the HOPE process (see representativeness section for additional information).
• Additionally, each service coordinator received a report for their caseload detailing the response rate, race/ethnic population breakdown of responses, results of each sub-indicator, and family comments from surveys.

Further details about the new family outcomes data collection process called, Help Our Parents Excel (HOPE) are available in the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III, Year 4 report on the TEIS website at https://www.tn.gov/didd/for-consumers/tennessee-early-intervention-system-teis/reports---data.html.

## 4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4 - OSEP Response

## 4 - Required Actions

# Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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)

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)) and Census (for the denominator).

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100.

**Instructions**

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State’s reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 0.74% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 0.89% | 0.89% | 0.89% | 0.89% | 0.89% |
| Data | 0.76% | 0.92% | 1.12% | 1.20% | 1.38% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 0.89% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Tennessee's state interagency coordinating council (SICC) is the primary stakeholder group for Tennessee's Early Intervention System (TEIS). Stakeholders consist of SICC members and visitors in attendance during quarterly meetings (i.e., TEIS staff, service providers, community).

The draft Annual Performance Report (APR) was formally reviewed with TEIS state leadership and other state personnel, December 17th. Late December, portions of the draft were sent for review by Tennessee’s OSEP state contact, Charles Kniseley. The draft APR was reviewed with the SICC Chairperson, January 21st, prior to its review with full SICC membership. Status of FFY 2019-20 data compared to federal and state targets was shared and discussed with SICC membership and attending visitors during the January 26th SICC meeting. Modifications to state targets were determined unnecessary for the upcoming fiscal year. Targets for FFY 2020-21 will remain the same as 2019 targets.

See attachments for a copy of the Annual Report Certification of the Interagency Coordinating Council under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

TEIS leadership established representative stakeholder groups in FFY 2015-16 to periodically access for feedback and/or input on various projects (e.g., TEIS operational procedure development, professional training development, State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) work). Committees were established through a self-nomination process with TEIS ensuring statewide coverage across several factors such as rural/urban and program size.

During 2019-20 the TEIS review committee met in August and October to provide input on a revised family assessment, and the three committees met jointly in December 2019 to provide input to TEIS on improvements to the data system. With TEIS’s transition to DIDD, the TEIS review committees were officially disbanded in May 2020. The new lead agency, DIDD is establishing more formal advisory groups to replace the stakeholder committees, starting with an Early Intervention Resource Agency (EIRA) Advisory Group, which took applications prior to TEIS’s transition but was not formalized until after July 1, 2020.

In addition to the stakeholder committees, throughout 2019-20 TEIS has utilized stakeholder input from the Tennessee Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (TNAAP) in supporting eligibility procedures. In December 2019, TNAAP worked with TEIS to form a committee of stakeholders, consisting of pediatricians, neonatologists, and other experts to provide input for expanding the TEIS diagnosis list for children with prenatal drug exposure. In March 2020, TNAAP pediatricians helped TEIS to develop an alternative method for eligibility evaluation that could be delivered remotely utilizing materials the parent would likely have in their homes. The pediatricians delivered the training to TEIS evaluators statewide and have been available to support any ongoing follow-up needed.

In addition, a small group of EIRA directors provided assistance in developing procedures for modifying ongoing assessment using the Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System (AEPS) remotely to collect ongoing progress and early childhood outcomes data from families using teleconference technology. This new methodology was deployed in May 2020.

In March 2019, the TEIS newsletter changed from once a month to twice monthly in order to provide more regular information to stakeholders, particularly through the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, TEIS added weekly calls with providers in March, which switched to bi-weekly. These calls provide an opportunity for providers to share information, ask questions, and discuss service delivery.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/08/2020 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs | 1,186 |
| Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin | 06/25/2020 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 | 79,775 |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs** | **Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,186 | 79,775 | 1.38% | 0.89% | 1.49% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Compare your results to the national data**

The national average for FFY 2019-20 for this indicator is 1.37%. The lead agency exceeded the national average, with a percentage of 1.49% of infants served by TEIS.

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

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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)

**Data Source**

Data collected under IDEA section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)) and Census (for the denominator).

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100.

**Instructions**

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State’s reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

## 6 - Indicator Data

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 1.80% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 2.37% | 2.37% | 2.37% | 2.37% | 2.37% |
| Data | 1.83% | 2.08% | 2.34% | 2.77% | 3.17% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 2.37% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Tennessee's state interagency coordinating council (SICC) is the primary stakeholder group for Tennessee's Early Intervention System (TEIS). Stakeholders consist of SICC members and visitors in attendance during quarterly meetings (i.e., TEIS staff, service providers, community).

The draft Annual Performance Report (APR) was formally reviewed with TEIS state leadership and other state personnel, December 17th. Late December, portions of the draft were sent for review by Tennessee’s OSEP state contact, Charles Kniseley. The draft APR was reviewed with the SICC Chairperson, January 21st, prior to its review with full SICC membership. Status of FFY 2019-20 data compared to federal and state targets was shared and discussed with SICC membership and attending visitors during the January 26th SICC meeting. Modifications to state targets were determined unnecessary for the upcoming fiscal year. Targets for FFY 2020-21 will remain the same as 2019 targets.

See attachments for a copy of the Annual Report Certification of the Interagency Coordinating Council under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

TEIS leadership established representative stakeholder groups in FFY 2015-16 to periodically access for feedback and/or input on various projects (e.g., TEIS operational procedure development, professional training development, State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) work). Committees were established through a self-nomination process with TEIS ensuring statewide coverage across several factors such as rural/urban and program size.

During 2019-20 the TEIS review committee met in August and October to provide input on a revised family assessment, and the three committees met jointly in December 2019 to provide input to TEIS on improvements to the data system. With TEIS’s transition to DIDD, the TEIS review committees were officially disbanded in May 2020. The new lead agency, DIDD is establishing more formal advisory groups to replace the stakeholder committees, starting with an Early Intervention Resource Agency (EIRA) Advisory Group, which took applications prior to TEIS’s transition but was not formalized until after July 1, 2020.

In addition to the stakeholder committees, throughout 2019-20 TEIS has utilized stakeholder input from the Tennessee Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (TNAAP) in supporting eligibility procedures. In December 2019, TNAAP worked with TEIS to form a committee of stakeholders, consisting of pediatricians, neonatologists, and other experts to provide input for expanding the TEIS diagnosis list for children with prenatal drug exposure. In March 2020, TNAAP pediatricians helped TEIS to develop an alternative method for eligibility evaluation that could be delivered remotely utilizing materials the parent would likely have in their homes. The pediatricians delivered the training to TEIS evaluators statewide and have been available to support any ongoing follow-up needed.

In addition, a small group of EIRA directors provided assistance in developing procedures for modifying ongoing assessment using the Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System (AEPS) remotely to collect ongoing progress and early childhood outcomes data from families using teleconference technology. This new methodology was deployed in May 2020.

In March 2019, the TEIS newsletter changed from once a month to twice monthly in order to provide more regular information to stakeholders, particularly through the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, TEIS added weekly calls with providers in March, which switched to bi-weekly. These calls provide an opportunity for providers to share information, ask questions, and discuss service delivery.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/08/2020 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs | 8,307 |
| Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin | 06/25/2020 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3 | 242,190 |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs** | **Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 8,307 | 242,190 | 3.17% | 2.37% | 3.43% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Compare your results to the national data**

The national average for FFY 2019-20 for this indicator is 3.70%. While the number of infants and toddlers served continues to increase, the lead agency did not meet the national average with the percentage of 3.43% infants and toddlers served by TEIS.

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

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

## 6 - Required Actions

# Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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)

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must address the timeline from point of referral to initial IFSP meeting based on actual, not an average, number of days.

**Measurement**

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) divided by the (# of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted)] times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.

**Instructions**

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child’s record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 86.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 97.06% | 98.78% | 99.08% | 98.66% | 98.32% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5,998 | 7,154 | 98.32% | 100% | 99.16% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**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" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.**

1,096

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

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 2019-June 30, 2020

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

Census data from the Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) were used to determine the percent of Part C eligible infants and toddlers who had eligibility determination and initial Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) development within 45 days of referral into Tennessee's Early Intervention System (TEIS).

The Statistical Analyst 3 (SA3) pulled data from TEIDS. Data were researched by three statistical analyst 2s (SA2s) for reasons where meetings were untimely. SA2s provided researched data to assigned TEIS Point of Entry (POE) district leadership for review before the SA3 compiled and submitted final indicator reports to the Part C monitoring coordinator and district leadership. Data accounted for reasons for untimely initial IFSP meetings (i.e., exceptional family circumstances or system).

Documented exceptional family circumstances for delays in timely eligibility determination and initial IFSP development include: difficulty in locating or contacting family upon receipt of referral into TEIS, child/family sickness, family’s preferred schedule, family vacation/holiday, delay in receiving medical records when requested timely, family “no show” for a timely scheduled appointment/meeting with developmental evaluator or service coordinator, weather related events (e.g., snow, ice, tornado, flood), state or local disaster recovery (e.g., flood, tornado, ice storm), state or national pandemic (e.g., Coronavirus/COVID-19).

System issues for delays include: developmental evaluator or service coordinator delay in contacting family and/or completing intake upon receipt of referral into TEIS, delay in TEIS requesting medical records, delay in scheduling a developmental evaluation, delay in scheduling initial IFSP meeting after eligibility has been determined, poor planning of the service coordinator around approved leave or state holidays, lack of documentation about the reason for delay.

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

COVID-19 did not impact the state’s ability to collect data required for this indicator nor did it impact data completeness, validity, and reliability for this indicator. The same process was used as described in section, “Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period” for the collection of data used for annual monitoring and the development of the FFY 2019-20 APR.

An additional column was added to the data research template used by statistical analyst 2s (SA2s) to capture information about COVID-19 impact on untimely eligibility determination and initial IFSP development in the analysis of data. The first case of COVID-19 was diagnosed on March 5 in Tennessee.

TEIS used OSEP guidance to code untimely meetings as “untimely/ exceptional family circumstances” when documentation was found in the child’s record (TEIDS) that the untimely eligibility determination and/or initial IFSP development were due to COVID-19. If there was any question about documentation, the coding of “Yes” for COVID-19 impact was not used.

Breakdown of exceptional family circumstances data for FFY 2019-20:
# of delays not due to COVID-19: 680
# and (%) of delays due to COVID-19: 416 (37.96%)
Total # of delays: 1,096

Breakdown of exceptional family circumstances due to COVID-19 by eligibility determinization and IFSP development:
Untimely eligibility determination: 289 (26.37%)
Timely eligibility determination / untimely Initial IFSP meeting: 127 (11.59%)
Total # due to COVID-19: 416

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

In FFY 18 there were two findings of noncompliance identified for indicator 7. No findings were issued through dispute resolution processes. There were no focused monitoring activities planned or initiated from a concern brought to TEIS leadership.

Two of the nine EIS programs had a finding of noncompliance issued in 2018 (FFY 2018-19) through annual monitoring (monitoring cycle FFY 2017-18). The two findings were corrected timely (i.e., as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from the written notice of finding). The Part C monitoring coordinator verified the two programs were correctly implementing regulatory requirements for initial IFSP development through a review of subsequent monthly data in TEIDS, demonstrating 100% compliance. All children had timely initial IFSP development (prong 2 correction).

For the other seven EIS programs, one program reported 100% compliance for the fiscal year, and six programs had pre-finding correction.

For the six programs with pre-finding correction, the Part C monitoring coordinator verified the programs were correctly implementing regulatory requirements through a review of subsequent monthly data in TEIDS demonstrating 100% compliance prior to the issuance of written findings of noncompliance. All children had timely initial IFSP meetings. (prong 2, pre-finding correction).

Pre-finding correction for prong 2 occurs by verifying subsequent monthly census data in TEIDS demonstrating 100% compliance for timely initial IFSP meetings prior to the the issuance of written findings of noncompliance. Refer to Introduction: General Supervision System regarding how TEIS ensures EIS programs are correctly implementing regulatory requirements and for information about pre-finding correction.

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

Two of the nine EIS programs had a finding of noncompliance issued in 2018 (FFY 2018-19) through annual monitoring (monitoring cycle FFY 2017-18). The two findings were corrected timely (i.e., as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from the written notice of finding). The Part C monitoring coordinator verified there was no remaining child-level noncompliance in fiscal year data. All children had initial IFSP development, however late. There was no child-level noncompliance found in subsequent monthly data reviewed when verifying correction for the indicator. Data demonstrated 100% compliance. All individual children had timely initial IFSP development (prong 1 correction).

For the other seven EIS programs, one program reported 100% compliance for the fiscal year, and six programs had pre-finding correction.

For the six programs with pre-finding correction, the Part C monitoring coordinator verified programs had no remaining no child-level noncompliance in fiscal year data. All individual children had initial IFSP development, however late. There was no child-level noncompliance found in subsequent monthly data reviewed prior to the issuance of written findings of noncompliance. Data demonstrated 100% compliance. All individual children had timely initial IFSP development (prong 1, pre-finding correction).

Pre-finding correction for prong 1 occurs by verifying that fiscal year and subsequent monthly census data contain no child-level noncompliance prior to the issuance of a written finding of noncompliance. Refer to Introduction: General Supervision System regarding how TEIS ensures there is no individual child-level noncompliance and for information about pre-finding correction.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

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

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

## 7 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

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

# Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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)

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have 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 their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred 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) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

**Instructions**

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

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

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child’s record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to “opt-out” of the referral. Under the State’s opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State’s Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 100.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 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)**

YES

| **Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services** | **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7,496 | 7,496 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**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” field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.**

0

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

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 2019-June 30, 2020

**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 Individual Family Service Plans (IFSPs) 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 at subsequent IFSP meetings, including the formal Local Education Agency (LEA) transition planning conference.

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

COVID-19 did not impact the state’s ability to collect data required for this indicator nor did it impact data completeness, validity, and reliability for this indicator. The same process was used as described in section, “Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period” for the collection of data used for annual monitoring and the development of the FFY 2019-20 APR.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

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

## 8A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8A - OSEP Response

## 8A - Required Actions

# Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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)

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have 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 their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred 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) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

**Instructions**

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

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

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child’s record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to “opt-out” of the referral. Under the State’s opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State’s Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8B - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 81.18% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 99.00% | 99.96% | 99.83% | 99.97% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA**

YES

| **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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4,527 | 4,527 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**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" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.**

0

**Describe the method used to collect these data**

Monthly data were 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 who are potentially eligible for part B, 619 special education preschool services. Contact information for these children is 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 service.

**Do you have a written opt-out policy? (yes/no)**

NO

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

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, 2019-June 30, 2020

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

For FFY 2019 (2019-20), the monthly notification process was found sufficient in implementing requirements for SEA/LEA notification. All toddlers who were potentially eligible for Part B had timely SEA/LEA notification.

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

COVID-19 did not impact the state’s ability to collect data required for this indicator nor did it impact data completeness, validity, and reliability for this indicator. The same process was used as described in section, “Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period” for the collection of data used for annual monitoring and the development of the FFY 2019-20 APR. There were no interruptions to the monthly notification process to the SEA and LEAs due to COVID-19.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

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

## 8B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8B - OSEP Response

## 8B - Required Actions

# Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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)

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have 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 their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred 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) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

**Instructions**

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

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

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child’s record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to “opt-out” of the referral. Under the State’s opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State’s Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8C - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 88.08% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 98.05% | 98.66% | 99.51% | 98.25% | 99.12% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 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)**

YES

| **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred 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** | **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3,285 | 4,527 | 99.12% | 100% | 98.66% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**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" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.**

659

**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 not more than nine months prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.**
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**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

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, 2019-June 30, 2020

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

Census data from the Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) were used to determine the percent of Part C eligible toddlers who had timely Local Education Agency (LEA) transition planning conferences with parent consent.

The Statistical Analyst 3 (SA3) pulled data from TEIDS for 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).. Data were researched by three statistical analyst 2s (SA2s) for reasons where meetings were untimely. SA2s provided researched data to assigned TEIS Point of Entry (POE) district leadership for review before the SA3 compiled and submitted final indicator reports to the Part C monitoring coordinator and district leadership. Data accounted for reasons for untimely LEA transition planning conferences (i.e., exceptional family circumstances or system).

Documented exceptional family circumstances for delays in timely Local Education Agency (LEA) transition conferences include: child/family sickness, family vacation/holiday, family’s preferred schedule, family “no show” for a timely scheduled meeting, weather related events (e.g., snow, ice, tornado, flood), state or local disaster recovery (e.g., flood, tornado, ice storm), state or national pandemic (e.g., Coronavirus/COVID-19).

System issues for delays include service coordinator delay in contacting the LEA to schedule a conference, availability issues with LEAs to meet (e.g., spring/summer, availability of personnel for the needed number of meetings), lack of documentation about the reason for delay.

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

COVID-19 did not impact the state’s ability to collect data required for this indicator nor did it impact data completeness, validity, and reliability for this indicator. The same process was used as described in section, “Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period” for the collection of data used for annual monitoring and the development of the FFY 2019-20 APR.

An additional column was added to the data research template used by statistical analyst 2s (SA2s) to capture information about COVID-19 impact on untimely transition planning conferences in the analysis of data. The first case of COVID-19 was diagnosed on March 5 in Tennessee.

TEIS used OSEP guidance to code untimely or missed meetings as “untimely/ exceptional family circumstances” when documentation was found in the child’s record (TEIDS) that the untimely or missed transition planning conferences were due to COVID-19. If there was any question about documentation, the coding of “Yes” for COVID-19 impact was not used.

Breakdown of exceptional family circumstances data for FFY 2019-20:
# of delays or missed meetings not due to COVID-19: 475
# and (%) of delays or missed meetings due to COVID-19: 56 (10.55%)
Total # of delays or missed meetings: 531

Breakdown of exceptional family circumstances due to COVID-19 by delays or missed transition planning meetings:
Untimely transition planning meetings: 48 (9.40%)
Missed transition planning meetings: 8 (1.51%)
Total # untimely or missed transition planning meetings due to COVID-19: 56

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

In FFY 18 there was one finding of noncompliance identified for indicator 8C. No findings were issued through dispute resolution processes. There were no focused monitoring activities planned or initiated from a concern brought to TEIS leadership.

One of the nine EIS programs had a finding of noncompliance issued in 2018 (FFY 2018-19) through annual monitoring (monitoring cycle FFY 2017-18). The finding was corrected timely (i.e., as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from the written notice of finding). The Part C monitoring coordinator verified the program was correctly implementing regulatory requirements for LEA transition conferences through a review of subsequent monthly data in TEIDS, demonstrating 100% compliance. All children had timely LEA transition conferences (prong 2 correction).

For the other eight EIS programs, one program reported 100% compliance for the fiscal year, and seven programs had pre-finding correction.

For the seven programs with pre-finding correction, the Part C monitoring coordinator verified programs were correctly implementing regulatory requirements through a review of subsequent monthly data in TEIDS demonstrating 100% compliance prior to the issuance of written findings of noncompliance. All children had timely LEA transition conferences. (prong 2, pre-finding correction).

Pre-finding correction for prong 2 occurs by verifying subsequent monthly census data in TEIDS demonstrating 100% compliance for timely LEA transition planning conferences prior to the the issuance of written findings of noncompliance. Refer to Introduction: General Supervision System regarding how TEIS ensures EIS programs are correctly implementing regulatory requirements and for information about pre-finding correction.

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

One nine EIS programs had a finding of noncompliance issued in 2018 (FFY 2018-19) through annual monitoring (monitoring cycle FFY 2017-18). The finding was corrected timely (i.e., as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from the written notice of finding). The Part C monitoring coordinator verified there was no remaining child-level noncompliance in fiscal year data. All children had LEA transition planning conferences, however late. There was no individual child-level noncompliance found in subsequent monthly data reviewed when verifying correction for the indicator. Data demonstrated 100% compliance. All individual children had timely LEA transition conferences (prong 1 correction).

For the other eight EIS programs, one program reported 100% compliance for the fiscal year, and seven programs had pre-finding correction.

For the seven programs with pre-finding correction, the Part C monitoring coordinator verified the programs had no remaining no child-level noncompliance in fiscal year data. All individual children had timely LEA transition conferences. There was no child-level noncompliance found in subsequent monthly data reviewed prior to the issuance of written findings of noncompliance. Data demonstrated 100% compliance. All individual children had timely LEA transition planning conferences (prong 1, pre-finding correction).

Pre-finding correction for prong 1 occurs by verifying that fiscal year and subsequent monthly census data contain no child-level noncompliance prior to the issuance of a written finding of noncompliance. Refer to Introduction: General Supervision System regarding how TEIS ensures there is no individual child-level noncompliance and for information about pre-finding correction.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

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

## 8C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8C - OSEP Response

## 8C - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

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

# Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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)

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

This indicator is not applicable to a State that has adopted Part C due process procedures under section 639 of the IDEA.

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

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

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

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Select yes to use target ranges.**

Target Range not used

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

NO

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/04/2020 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/04/2020 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 0 |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Tennessee's state interagency coordinating council (SICC) is the primary stakeholder group for Tennessee's Early Intervention System (TEIS). Stakeholders consist of SICC members and visitors in attendance during quarterly meetings (i.e., TEIS staff, service providers, community).

The draft Annual Performance Report (APR) was formally reviewed with TEIS state leadership and other state personnel, December 17th. Late December, portions of the draft were sent for review by Tennessee’s OSEP state contact, Charles Kniseley. The draft APR was reviewed with the SICC Chairperson, January 21st, prior to its review with full SICC membership. Status of FFY 2019-20 data compared to federal and state targets was shared and discussed with SICC membership and attending visitors during the January 26th SICC meeting. Modifications to state targets were determined unnecessary for the upcoming fiscal year. Targets for FFY 2020-21 will remain the same as 2019 targets.

See attachments for a copy of the Annual Report Certification of the Interagency Coordinating Council under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

TEIS leadership established representative stakeholder groups in FFY 2015-16 to periodically access for feedback and/or input on various projects (e.g., TEIS operational procedure development, professional training development, State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) work). Committees were established through a self-nomination process with TEIS ensuring statewide coverage across several factors such as rural/urban and program size.

During 2019-20 the TEIS review committee met in August and October to provide input on a revised family assessment, and the three committees met jointly in December 2019 to provide input to TEIS on improvements to the data system. With TEIS’s transition to DIDD, the TEIS review committees were officially disbanded in May 2020. The new lead agency, DIDD is establishing more formal advisory groups to replace the stakeholder committees, starting with an Early Intervention Resource Agency (EIRA) Advisory Group, which took applications prior to TEIS’s transition but was not formalized until after July 1, 2020.

In addition to the stakeholder committees, throughout 2019-20 TEIS has utilized stakeholder input from the Tennessee Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (TNAAP) in supporting eligibility procedures. In December 2019, TNAAP worked with TEIS to form a committee of stakeholders, consisting of pediatricians, neonatologists, and other experts to provide input for expanding the TEIS diagnosis list for children with prenatal drug exposure. In March 2020, TNAAP pediatricians helped TEIS to develop an alternative method for eligibility evaluation that could be delivered remotely utilizing materials the parent would likely have in their homes. The pediatricians delivered the training to TEIS evaluators statewide and have been available to support any ongoing follow-up needed.

In addition, a small group of EIRA directors provided assistance in developing procedures for modifying ongoing assessment using the Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System (AEPS) remotely to collect ongoing progress and early childhood outcomes data from families using teleconference technology. This new methodology was deployed in May 2020.

In March 2019, the TEIS newsletter changed from once a month to twice monthly in order to provide more regular information to stakeholders, particularly through the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, TEIS added weekly calls with providers in March, which switched to bi-weekly. These calls provide an opportunity for providers to share information, ask questions, and discuss service delivery.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target>= |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target>= | 0.00% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 |  | 0.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

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

There were no resolution sessions held during FFY 2019-20. States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10.

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2019. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

## 9 - Required Actions

# Indicator 10: Mediation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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)

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range not used

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

NO

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1 Mediations held | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 0 |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Tennessee's state interagency coordinating council (SICC) is the primary stakeholder group for Tennessee's Early Intervention System (TEIS). Stakeholders consist of SICC members and visitors in attendance during quarterly meetings (i.e., TEIS staff, service providers, community).

The draft Annual Performance Report (APR) was formally reviewed with TEIS state leadership and other state personnel, December 17th. Late December, portions of the draft were sent for review by Tennessee’s OSEP state contact, Charles Kniseley. The draft APR was reviewed with the SICC Chairperson, January 21st, prior to its review with full SICC membership. Status of FFY 2019-20 data compared to federal and state targets was shared and discussed with SICC membership and attending visitors during the January 26th SICC meeting. Modifications to state targets were determined unnecessary for the upcoming fiscal year. Targets for FFY 2020-21 will remain the same as 2019 targets.

See attachments for a copy of the Annual Report Certification of the Interagency Coordinating Council under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

TEIS leadership established representative stakeholder groups in FFY 2015-16 to periodically access for feedback and/or input on various projects (e.g., TEIS operational procedure development, professional training development, State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) work). Committees were established through a self-nomination process with TEIS ensuring statewide coverage across several factors such as rural/urban and program size.

During 2019-20 the TEIS review committee met in August and October to provide input on a revised family assessment, and the three committees met jointly in December 2019 to provide input to TEIS on improvements to the data system. With TEIS’s transition to DIDD, the TEIS review committees were officially disbanded in May 2020. The new lead agency, DIDD is establishing more formal advisory groups to replace the stakeholder committees, starting with an Early Intervention Resource Agency (EIRA) Advisory Group, which took applications prior to TEIS’s transition but was not formalized until after July 1, 2020.

In addition to the stakeholder committees, throughout 2019-20 TEIS has utilized stakeholder input from the Tennessee Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (TNAAP) in supporting eligibility procedures. In December 2019, TNAAP worked with TEIS to form a committee of stakeholders, consisting of pediatricians, neonatologists, and other experts to provide input for expanding the TEIS diagnosis list for children with prenatal drug exposure. In March 2020, TNAAP pediatricians helped TEIS to develop an alternative method for eligibility evaluation that could be delivered remotely utilizing materials the parent would likely have in their homes. The pediatricians delivered the training to TEIS evaluators statewide and have been available to support any ongoing follow-up needed.

In addition, a small group of EIRA directors provided assistance in developing procedures for modifying ongoing assessment using the Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System (AEPS) remotely to collect ongoing progress and early childhood outcomes data from families using teleconference technology. This new methodology was deployed in May 2020.

In March 2019, the TEIS newsletter changed from once a month to twice monthly in order to provide more regular information to stakeholders, particularly through the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, TEIS added weekly calls with providers in March, which switched to bi-weekly. These calls provide an opportunity for providers to share information, ask questions, and discuss service delivery.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target>= |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data |  |  | 100.00% | 0.00% |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target>= | 0.00% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints** | **2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints** | **2.1 Number of mediations held** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

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

There were no mediations held during FFY 2019-20. States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10.

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2019. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

## 10 - Required Actions

# Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan



# Certification

**Instructions**

**Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.**

**Certify**

**I certify that I am the Director of the State's Lead Agency under Part C of the IDEA, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.**

**Select the certifier’s role**

Designated Lead Agency Director

**Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.**

**Name:**

Catherine Goodwin

**Title:**

Part C Monitoring Coordinator

**Email:**

catherine.goodwin@tn.gov

**Phone:**

615-253-4521

**Submitted on:**

04/22/21 3:30:58 PM

# ED attachments

  