

TN Part C, State Annual Performance Report



State of Tennessee Department of Education Division of Special Education 2005 – 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview..... 3
INDICATOR 1..... 4
Timeliness of Services
INDICATOR 2..... 9
Natural Environments
INDICATOR 3..... 12
Child Outcomes
INDICATOR 4..... 20
Family Outcomes
INDICATOR 5..... 25
Birth to One Comparison Data
INDICATOR 6..... 29
Birth through Two Comparison Data
INDICATOR 7..... 34
Timeliness of IFSPs
INDICATOR 8..... 39
Timeliness of Transitions
INDICATOR 9..... 51
Statewide Monitoring of Corrections and Noncompliance
INDICATOR 10..... 81
Timeliness of Written Complaints
INDICATOR 11..... 83
Timeliness of Due Process Hearings
INDICATOR 12..... 84
Resolution Sessions
INDICATOR 13..... 85
Mediation Agreements
INDICATOR 14..... 86
Timeliness and Accuracy of State Reported Data

ATTACHMENTS

3.1 TN Child Outcome Summary Form at Entrance Directions for Completion..... 90
3.2 Tennessee Child Outcomes Summary Form at Entrance.....91
4.1 TEIS Survey Introduction Letter to Parents..... 92
4.2 NCSEAM Survey.....93
10.1 Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part C of the IDEA 2005-2006 Data.....98

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The Part C, IDEA State Performance Plan (SPP) for Tennessee was developed in conjunction with and approved by the State's Interagency Coordinating Council.

In order to complete this document:

1. Data was gathered from the Federal Data Reports, state data reports, state and federal statistical analysis reports, parent surveys, monitoring information, advocacy and parent groups. The Office of Data Services reformatted the information into tables that could be used for completion of the indicators.
2. The SPP Chairperson was asked to be responsible for the overall completion and submission of the document.
3. Each Cluster was assigned a chairperson for overall management and accountability as well as specific timelines for completion.
4. Each indicator was assigned a primary person who was responsible for core communication with the stakeholders of that group and ensuring that all information and suggestions were considered in the development and finalization of that indicator. Division personnel were assigned to various indicators and personnel from other departments, were asked to be a part of the various indicator groups, as needed.
5. Deadlines for review dates, draft presentations and meetings were established along with determining who should be in attendance at each meeting.
6. Meetings were held on a regular basis with the cluster and indicator chairpersons to ask and answer questions, review data and indicator progress of various indicators and clarify any issues.
7. The Annual Performance Plan document was then presented to the State Interagency Coordinating Council Chair Person on January 24, 2007, for approval prior to being submitted to OSEP. The chairperson's recommended edits were incorporated into the final submission.
8. In addition to the regular meetings, some of the indicator groups had additional meetings.
9. This APR and updated SPP will be made available to the public throughout the state via our website, <http://tennessee.gov/education/speced/TEIS/tools.htm> . These reports will provide the public with Tennessee's progress and/or slippage pertaining to the Targets located in the SPP. The public will also be made aware of the status of each Early Intervention Service Program's performance as they relate to the Targets located in the SPP.
10. The public will be made aware of the status of each Early Intervention Service Program's performance as it relates to the Targets located in Tennessee's SPP. Tennessee's Program Improvement Plan Tracker (PIP Tracker) provides the status of compliance for the most recent APR submission as well as the history from the original submission of the Self- Assessment/Program Improvement Plan of each reporting agency. Agency PIP Trackers will be posted via our website: <http://tennessee.gov/education/speced/TEIS/tools.htm> .

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 1: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

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

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.

91% = 483 / 531 x100

This percentage accounts for untimely receipt of services.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|-----------|---|
| 2005-2006 | Data from all TEIS Districts will indicate that a minimum of 100% of all early intervention services are provided in a timely manner. |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005-2006:

Tennessee has defined “timely” as no longer than 30 calendar days from parent consent for a particular service. For purposes of this report, the Lead Agency collected data through two avenues to address this indicator: (1) Focused record review; and (2) Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) report data from Cohort 1.

1. A focused review was conducted in November/December 2006 to collect data to address this indicator. This process consisted of a review of 15% of records for children with an initial IFSP in each of the nine TEIS Point of Entry (POE) offices. The 15% was calculated based on services which were paid for by the TEIS POE, either as “Payor of Last Resort” or “Sole Payor”. Records consisted of children who had an initial IFSP conducted in the time frame of 7/1/2005 – 6/30/2006. Two critical time-elements were used when extracting records for this review:
 - Date of written parent consent for the specific service (date IFSP was signed), that authorized, and
 - Date the specified service was first delivered.

The review involved a targeted-random sampling approach in the section of the records. Depending on the numbers, a minimum of one record from each county in a TEIS district was included to ensure all counties were covered in the review. The records were then selected through a web-based random sampling mechanism (<http://www.randomizer.org/form.htm>). By ensuring all counties were included in this review the actual record review size => than 15%. Refer to Tables 1.1 and 1.2 for results of the focused review.

The reviewer will note that the percentage of records reviewed for the focused review is an increase of 10% from the SPP submitted December 2005. There was a change in monitoring personnel in March 2006 and when process/procedures were reviewed for data collection, it was believed 15% would be a more sound data collection size.

2. Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) indicator 7.1.A addresses the provision of services in accordance with the IFSP. Guidance (9), a critical element for this indicator, specifically addresses the issue of timeliness of service delivery. All programs completing CIMP reports (Self-Assessment or Annual Performance Report) must

address this issue. Where the delivery of services has been found to be longer than 30 days, reporting entities are required to account for reason of delay – family reasons or provider issues. CIMP data for this report was taken from Cohort 1. Cohort 1 consists of three districts - First Tennessee (FT), Greater Nashville (GN), and Northwest (NW), for 18 programs. Programs include the three TEIS POEs and 15 early intervention providers. Cohort 1 have completed the full process of TN's revised monitoring system through the submission a self-assessment/program improvement plan (PIP) and subsequent annual performance reports (APR) from which status of noncompliance correction can be tracked. For additional information regarding TN's monitoring system see the Revised SPP (2/1/07) Indicator 9.

Table 1.1: Percent of Early Intervention Services Delivered in a Timely Manner by Service

| Services Identified Through Focused IFSP Review | # of Children per Service Identified | # and (%) Services Delivered Timely | # and (%) Services Delivered in a Timely Manner Omitting Family Reasons for Delay |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Assistive Technology | 11 | 10 (91%) | 10 (91%) |
| Audiology | 5 | 3 (60%) | 5 (100%) |
| Family Training | 24 | 21 (88%) | 22 (92%) |
| Occupational Therapy | 61 | 51 (84%) | 55 (90%) |
| Physical Therapy | 65 | 53 (82%) | 58 (89%) |
| Psychological Services | 4 | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) |
| Special Instruction | 57 | 48 (84%) | 54 (95%) |
| Speech Language | 244 | 208 (85%) | 221 (91%) |
| Transportation | 29 | 25 (86%) | 27 (93%) |
| Vision | 1 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other EI | 30 | 26 (87%) | 27 (90%) |
| Total | 531 | 449 (85%) | 483 (91%) |

Table 1.1 reflects the results of the statewide focused IFSP review regarding timely delivery of early intervention services. This table includes unduplicated services for which the TEIS POEs were found to be either "payor of last resort" or "sole payor"; the number of children whose IFSPs authorized those services; and the number/(percentage) of services delivered timely without and than with omitting family reasons for delay. Totals were calculated by the following formula: total number of early intervention service(s) provided 'timely' and then 'timely omitting family reasons' divided by the total number of children receiving those service(s).

Table 1.2: Percent of Early Intervention Services Delivered in a Timely Manner by TEIS District

| TEIS District | # of Children | # and (%) Services Delivered Timely | # and (%) Services Delivered in a Timely Manner Omitting Family Reasons for Delay |
|-------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| FT* | 15 | 10 (67%) | 12 (80%) |
| ET | 84 | 68 (81%) | 76 (90%) |
| SE | 18 | 18 (100%) | 18 (100%) |
| UC | 51 | 44 (86%) | 46 (90%) |
| GN* | 157 | 123 (78%) | 138 (88%) |
| SC | 140 | 133 (95%) | 134 (96%) |
| NW* | 13 | 11 (85%) | 12 (92%) |
| SW | 14 | 9 (64%) | 13 (93%) |
| MD | 39 | 33 (85%) | 34 (87%) |
| Statewide Totals | 531 | 449 (85%) | 483 (91%) |

Table 1.2 reflects the results of the focused IFSP review regarding timely delivery of early intervention services by the nine TEIS districts, including state totals. This table identifies each TEIS district with an "*" denoting Cohort 1 districts for which there is also monitoring compliance data reflected in Table 1.4. By district, the Table identifies the number of children's records reviewed where TEIS POEs were found to be either "payor of last resort" or "sole payor" and the number/(percentage) of services delivered timely without and than with omitting family reasons for delay.

Table 1.3: Reasons of delay regarding timely service delivery

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

| Reasons | # and % |
|--------------|------------------|
| 1. Family | 34 (41%) |
| 2. Provider | 48 (58%) |
| Total | 82 (100%) |

Table 1.3 reflects results for overall of reasons for delay for the services reported untimely in preceding Tables 1.1 and 1.2. Family issues include: sickness, vacation, preference, etc. Provider issues include: availability, obtaining physician orders and/or insurance approval, etc.

Table 1.4: CIMP Data for Cohort 1 regarding Compliance with Timely Delivery of Early Intervention Services

| District | # and (%) Findings of Noncompliance Self-Assessment: 4/15/05 | # Corrections <1 Year from Identification APR 1: 3/1/06 | # Corrections =1 Year from Identification APR 2: 12/15/06 | # and (%) of Continued Findings of Noncompliance |
|-----------------|--|---|---|--|
| FT | 1 (6%) | 1 | | 0 (0%) |
| GN | 4 (22%) | 2 | 1 | 1 (6%) |
| NW | 1 (6%) | 0 | 0 | 1 (6%) |
| Cohort 1 | 6/18 (33%) | 3 | 2 | 2/18 (11%) |
| Totals | 12/18 (67%) compliant (0 Programs N/A) | | | 16/18 (89%) compliant (0 Programs N/A) |

Table 1.4 reports district monitoring data contained in CIMP reports for Cohort 1. The Table also reflects a statewide summary for the number/(percentage) across findings and corrections.

Discussion of Data:

The Lead Agency reports progress towards compliance for this indicator. The Statewide percentage of early intervention services received in a timely manner increased from 78% as reported in the 2005 SPP to 91% reported in this APR. Services were provided timely, omitting family reasons, 89% of the time or greater for all services identified through the focused review with the exception of vision services for one child due to a provider issue. Provider issues accounted for greater than half (58%) of the reasons for delay in timely delivery of services while family reasons accounted for 41% of the delay. A comparison of information from Table 1.2 and Table 1.4 reveals similar data regarding the percentage of timely delivery of early intervention services. Table 1.2 reports 91% for timely delivery of services where CIMP data (Cohort 1) in Table 1.4 reports 89% timely delivery of services. Further data analysis was conducted for Cohort 1 regarding the two programs with continued issues of noncompliance. The two TEIS POE offices (GN and NW) did not demonstrate correction within one year of identification of noncompliance. Program Improvement Plans were included in their CIMP reports to address this issue. The other 4 programs (1 TEIS POE, 1 EIRA, and 2 DMRS) had timely correction of this issue.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005-2006:

| Activities/Resources | Timelines | Resources | Activity Status 2005-2006 |
|---|--------------|--|--|
| Disseminate information regarding timeliness of service provision (30 days from parent signature on IFSP) by posting SPP Report on State's website for public access. Inform community through upcoming 9 District LICC meetings when SPP has been posted for access and use in their CIMP activities. | January 2006 | Public Awareness Coordinator, DSE TA Staff, State Parent Organizations | SPP was posted on the State's website January 2006. TN's definition of "timely services" was communicated to TEIS POEs and District LICCs through regularly scheduled meetings by DSE personnel. CIMP documents were updated with information. Attention was drawn to new information during |

| | | | |
|---|---------------------|---|--|
| | | | annual statewide CIMP trainings held between May and August 2006. |
| Improve procedures for on-going tracking of performance data for timeliness of service delivery. This will include modification of current data system, incorporating tracking element in the upcoming TEIDS data system and monitoring submissions of local Program Improvement Plans (PIP) and Annual Performance Report (APR). | Begin December 2005 | TEIDS Coordinator, TEIS Technical Project, DSE Monitoring Coordinator | Work by the TEIDS development team was done to ensure reporting mechanism is developed in the new data system. The implementation of the system begins December 2006. TEIDS will have the capacity to collect data regardless of IFSP type. Service providers will input attendance data related to early services for which they are responsible. Full implementation of data system by early intervention service providers begins January 2007. See previous "activity" for information regarding CIMP documents and training. Began tracking the specific issue of timeliness through March-April 2006 CIMP report submissions. |
| Revised State Monitoring procedures to require the reporting of timeliness for service provision through submission of PIPs and APRs. | December 2005 | DSE and DMRS TA Staff | See previous "activity" for information regarding status. Monitoring entities are provided with a report from the validation team indicting final status of compliance from which they have 1 year for correction of noncompliance. |

Discussion of Progress

The Lead Agency reports progress towards compliance for this indicator. The Statewide percentage of early intervention services received in a timely manner increased from 78% as reported in the 2005 SPP to 91% reported in this APR. Services were provided timely, omitting family reasons, 89% of the time or greater for all services identified through the focused review with the exception of vision services for one child due to a provider issue. Provider issues accounted for greater than half (58%) of the reasons for delay in timely delivery of services while family reasons accounted for 41% of the delay. A comparison of information from Table 1.2 and Table 1.4 reveals similar data regarding the percentage of timely delivery of early intervention services. Table 1.2 reports 91% for timely delivery of services where CIMP data (Cohort 1) in Table 1.4 reports 89% timely delivery of services. Further data analysis was conducted for Cohort 1 regarding the two programs with continued issues of noncompliance. The two TEIS POE offices (GN and NW) did not demonstrate correction within one year of identification of noncompliance. Program Improvement Plans were included in their CIMP reports to address this issue. The other 4 programs (1 TEIS POE, 1 EIRA, and 2 DMRS) had timely correction of this issue.

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005-2006:

Improvement activities have been revised for 2006-2007. Activities are more reflective of targeted actions needed for continued progress towards compliance with this indicator. These activities have also been included in the revised SPP.

| Improvement Activities for 2006-2007 | | |
|--|--|--|
| Activities/Resources | Timelines | Resources |
| Quarterly Caseload Report submissions around timely initial IFSPs, including reasons for delay through current FileMaker Pro Database until such time as data can be pulled from TEIDS. | Begin March 2006 | DSE Data Manager and Monitoring Personnel, Quarterly Report Submissions |
| Data verification for "reasons of delay" through written confirmation by TEIS POEs pertaining to the accuracy of data they submit to the State. | Begin March 2007 and each quarter thereafter | DSE Data Manager and Monitoring Personnel, Quarterly Report Submissions, TEIS POE Project Coordinators, Contract Coordinators, and Principal Investigators |
| Data verification regarding "reasons of delay" via periodic on-site sampling of data for verification of accuracy. | Begin May 2007 | DSE Data Manager and Monitoring Personnel, Quarterly Report Submissions, TEIS POE Project Coordinators |
| District and state-wide summaries provided to POEs for the tracking of performance and utilization for correction of systematic issues of noncompliance. | Begin March 2007 | DSE Data Manager and Monitoring Personnel, TEIS POE Project Coordinators, Contract Coordinators and Principal Investigators |
| District POEs utilize data from Quarterly Caseload Report for tracking and reporting on indicator compliance in Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) reporting | Begin December 2006 | TEIS POE Project Coordinators, Contract Coordinators and Principal Investigators, District Quarterly Caseload Reports, CIMP Reports |
| Language added to TEIS Scope of Services to address contract compliance related to issue of timeliness pending recommendations from the Governor's Office of Children's Care Coordination (GOCCC). | July 2007 pending GOCCC | DSE Director, DSE Contract Coordinator, TEIS POE Project Coordinators, Contract Coordinators and Principal Investigators; Scope of Services |
| Monitoring and implementation of sanctions for noncompliance. | Begin monitoring cycle 7/1/07-6/30/08 | DSE Director, DSE Contract Coordinator, Monitoring and TA Personnel; TEIS POE Project Coordinators, Contract Coordinators and Principal Investigators |
| Work with TEIDS development team to ensure reporting requirements are implemented in data system. | Begin implementation December 2006 | TEIDS development team, Monitoring Personnel |

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to "Overview", page 3.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 2: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.¹

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

Measurement: Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

76% = 3205 / 4217 x 100

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|-----------|---|
| 2005-2006 | <p><u>Birth to 3 years of age:</u></p> <p>Target set for 73.34% (increase of 2.34%) for Home and Community settings combined.</p> |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005-2006:

Data used for the 2005-2006 APR were obtained from the December 1, 2005 618 Child Count and from the IDEA data website for Part C Trend Data. As a note for this report and future reports, Tennessee has opted to utilize data specific to the measurement requirement for this indicator. The December 2005 SPP also included settings data for the birth to one-year subgroup. As the measurement requirement for this indicator does not require reporting data for the birth to one-year subgroup, this and future reporting will be based on birth to three data.

Table 2.1 618 Data by State and District: Primary Setting for Children for Birth to 3 Years 2005

| Primary Setting % National Average | State Total | District | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | FT | ET | SE | UC | GN | SC | NW | SW | MD |
| Home 83% | 2728 (65%) | 287 (78%) | 357 (48%) | 193 (56%) | 197 (65%) | 639 (77%) | 313 (55%) | 154 (67%) | 110 (63%) | 478 (73%) |
| Community 4% | 477 (11%) | 24 (6%) | 61 (8%) | 49 (14%) | 33 (11%) | 83 (10%) | 92 (16%) | 31 (13%) | 22 (13%) | 82 (12%) |
| Combined: Home and Community 87% | 3205 (76%) | 311 (84%) | 418 (56%) | 242 (71%) | 230 (76%) | 722 (87%) | 405 (71%) | 185 (80%) | 132 (76%) | 560 (85%) |

Table 2.1 reports 2005, 618 data for the "primary" program settings of home, community, and home and community combined for children who are birth to 3 years of age. % = # in setting category divided by total # of 4217 in all setting categories.

Table 2.2 2005 Tennessee 618 Program Setting Data compared with 2004 National 618 Program Setting Data for Birth to 3 Years

| Primary Setting % National Average | State Total | District | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|----------|------|------|------|-----|------|------|------|------|
| | | FT | ET | SE | UC | GN | SC | NW | SW | MD |
| Home 83% | - 18 | - 5 | - 35 | - 27 | - 18 | - 6 | - 28 | - 16 | - 20 | - 10 |
| Community 4% | + 7 | + 2 | + 4 | + 10 | + 7 | + 6 | + 12 | + 9 | + 9 | + 8 |
| Combined: Home and Community 87% | - 11 | - 3 | - 31 | - 16 | - 11 | + 0 | - 16 | - 7 | - 11 | - 2 |

Table 2.2 reflects 2005, 618 data for Tennessee program settings compared with respective 2004 national data for children who are birth to 3 years of age. National data was located on IDEAdata.org – Part C Trend Data. TN difference from national data = % in setting category – % national data for setting category

Discussion of Data:

Home setting: Statewide, children received early intervention services in their home as the primary setting 65% of the time. In comparison with national trend data, Tennessee fell 18% below the national average which is 83%. In looking at information on the district level, data revealed a range of low, 48% (ET), to high 78% (FT) for children who received services in the home as their primary setting. In comparison to the national average, districts ranged from high of 78% (-5) in FT to low of 46% (-35) in ET.

Community setting: Statewide, children received early intervention services in their community setting as the primary setting 11% of the time. In comparison with national trend data, Tennessee fell 7% above the national average which is 4%. In looking at information on the district level, data revealed a range of low 6% (FT), to high 16% (SC) for children who received services in the community as their primary setting. In comparison to the national average, districts ranged from high of 16% (+12) in SC to low of 6% (+2) in FT.

Home and Community settings combined: Statewide, children received early intervention services in their home and community combined as the primary setting 76% of the time. In comparison with national trend data, Tennessee fell 11% below the national average which is 87%. In looking at information on the district level, data revealed a range of low, 56% (ET), to high 87% (GN) which is at the national average for children who received services in a natural environment setting as their primary setting. In comparison to the national average, districts ranged from high of 85% (-2) in MD to low of 56% (-31) in ET.

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

The 2005 target for combined program settings of Home and Community was 73.34%, which was a projected increase of 2.34% from 2004. As reflected in the tables above, TN exceeded its target by 2.66%, with a total of 76%. The increase to 76% was a total increase of 5% from last year's data.

The Lead Agency reports it has met and exceeded the Target and maintains progress toward compliance with this indicator.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005-2006:

| Activities | Timelines | Resources | Activity Status 2005-2006 |
|---|---|------------------------------------|--|
| Post SPP Report on State's website for public access. | January 2006 | Public Awareness Coordinator | SPP was completed and posted on the web site in January 2006 |
| Inform community through upcoming 9 District LICC meetings when SPP has been posted for access and use in CIMP activities. | Begin January 2006 | DSE TA Staff | DSE TA staff attended district LICC meetings, informing the community how to access the SPP from the State's website. |
| Establish state-wide task force to develop service guidelines. The charge of the task force will be to detail process/procedures for IFSP decision making around the provision of early intervention services. This would include a focus towards increasing the provision of services within the context of home and community settings. | Begin September 2005. Guidelines to be completed by May 2006. | TN Part C Director and DSE staff. | Task force met to begin working on service guideline development. Task force collected research materials needed for guidelines and in May, all resource material needed had been gathered. April 2006 initiated issues of compliance around natural environments as a part of the Governor's Office of Children's Care Coordination (GOCCC) review for TN's Part C system. Recommendations to be finalized Feb. 2007. |
| Provide training to early intervention community regarding service guidelines. | June – July 2006 | DSE Staff | Action to be completed once GOCCC guidelines have been finalized. |
| Ensure sub-contract language for early intervention providers is in line with service guidelines. | 2006-2007 subcontracts | TEIS District Project Coordinators | Clarification to TEIS Point of Entry scope of services to address service provision for Part C services only. |
| Monitor targets set through annual December 1, 618 Child Count. | Begin spring 2006 for December 1, 2005 Child Count. | TN Part C Director and DSE staff. | Targets will continue to be monitored, comparing the State's data with national data for the birth to 3 year old population. |
| Report status of targets through APR submission to OSEP. | Begin March 2007 and ongoing annually. | TN Part C Director and DSE staff. | Completed and ongoing in subsequent reports. |

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-2006:

Improvement activities have been revised for 2006-2007. Activities are more reflective of targeted actions needed for continued progress towards compliance with this indicator. These activities have also been included in the revised SPP.

| Improvement Activities for 2006-2007 | | |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Activities | Timelines | Resources |
| Draft Service Parameters (formerly service guidelines) were developed for early intervention service providers studying natural environment issues. | Sept. 2006 | GOCCC, Stakeholder Participation, DSE Staff |
| Stakeholder group was assembled to address natural environment compliance concerns. | Oct./Nov. 2006 | GOCCC, Stakeholder Participation, DSE Staff |
| GOCCC's work to review and make recommendations related to TN's Part C system. | Finalized by Feb. 2007 | Part C Director, Part C Coordinator, GOCCC Personnel |
| Recommendations from GOCCC implemented in timely fashion. | July 1, 2007 | GOCCC, Stakeholder Participation, DSE Staff |
| Based on significant compliance concerns ET early intervention district has been required to restructure local leadership team to more consistently implement state policies and procedures. | Jan 1, 2007 | GOCCC, DSE Staff, ET TEIS District Leadership Staff |

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to Overview, page 3.

| |
|---|
| Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments |
|---|

Indicator 3: 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)

| |
|---------------------|
| Measurement: |
|---------------------|

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

- 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.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

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

- 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.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

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 the (# 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 the (# 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 the (# 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 the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|-----------|--|
| 2005-2006 | Indicator #3 is a new indicator. Measurable and Rigorous Targets are located in the State Performance Plan. Since this is a new indicator and exit data has yet to be obtained, measurable and rigorous targets will be provided in FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008. Targets will be established once baseline data are available. |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005-2006:

Indicator #3 is a new indicator. The baseline data, discussion of baseline data, targets, timelines and activities are included in the Updated State Performance Plan (pages 16-22). For ease of reference, the baseline information has also been included in this section as follows.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

An Early Childhood Outcome Committee was formed by the Lead Agency in Fall 2004. This committee was composed of key stakeholders from around the state, including families, program administrators, practitioners, university personnel, State Education Agency personnel, and State Interagency Coordinating Council representatives. This committee began addressing issues related to identifying early childhood outcomes for Part C and 619 programs and ensuring these outcomes would align with Tennessee Early Childhood Early Learning Developmental Standards (TN-ELDS). Initial efforts of this group have focused on four major activities (a) reaching consensus about birth through 5 outcomes, (b) selecting a tool/instrument that could be used to measure these outcomes, (c) surveying the field to determine the extent to which this tool or others were being used, and (d) sponsoring initial training on the selected tool/instrument for Part C and Section 619 pilot sites.

The committee chose to adopt the three early childhood outcomes recommended by the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (2005, April) as a preliminary framework to guide their efforts (Note these outcomes are similar, but not identical, to the ones eventually promulgated by OSEP). No final decisions were made by the committee about whether **only** three outcomes would form the basis for the early childhood portion of the outcomes measurement system or whether additional outcomes might be added.

Based on a comprehensive review of existing early childhood measures, including norm-referenced, criterion-referenced, judgment-, and portfolio-based, the committee selected the Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System (AEPS; Bricker) as one measure that could potentially be used in their child outcomes measurement system. While the committee was deliberating about outcomes and how these outcomes could be measured, they simultaneously conducted a survey of preschool teachers to determine which instruments/tools were being used with young children. (Note the survey did not ask teachers to describe for what purposes these assessment data were being gathered, such as program planning, eligibility determination, progress monitoring). The survey also asked teachers to indicate whether they were using the AEPS. Ninety-one respondents associated with 69 of the 136 school districts or special school districts in TN returned surveys. Survey results showed 99 different tools/instruments were listed (some teachers indicated they used more than one tool/instrument). The types of measures/tools being used vary widely from norm- or criterion-referenced to teacher constructed. Only 13 of the 69 respondents indicated they were using the AEPS.

Subsequent to the decision to explore the use of the AEPS in the TN outcomes measurement system and informed by survey findings, the Early Childhood Outcomes Committee recommended the TN DOE Office of Early Childhood sponsor an AEPS training session for preschool and early intervention providers who would be willing to participate in a pilot project. The pilot project is designed to explore the feasibility, acceptability, and usefulness of the AEPS as a child outcome measure in the TN outcomes measurement system.

It includes statewide representation of Early Intervention System programs and LEA preschools (13 preschool classes and 9 early intervention programs) in the three regions of the state, urban and rural, large and small size, as well as representation of various disabilities.

Initial awareness-level training on the AEPS for the pilot project participants took place on September 14, 2005. Participants in the training expressed the need for additional training/technical assistance in how to administer the AEPS and how to report AEPS data to the state. Pilot activities related to exploring the usefulness of the AEPS as a child outcome measure need to be further refined and aligned with the proposed project's activities.

The Early Childhood Outcomes Committee has expressed interest in aligning the early childhood measures currently in use in TN (including the AEPS) with the TN-EDLS (Tennessee Early Learning Developmental Standards, <http://www.state.tn.us/education/ci/cistandards2001/earlychildhood/ciearlychidcover.htm>) and the OSEP child outcomes. To date, however, this has not been accomplished. Although several steps for Developing a Child Outcomes Measurement System have been accomplished in Tennessee, much work remains to be done related to this element of a comprehensive outcomes measurement system.

In September of 2005, Tennessee partnered with Vanderbilt University to submit a GSEG to continue the work it has begun. The GSEG, if received, will target the development of **an integrated outcomes measurement system that includes**

- desired child/family outcomes and associated indicators and evidence statements,
- technically sound measurement approaches and processes;

- policies and procedures related to collection, analysis, and reporting of data, which integrates these data into existing data systems; and
- “manualized” training and technical assistance activities that develop the capacity of professional development and technical assistance providers to deliver meaningful training and TA related to the outcomes measurement system.

At the end of the proposed project, the state will be able to use data about child and family outcomes to demonstrate effectiveness of Part C and 619 services, to make decisions for program improvement, and to submit timely and accurate reports to OSEP (NECTAC, 2005).

Tennessee will work with our SICCC, State Advisory Council, and GSEG Leadership, Advisory, and Management Councils on a continuous basis, reporting progress annually and on a six year basis to OSEP. We will ensure that we sample each of our state’s districts at least once every 6 years and will annually include our 3 districts with average daily memberships (ADM) over 50,000. In keeping with our focused monitoring process, some districts may be sampled more often if the monitoring results warrant.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process (Updated for 2005-2006):

Within the FFY 2005-2006, further clarification of ECO reporting system requirements and updates on expected additional reporting features of the AEPS necessitated a change in our initial plan. Tennessee was also notified that the GSEG grant was not awarded, further requiring a change in the original plan.

Tennessee’s ECO core committee, in consultation with Dr. Patricia Snyder, Vanderbilt University, and Mr. Jim Henson, Midsouth Regional Resource Regional Center, formulated the new plan. Tennessee’s Early Childhood Outcomes Plan is a Birth to five (year olds) plan with the same parameters, process, and forms being used in Part C and Part B, 619. It was determined that a phase-in approach would be used; 3 Tennessee’s Early Intervention System (TEIS) districts and 9 LEA’s were identified for the first phase. Tennessee is naturally divided into three distinct geographic regions, east, middle and west. The 3 TEIS districts are representative of the state in the following factors:

- Various sized districts representing large and small districts. These three districts are:
 - East Tennessee District (Knoxville-East Region)
 - Greater Nashville District (Nashville-Middle Region))
 - North West District (Martin-West Region)
- Percent of disabled population
- Percent of population by race/ethnicity
- Percent of population by gender
- Representative of rural/urban

It was further decided that baseline data would be gathered using a slightly modified ECO summary form for all children in Part C or Part B 619 who received an initial IFSP or IEP from August 15th, 2006, to November 15th, 2006. Once a district begins collecting Early Childhood Outcomes data information, they will continue with the process.

Outcomes decisions will be made by the IFSP/IEP teams, using current assessment/evaluation/eligibility information, including observations and parent report, at the initial IFSP or IEP. All information used to determine outcome ratings will be documented on the present levels of performance area of the IFSP/IEP. Signatures of participation on the IFSP/IEP will also document participation in determining child outcomes. Parents will be given a copy of the ECO form.

Although we hope to move the ECO data gathering process within our Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS), and Easy IEP web-based systems, our baseline data is being collected on paper forms. Some changes were made on the ECO summary form to facilitate ease of administration and reporting and anticipating possible changes to the form in the future. The ECO summary form was separated into an entrance and exit form. See attachments # 3.1 & # 3.2.

All TEIS and LEA districts in phase one were trained on policies and procedures related to determining, collecting, and reporting Early Childhood data. Half-day trainings were held in August 2006 for all districts in phase one, using training materials produced by the ECO Center, which were slightly modified to match Tennessee forms. Participants had an opportunity to practice using the Tennessee Early Childhood Outcomes Form at Entrance. All participants received

information about a sample child, then participated in small groups in mock IFSP/IEP meetings where they completed the entrance form. Ratings were compared, and in all trainings, the many groups generally rated the sample child within one numeral of the mean.

The Tennessee Early Childhood Outcomes Form at Exit will be revised to match the updated OSEP reporting categories for collecting exit data on the children in the baseline group, as well as for children in the next entrance cohort.

Once entrance and exit data are collected, children who have been in their respective programs for six months or longer will have their scores used to establish percentiles of children in each category of the three outcome questions.

Within the next two fiscal years the “phase in” process will be completed. Three additional TEIS districts will be added per fiscal year to reach a total of all nine TEIS districts participating in the entrance and exit data collection for Early Childhood Outcomes.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Since this is a new indicator, baseline and targets will be provided in FFY 2005 APR due February 1, 2007. Baseline data are currently being collected

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

Table 3.1 Tennessee’s Outcome Measures Entrance Data

| Outcome Measure #1 | | Outcome Measure #2 | | Outcome Measure #3 | |
|--------------------|------------|--------------------|------------|--------------------|------------|
| Ranking | Percentage | Ranking | Percentage | Ranking | Percentage |
| 1 | 2.41% | 1 | 4.82% | 1 | 5.42% |
| 2 | 9.64% | 2 | 9.94% | 2 | 13.86% |
| 3 | 17.47% | 3 | 23.19% | 3 | 17.17% |
| 4 | 12.65% | 4 | 16.87% | 4 | 18.67% |
| 5 | 26.51% | 5 | 16.57% | 5 | 19.58% |
| 6 | 19.58% | 6 | 20.78% | 6 | 16.57% |
| 7 | 11.75% | 7 | 7.83% | 7 | 8.73% |

Table 3.1 Outcome measures data by ranking order 1-7 per outcome measure collected.

Table 3.2 Tennessee’s Outcome Measures Entrance Data

| Outcome Measure #1 | | Outcome Measure #2 | | Outcome Measure #3 | |
|--------------------|------------|--------------------|------------|--------------------|------------|
| Ranking | Percentage | Ranking | Percentage | Ranking | Percentage |
| 6 + 7 = | 31.33% | 6 + 7 = | 28.61% | 6 + 7 = | 25.30% |

Table 3.2 Entrance data reflecting the “completely” functioning ranges of 6 and 7 per outcome measure collected.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Since this is a new indicator, discussion of the baseline data will be provided in FFY 2005 APR due February 1, 2007.

Discussion of Baseline Data (2005-2006):

Entrance data were collected for FFY 2005-2006 from the East Tennessee District (Knoxville-East Region, Greater Nashville District (Nashville-Middle Region) and the North West District (Martin-West Region). Table 3.1 reflects this data

collection. The entrance data reflects the consensus of each child’s Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) team as to that child’s functioning in the following three areas:

- Outcome 1: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- Outcome 2: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- Outcome 3: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

The percentages in Table 3.1 are based on the total number of 332 infants and toddlers from the three districts. The data were collected beginning on August 15, 2006 and November 15, 2006. The ranking order of a child’s age appropriate functioning ranged from 1 to 7 as follows:

- 1 Not yet
- 3 Emerging
- 5 Somewhat
- 7 Completely

The percentages for functioning based on the three Outcomes are the combined total percentages for all three districts.

In analyzing the totals of percentages on collected data for infants and toddlers who fell within the 6 or 7 (Completely) range for Outcomes 1, 2 and 3, the following is noted:

- 31.33% of infants and toddlers functioned at a level comparable to same-aged peers for Outcome 1: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- 28.61% of infants and toddlers functioned at a level comparable to same-aged peers for Outcome 2: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- 25.30% of infants and toddlers functioned at a level comparable to same-aged peers for Outcome 3: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Improvement strategies and activities with timelines and resources will be developed based on established targets.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources established FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

| Activity | Timelines | Resources |
|--|--|--|
| Data verification to include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Formal verification of data 2. Record review as needed 3. Retraining on data collection and data entry 4. Regular report tracking 5. Ongoing communication between state and local TEIS districts 6. Site visits as needed | January 2007 January 2007 February 2007 January 2007 and on As needed As needed | Director of Office of Early Childhood, Division of Special Education, Preschool and Early Intervention state consultants |
| Data analysis to include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identification of data trends and issues 2. Action plan developed for needed changes 3. Ongoing communication and between state and local TEIS districts | January 2007 January 2007 January 2007 forward | Director of Office of Early Childhood, Division of Special Education, Preschool and Early Intervention state consultants |

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>4. Site visits as needed 5. Retraining as needed</p> | <p>As needed As needed</p> | |
| <p>Development of outcomes data collection system within the state web-based electronic Part C system/TEIDS to include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development of temporary outcomes data system to collect exit data and provide ratings corresponding with OSEP categories. 2. Design of data collection system within the state web-based electronic Part C system to include entry and exit data and ratings corresponding with OSEP categories. 3. Training provided to participating TEIS districts. 4. Linkage developed between Tennessee's Early Intervention Data System and EASY IEP | <p>January 2007 June/July 2007 August 2007 January 2008</p> | <p>Director of Data Management for Tennessee Division of Special Education, Director of Office of Early Childhood, Division of Special Education, Preschool and Early Intervention state consultants</p> |
| <p>Collaboration between other Tennessee early childhood entities including: TN Voluntary Pre-K Program Head Start Title I Pre-K Programs SIG Early Childhood grantees Community Childcare Community Pre-K Programs And others as identified to encourage an understanding of early childhood outcomes.</p> | <p>February 2007 – annual state special education spring conference March 2007 – Early Childhood Inclusion Collaborative Other dates as appropriate</p> | <p>Director of Office of Early Childhood, Division of Special Education, Preschool and Early Intervention state consultants</p> |

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005-2006: not applicable

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005-2006: not applicable

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to Overview, page 3.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 4: 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)

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.

A. 90% = 297/329 x 100

B. 95% = 313/329 x 100

C. 95% = 313/329 x 100

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|-----------|---|
| 2005-2006 | Indicator #4 is a new indicator. Measurable and Rigorous Targets are located in the State Performance Plan. |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005-2006:

Indicator #4 is a new indicator. The baseline data, discussion of baseline data, targets, timelines and activities can be referenced in the Updated State Performance Plan (pages 23-27). For ease of reference, the baseline information has also been included in this section as follows.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

In 2003, the State initiated, through contractual arrangement with the University of Tennessee and Tennessee Technological University, a study (Pathways Research Project) of the effectiveness and impact of service coordination of for Part C eligible children in Tennessee. The contractors spent time reviewing the literature and developing a family survey for gathering the desired information. This included selecting and incorporating existing surveys already validated through other research efforts to address the key areas of concern for Part C in Tennessee, e.g., The Family-Centered Program Rating Scale and the Family Empowerment Scale. The final version of the survey included 512 items and covered a wide range of areas including: family-centered practices, family empowerment, stress, social support, parent-child relations, marital satisfaction, and depression. A target of 1000 families was established with a representative sample randomly selected from each of the nine TEIS districts. The contractors developed an implementation plan and provided on-site training for TEIS Service Coordinators for presenting the questionnaire to families. Both mothers and fathers were invited to complete the questionnaire. Data collection from the surveys began 2004. Surveys are still being accepted from Districts that were last to come on board in the process. To-date, a total of 396 surveys have been returned state-wide from mothers of eligible children and a total of 144 surveys have been returned by fathers for a total of 540 state-wide. The sample returned to date represents 12% of the total number of Part C eligible children served in TN on the December 1, 2004 child count. It has been determined that the sample received to-date is sufficient to accurately speak to the performance of the Part C system in the areas reflected. This research effort was intended to be a single event and not designed to be an on-going process.

In order to evaluate the performance of the Part C system in Tennessee in an on-going and systematic way, the Department will utilize the Part C Family Survey developed through the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM). Available: http://www.monitoringcenter.lsuhs.edu/parent_family_involvement.htm The implementation of the survey will, again, be in collaboration with institution/s of higher education to ensure that there is an appropriate plan for obtaining a representative sample of the population served and a sufficient rate of return to adequately demonstrate performance of the Part C system related to the three areas specified in this indicator. The final plan will be developed and reviewed by a management team including appropriate stakeholders. Sampling will be utilized for FY 05-06 – families who have been in the system a minimum of 6 months. At this time the State anticipates implementing the survey through the proposed GSEG Grant. In the event the GSEG is not funded by OSEP, the State will implement a process consistent with the proposal. In the long term, the State anticipates incorporation of data collection for this Indicator within the TEIDS system.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

While the following data is not sufficient to establish a baseline for 2004-05, it does provide some insight into the State's performance on this indicator.

Helped families know their rights: Family-Centered Collaboration

Mothers:

98% of mothers statewide reported that the TEIS system was effective in the area of Respectful Collaboration.

Fathers

91% of fathers statewide reported that the TEIS system was effective in the area of Respectful Collaboration.

Helped families effectively communicate their children's needs: Competence/Assertiveness

Mothers:

86% of mothers statewide reported that the TEIS system was effective in the area of promoting their competence in communicating their child/family's needs.

91% of mothers statewide reported that the TEIS system was effective in the area of promoting their assertiveness in communicating their child/family's needs.

Fathers:

69% of fathers statewide reported that the TEIS system was effective in the area of promoting their competence in communicating their child/family's needs.

66% of fathers statewide reported that the TEIS system was effective in the area of promoting their assertiveness in communicating their child/family's needs.

Helped families help their children develop and learn: Responsive Teaching

Mothers:

80% of mothers statewide reported that the TEIS system was effective in the area of Responsive Teaching.

Discussion of Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

The data clearly demonstrates that parents, both mothers and fathers, perceive the supports provided through TEIS as effective in informing and empowering them in key areas related to meeting the needs of their child and family. While there are some slight variances in the levels reported across the nine TEIS Districts, the variances are not statistically significant. Therefore, the state-wide percentage is an appropriate representation of the performance of the Part C system in each reporting area.

Helped families know their rights:

The data reflected represents the summary of all items in the area of "Family Centered Collaboration". This component included the following item:

- *Our family's TEIS Service Coordinator gives clear and complete information about my family's rights*

Helped families effectively communicate their children's needs:

The data reflected represents the summary of all items in the area of "Competence" and Assertiveness". These components were structured as follows:

"Competence" included the following:

- *I know what to do when problems arise with my child.*
- *I am able to work with agencies and professionals to decide what services my child needs.*
- *When I need help with problems in my family, I am able to ask for help from others.*

"Assertiveness" included the following:

- *I tell professionals what I think about services being provided to my child; and*
- *My opinion is just as important as professionals' opinion in deciding what services my child needs.*

Helped families help their children develop and learn:

The data reflected represents the summary of all items in the area of "Family Centered Teaching". This component included the following items:

- Our family's TEIS service coordinator gives my family information about how children usually grow and develop;
- Our family's TEIS Service Coordinator helps my family learn how to teach our child with special needs particular skills; and
- Our family's TEIS Service Coordinator offers ideas on how my family can have fun with our children.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process (Updated for 2005-2006);

Tennessee's Department of Education partnered with East Tennessee State University's (ETSU) Center of Excellence in gathering family survey data. The decision was made to utilize the NCSEAM Part C Family Survey as the data collection tool (see attachment # 4.2). The survey consists of three scales. All three scales were distributed and utilized for state purposes. Indicator 4 utilizes the Impact of Early Intervention Scale. This scale consists of 22 items that were selected through NCSEAM's advisory board. ETSU participated in the selection of the phase in group, as well as being responsible for the dissemination, collection and analysis of the family survey data. DOE staff felt it was important for families to be guaranteed that there would be some level of objectivity in gathering these data. The Director of Early Childhood Special Education Programs crafted an introductory letter to parents that was included in the mail out survey (see attachment #4.1). Tennessee had a strong return rate.

Tennessee is naturally divided into three distinct geographic regions, east, middle, and west. Each geographic region has one of our large TEIS districts within it. One Early Intervention District per region was selected ensuring all representative factors, for a total of three TEIS districts across the state. Within these three districts, all active families with an IFSP were disseminated a self-addressed copy of the NCSEAM Part C Family Survey.

ETSU staff developed a small database to insure consistent and complete data entry of the items. This database allowed for analysis for Indicator 4 as well as being available for state analysis purposes in the future. Although we hope to move the Family Outcome data gathering process within our Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) our baseline data was collected on paper NCSEAM Part C Family Survey forms. Once these elements are included in TEIDS, we will complete these items at least annually with all families being served with an IFSP.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

Table 4.1 Dissemination and Return Rate

| | Number Surveys Distributed | Number Surveys Returned | Return Rate |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| East Tennessee | 707 | 128 | 18% |
| Greater Nashville | 650 | 164 | 25% |
| Northwest | 189 | 37 | 20% |
| Total | 1513 | 329 | 22% |

Table 4.1 presents dissemination and return rate of the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) - Part C Parent Survey as distributed by region (East, Middle, West) in Tennessee. Of the 1513 surveys which were disseminated among the three districts within the three regions, 329 (22%) were returned. Analysis by districts indicates the following: In East Tennessee, 707 surveys disseminated, 128 (18%) returned; in Greater Nashville, 650 surveys disseminated, 164 (25%) returned; and in Northwest, 189 surveys disseminated, 37 (20%) returned.

Discussion of Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

Results:

A-90% of respondent families participating in Part C report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights.

B-95% of respondent families participating in Part C report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs.

C-95% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources established FFY 2004 (2004-2005): Improvement strategies and activities with timelines and resources will be developed based established targets.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources established FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|------------------|------------------|
| Additional data system design work continues; including the development of data elements for the purposes of consistently collecting and analyzing Child and Family Outcome data with all Part C eligible children in Tennessee. At the end of this reporting | 7/1/2007 | TEIDS |

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

| | | |
|--|-----------|------------------------------------|
| period the elements have not been finally developed for implementation in TEIDS. | | |
| At the point of these family outcome data elements being included in TEIDS, additional training will be provided and then collection will happen annually with all families. | 7/1/2008 | TEIDS Regional Consulting Staff |
| Repeat Annual Family Survey | 6/30/2007 | Higher Education Support |

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005-2006: not applicable

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005-2006: not applicable

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to Overview, page 3.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 5: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to:

- A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and
- B. National data.

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

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared to the same percent calculated for other States with similar (narrow, moderate or broad) eligibility definitions.
- B. Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared to National data.

A. .74% = 581/ 78752 x 100 as compared to .93% for other states with a narrow eligibility category.

B. .74% = 581/ 78752 x 100 compared to National Baseline of .92%

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|-----------|---|
| 2005-2006 | Target has been set for an increase of .07% in the number of children served birth to one year of age with an estimated total of 565. |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005-2006:

The Lead Agency's processes and procedures remain the same for this reporting period as written in the 2005 SPP. For the 2005-06 reporting period, Tennessee has moved from the moderate eligibility category to the narrow category based on OSEP's revised characterization of Tennessee's ranking with other similar states eligibility definitions.

Data to monitor child find related efforts are collected in the following areas:

- Federal 618 Child Count
- TN Population Estimates for 2004 from National Data from OSEP Federal Resource Center

Table 5.1: Comparison of Tennessee with other “Narrow” eligibility states for the percentage of children served under the age of 1 year.

| Narrow Eligibility Category | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|
| State | Narrow Eligibility States Baseline = .93 %Population Served | Difference from Narrow Eligibility States Baseline |
| Idaho | 1.75 | 0.82 |
| North Dakota | 1.58 | 0.65 |
| Oklahoma | 1.35 | 0.42 |
| Montana | 1.33 | 0.40 |
| District of Columbia | 1.23 | 0.30 |
| Guam | X | X |
| Connecticut | .93 | 0.0 |
| South Carolina | .78 | -0.15 |
| Oregon | .74 | -0.19 |
| Tennessee | .74 | -0.19 |
| Utah | .66 | -0.27 |
| Maine | .65 | -0.28 |
| Nebraska | .64 | -0.29 |
| Arizona | .59 | -0.34 |
| Georgia | .48 | -0.45 |
| Nevada | .47 | -0.46 |

Table 5.1 reports data from the 2005, 618 Child Count for states who fall in the narrow category for eligibility. This Table also includes a comparison of TN in relation to other narrow eligibility states baselines. Data source for national baseline taken from OSEP Federal Resource Center.

Table 5.2 reports Tennessee 618 Child Count Data from 2005 Compared to National Baseline Data

| District | Child Count Birth to 1 year | General Population Birth to 1 year | Percent Population Birth to 1 year | Percent Difference from National Average |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Northwest (NW) | 43 | 3,629 | 1.18 | 0.26 |
| Southwest (SW) | 40 | 3,397 | 1.18 | 0.26 |
| National Baseline | 38,192 | 4,143,461 | .92 | |
| Greater Nashville (GN) | 133 | 14,737 | .90 | -0.02 |
| First Tennessee (FT) | 43 | 5,506 | .78 | -0.14 |
| Tennessee State Total | 581 | 78,752 | .74 | -0.18 |
| Memphis Delta (MD) | 108 | 16,338 | .66 | -0.26 |
| Upper Cumberland (UC) | 39 | 6,066 | .64 | -0.28 |
| Southeast (SE) | 47 | 7,545 | .62 | -0.30 |
| East Tennessee (ET) | 75 | 13,314 | .56 | -0.36 |
| South Central (SC) | 53 | 10,492 | .51 | -0.41 |

Table 5.2 reports 618 Child Count Data from 2005 for the number of children served by District and compared to national baseline data. Two of TN's nine Districts are above the National Baseline.

Discussion of Data:

Due to Tennessee's revised characterization by OSEP that includes the state in the narrow eligibility category, the data has shifted to narrow category comparisons to other states. Tennessee's 2005 Child Count (618) total shows that 581 infants up to 1 year were counted. Comparing this total to 2004 (528), Tennessee exceeded the target of 565 with an overall increase of 10% in this age group.

In comparison to other “narrow” states, Tennessee is below average in the state rankings (Table 5.1)

In Table 5.2, the 2005, 618 Child Count reported 581 children birth to 1 year of age served in TN's Part C System.

The three largest districts in the state which served the greatest number of children this age were: Greater Nashville,

Memphis Delta, and East TN (Knoxville) in that order. The four smallest (and more rural) districts in the state which served the fewest number of children this age were: Upper Cumberland, Southwest, First Tennessee, and Northwest.

Tennessee has two of its nine districts above the National Baseline, four districts above the state average for percent of population birth-1year, and five of the nine districts are below the state average.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005-2006:

Due to state category changes by OSEP, and not related to any Eligibility Definition changes in Tennessee, our state has now been included in the “narrow” eligibility category. We have typically in the past been included in the “moderate” eligibility category. Tennessee continues to see an overall increase in referrals, but a drop in IFSP enrollments. Eligibility Procedures are being reviewed to ensure that undue time burdens attached to current eligibility practices are not being a barrier to family enrollment. State-wide publicity and public awareness strategies are also under review through work with the Governor’s Office of Children’s Care Coordination. Stakeholder groups will be involved in developing a sound public awareness plan for the state. A state-wide fiscal analysis is underway via Emerald Consulting which includes prevalence and time studies. The intent of this analysis will be studying Child Find and Eligibility Procedures, including identification of any potential barriers to eligibility determination. Appropriate state wide policy will be implemented by January 1, 2007 to ensure consistent, timely eligibility procedures.

| Activities | Timelines | Resources | Activity Status 2005-2006 |
|--|--------------|---|---|
| Modify current Quantitative Data System to support gathering, analysis and reporting of data to reflect age of child at referral by referral source. | January 2006 | Part C Data Coordinator; TEIS Training and TA Project | New web-based, state-wide data system :TN Early Intervention Data System(TEIDS) in place as of 12/06 |
| Organize interagency committee explore the development of an updated comprehensive child find plan specific to Part C including clarifying barriers to identification of children in a timely manner and identifying approaches and supports for identifying infants and toddlers with disabilities. | January 2006 | TN DOE, State ICC, TN Governor’s Office of Children’s Care Coordination (GOCCC) | 45 day timelines brochure created and distributed to all 9 District offices by 11/06; state- wide MD office mailing planned for 2/07; key informant group on Child Find facilitated by the Governors Office of Children’s Care Coordination (GOCCC); first meetings during 10/06-11/06 |
| Continue collaborative efforts with Federal and State initiatives to support young children and their families. | Ongoing | TN DOE Office of Early Learning; State’s Newborn Hearing Screening Project; TN Child Health Profile Project(TN-CHP), the Governor’s Office of Children’s Care Coordination and the State TenderCare Efforts (Informing physicians and the public about EPSDT); Early Childhood Comprehensive System Project | The new TEIS Director sought and received approval of a Part C Coordinator (previously part of the Director position); Together, they have engaged the active consultation of the GOCCC including the funding of a fiscal analysis which further convened state-wide agencies including DMRS, DCS, CSS, Head Start, DHS. Also participated in the state grant ECCS, which additionally convenes workgroups on state wide early childhood objectives |

| | | | |
|---|---------|--|---|
| | | (ECCS) TN Infant-Toddler Child Care Initiative; Project; SSI; TN Dept. Children's Services (CAPTA referrals);etc | |
| TEIS POE and EI Service Providers continue to maintain records of specific efforts to inform the public and identify children who are eligible, or potentially eligible for TEIS. | Ongoing | TEIS Point of Entry Personnel; LICCs; Part C Monitoring System | Bi-annual reporting of outreach and public awareness is mandated via TEIS-POE contracts as well as EIRA's . Logs and other data are monitored annually. |
| Include tracking of local public awareness activities in the TEIDS to allow for more definitive reporting on local efforts. | Ongoing | TEIDS Project Coordinator and DSE Part C Monitoring Coordinator | Data elements have been added to TEIDS as of 12/06 |
| Track activity and progress on PIPs that have identified child find as a local need. | Ongoing | DSE Part C Monitoring Coordinator; DSE and DMRS TA Personnel | On-going |

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005-2006:

Improvement activities have been revised for 2006-2007. Activities are more reflective of targeted actions needed for continued progress towards compliance with this indicator. These activities have also been included in the revised SPP.

| Improvement Activities for 2006-2007 | | |
|--|---------------------|--|
| Activities | Timelines | Resources |
| Support the expansion of the START program of Early Intervention training/tools to Pediatric offices in Tennessee | Implemented-Ongoing | Dr. Quentin Humberd, Developmental Pediatrician; SICC member |
| Analysis of newly installed TEIDS tracking in terms of referral sources, age of entry | Implemented-Ongoing | Yahasoft Inc. (Roy Su, Developer) |
| The GOCCC workgroup including Emerald Consulting will be studying Child Find and Eligibility Procedures, including identifying any potential for reducing barriers to eligibility determination. Appropriate state wide policy will be implemented by January 1, 2007 to ensure consistent, timely eligibility procedures. | February 2007 | GOCCC, DSE Leadership Staff, Emerald Consulting |

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to Overview, page 3.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 6: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to:

- A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and
- B. National data.

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

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100 compared to the same percent calculated for other States with similar (narrow, moderate or broad) eligibility definitions.
- B. Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100 compared to National data.

A. Tennessee reports 1.80% compared to 2.04% for other states with a narrow eligibility category, per OSEP’s Rank Order Data.

B Tennessee reports 1.80% as compared to the National Baseline of 2.24%.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|-----------|---|
| 2005-2006 | Target has been set for an increase of 12% in the number of children served birth through 2 years of age with an estimated total of 4360. |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005-2006:

The Lead Agency supports a statewide Public Awareness Coordinator to design and disseminate materials to inform families and potential referral sources about the resources available to infants with disabilities and their families through the Part C system. Each of the nine TEIS Points of Entry across the state are responsible for facilitating a collaborative effort in the counties served by that office for identifying infants and toddlers with disabilities. Each POE works individually and in collaboration with the Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) and service providers to implement systematic child find. The LICC Self-Assessment conducted through the Part C monitoring system requires a county specific evaluation of the effectiveness of the child find effort in the district and a Program Improvement Plan (PIP) is required when results are not deemed sufficient. Data to monitor child find related efforts are collected in the following areas:

- Federal 618 Child Count
- TEIS POE Public Awareness and Child find efforts

Table 6.1: Comparison of Tennessee with other "Narrow" Eligibility States for the percentage of children served birth through Age 2 years.

| Narrow Eligibility Category | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|
| State | Narrow Eligibility States Baseline= 2.04 %Population Served | Difference from Narrow Eligibility States Baseline |
| Connecticut | 3.16 | 1.12 |
| North Dakota | 3.02 | 0.98 |
| Idaho | 2.90 | 0.86 |
| Maine | 2.89 | 0.85 |
| Montana | 2.21 | 0.17 |
| Oklahoma | 2.03 | -0.01 |
| South Carolina | 1.87 | -0.17 |
| Utah | 1.87 | -0.17 |
| Tennessee | 1.80 | -0.24 |
| Oregon | 1.78 | -0.26 |
| District of Columbia | 1.68 | -0.36 |
| Nebraska | 1.67 | -0.37 |
| Arizona | 1.61 | -0.43 |
| Guam | 1.47 | -0.57 |
| Nevada | 1.36 | -0.68 |
| Georgia | 1.34 | -0.70 |

Table 6.1 reports data from the 2005, 618 Child Count for states who fall in the narrow category for eligibility. This Table also includes a comparison of TN in relation to other narrow eligibility states based on the national baseline for this population of children. Data source for national baseline taken from OSEP Federal Resource Center.

Table 6.2 reports Tennessee 618 Child Count Data from 2005 Compared to National Baseline Data

| District | Percent Population Birth to 3 year | Percent Difference from National Average |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| National Baseline | 2.24 | |
| First Tennessee (FT) | 2.23 | -0.01 |
| Northwest (NW) | 2.10 | -0.14 |
| East Tennessee (ET) | 1.88 | -0.36 |
| Greater Nashville (GN) | 1.88 | -0.36 |
| South Central (SC) | 1.81 | -0.43 |
| Tennessee State Total | 1.80 | -0.44 |
| Southwest (SW) | 1.71 | -0.53 |
| Upper Cumberland (UC) | 1.67 | -0.57 |
| Southeast (SE) | 1.51 | -0.73 |
| Memphis Delta (MD) | 1.34 | -0.90 |

Table 6.2 reports 618 Child Count Data from 2005 for the number of children served by District and compared to national baseline data. All nine Point of Entry Districts are below the National Baseline.

Discussion of Data:

Table 6.2: 2005, 618 Child Count reports 4217 children birth to 3 years of age with IFSPs served in TN's Part C System. The three largest districts in the state which served greatest number of children this age were: Greater Nashville, East TN (Knoxville) and Memphis Delta in that order. The two smallest (and more rural) districts in the state which served the fewest number of children this age were: Southwest and Northwest.

Despite setting a target for birth through 3 years of 4360, with a 12 % increase, the number of children in this age range in the 2005 Child Count totaled only 4217 and therefore, this target was not met.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005-2006:

Due to state category changes by OSEP, and not related to any Eligibility Definition changes in Tennessee, Our state has now been included in the “narrow” eligibility category. We have typically in the past been included in the “moderate” eligibility category. Tennessee continues to see an overall increase in referrals, but a drop in IFSP enrollments. Eligibility Procedures are being reviewed to ensure that undue time burdens attached to current eligibility practices are not being a barrier to family enrollment. State-wide publicity and public awareness strategies are also under review through work with the Governor’s Office of Children Care Coordination. Stakeholder groups will be involved in developing a sound public awareness plan for the state. A state-wide fiscal analysis is underway via Emerald Consulting which includes prevalence and time studies. The intent of this analysis will be studying Child Find and Eligibility Procedures, including identifying any potential for reducing barriers to eligibility determination. Appropriate state wide policy will be implemented by January 1, 2007 to ensure consistent, timely eligibility procedures.

| Activities | Timelines | Resources | Activity Status 2005-2006 |
|--|--------------|---|---|
| Modify current Quantitative Data System to support gathering, analysis and reporting of data to reflect age of child at referral by referral source. | January 2006 | Part C Data Coordinator; TEIS Training and TA Project | New web-based , state-wide data system :TN Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) in place as of 12/06 |
| Organize interagency committee explore the development of an updated comprehensive child find plan specific to Part C including clarifying barriers to identification of children in a timely manner and identifying approaches and supports for identifying infants and toddlers with disabilities. | January 2006 | TN DOE, State ICC, TN Governor’s Office of Children’s Care Coordination (GOCCC) | 45 day timelines brochure created and distributed to all nine District offices by 11/06; state-wide MD office mailing planned for 2/07; key informant group on Child Find facilitated by the Governor’s Office of Children’s Care Coordination. (GOCCC); first meetings during 10/06-11/06 |
| Continue collaborative efforts with Federal and State initiatives to support young children and their families. | Ongoing | TN DOE Office of Early Learning; State’s Newborn Hearing Screening Project; TN Child Health Profile Project(TN-CHP), the Governor’s Office for Children’s Care Coordination and the State TenderCare Efforts (Informing physicians and the public about EPSDT); Early Childhood | The new TEIS Director sought and received approval of a Part C Coordinator (previously part of the Director position); Together, they have engaged the active consultation of the GOCCC including the funding of a fiscal analysis which further convened state-wide agencies including DMRS, DCS, CSS, Head Start, DHS. Also |

| | | | |
|---|---------|---|---|
| | | Comprehensive System Project (ECCS) TN Infant-Toddler Child Care Initiative; Project; SSI; TN Dept. Children's Services (CAPTA referrals) | participated in the state grant ECCS, which additionally convenes workgroups on state wide early childhood objectives |
| TEIS POE and EI Service Providers continue to maintain records of specific efforts to inform the public and identify children who are eligible, or potentially eligible for TEIS. | Ongoing | TEIS Point of Entry Personnel; LICCs; Part C Monitoring System | Bi-annual reporting of outreach and public awareness is mandated via TEIS -POE contracts as well as EIRA's. Logs and other data are monitored annually. |
| Include tracking of local public awareness activities in the TEIDS to allow for more definitive reporting on local efforts. | Ongoing | TEIDS Project Coordinator and DSE Part C Monitoring Coordinator | Data elements have been added to TEIDS as of 12/06 |
| Track activity and progress on PIPs that have identified child find as a local need. | Ongoing | DSE Part C Monitoring Coordinator; DSE and DMRS TA Personnel | On-going |

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005-2006:

Improvement activities have been revised for 2006-2007. Activities are more reflective of targeted actions needed for continued progress towards compliance with this indicator. These activities have also been included in the revised SPP.

| Improvement Activities for 2006-2007 | | |
|--|---------------------|--|
| Activities | Timelines | Resources |
| Support the expansion of the START program of Early Intervention training/tools to Pediatric offices in Tennessee | Implemented-Ongoing | Dr. Quentin Humberd, Developmental Pediatrician; SICC member |
| Analysis of newly installed TEIDS tracking in terms of referral sources, age of entry | Implemented-Ongoing | Yahasoft Inc. (Roy Su Developer) |
| The GOCCC workgroup including Emerald Consulting will be studying Child Find and Eligibility Procedures, including identifying any potential for reducing barriers | February 2007 | GOCCC, DSE Leadership Staff, Emerald Consulting |

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| to eligibility determination. Appropriate state wide policy will be implemented by January 1, 2007 to ensure consistent, timely eligibility procedures. | | |
|---|--|--|

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to Overview, page 3.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 7: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and 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)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed)] times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations.

March 15, 2006 **87% = 1706 / 1956 x 100**

June 15, 2006 **86% = 1872 / 2184 x 100**

September 15, 2006 **88% = 1839 / 2082 x 100**

These figures account for untimely IFSPs due to family reasons.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|-----------|--|
| 2005-2006 | <p>Tennessee’s Early Intervention System will see 100 Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline.</p> <p>The State Lead Agency will continue to require justification for all IFSPs not completed within the specified timeline of 45 days</p> |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005-2006:

For purposes of this report, the Lead Agency collected data through two avenues to address this indicator:

1. TEIS Quarterly Caseload Reports; and
2. Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) report data from Cohort 1

1. Quarterly Caseload Reports were utilized as the sole data source in establishing baseline data in the 2005 SPP. These are reports that are compiled in the State office from data in the nine Tennessee Early Intervention System (TEIS) Point of Entry (POE) Offices contained in a FileMaker Pro database housed in each district office. Like with 618 Child Count Data, these reports are a “snapshot in time” around several elements based on the date the data is pulled from the database. Information included in these district reports are: ‘active’ child/family caseload for the district POE; caseload size by each service coordinator; average caseload size for the POE; number of initial IFSP meetings held; number of

initial IFSPs meetings held timely without and then with family reasons identified; number of transition planning conferences held; number of transition planning conferences held timely without and then with family reasons identified. Prior to March 15, 2006, Quarterly Caseload Reports were collected (See SPP Indicator 7 under Baseline Data), but family reasons for delay were not factored out until March 2006 and subsequent reports.

2. Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) indicator 3.1.A addresses the initial IFSP held within 45 days of referral into the early intervention system. Guidance (1), a critical element for this indicator, specifically addresses the issue of timely initial IFSP meetings. Where initial IFSPs have been found to be take longer than 45 days, reporting entities are required to account for reason of delay – family reasons or provider. Reason(s) for delay for initial IFSP meetings are documented in IFSP conference notes. CIMP data were taken from the TEIS POEs in Cohort 1 for this indicator as these programs are responsible for incoming service coordination activities culminating to the initial IFSP meeting. Cohort 1 consists of three districts - First Tennessee (FT), Greater Nashville (GN), and Northwest (NW), for 18 programs. Programs include the three TEIS POEs and 15 early intervention providers. Cohort 1 have completed the full process of TN's revised monitoring system through the submission a self-assessment/program improvement plan (PIP) and subsequent annual performance reports (APR) from which status of noncompliance correction can be tracked. For additional information regarding TN's monitoring system see the Revised SPP (2/1/07) Indicator 9.

Table 7.1: TEIS Quarterly Caseload Report Data Regarding Timeliness of Initial IFSPs for 2005-2006 APR Reporting Period

| District | March 15, 2006 | | | June 15, 2006 | | |
|---------------------------|--|------------------|--|--|------------------|--|
| | # of Initial IFSP Meetings for this Report | # and (%) Timely | # and % Timely Omitting Family Reasons | # of Initial IFSP Meetings for this Report | # and (%) Timely | # and % Timely Omitting Family Reasons |
| FT * | 121 | 76 (63%) | 92 (76%) | 136 | 101 (74%) | 125 (92%) |
| ET | 365 | 252 (69%) | 331 (91%) | 501 | 313 (62%) | 426 (85%) |
| SE | 119 | 105 (88%) | 112 (94%) | 129 | 105 (81%) | 120 (93%) |
| UC | 172 | 114 (66%) | 155 (90%) | 218 | 115 (53%) | 167 (77%) |
| GN * | 431 | 244 (57%) | 331 (77%) | 430 | 250 (58%) | 338 (79%) |
| SC | 306 | 211 (69%) | 255 (83%) | 306 | 193 (63%) | 242 (79%) |
| NW * | 81 | 77 (95%) | 80 (99%) | 83 | 74 (89%) | 79 (95%) |
| SW | 63 | 60 (95%) | 62 (98%) | 72 | 69 (96%) | 74 (99%) |
| MD | 298 | 278 (93%) | 288 (97%) | 309 | 284 (92%) | 301 (97%) |
| Total | 1956 | 1417 | 1706 | 2184 | 1504 | 1872 |
| Statewide % Timely | | 72% | 87% | | 69% | 86% |

Table 7.1 reports number/(percentage) of timely initial IFSPs without and then with omitting family reasons for delay by the nine TEIS Point of Entry (POE) Offices for the APR reporting period. This table identifies each TEIS district with an "*" denoting Cohort 1 districts for which there is also monitoring compliance data reflected in Table 7.3. Totals were calculated by the following formula: total number of IFSP meetings held 'timely' and then 'timely omitting family reasons' divided by the total number of IFSP meetings held. The Table also reflects a summary of the statewide average % timely IFSPs.

Table 7.2: TEIS Quarterly Caseload Report Data Regarding Timeliness of Initial IFSPs for September 2006

| District | September 15, 2006 | | |
|----------|--|------------------|--|
| | # of Initial IFSP Meetings for this Report | # and (%) Timely | # and % Timely Omitting Family Reasons |
| FT | 134 | 107 (80%) | 125 (93%) |
| ET | 357 | 274 (77%) | 330 (92%) |
| SE | 125 | 104 (83%) | 117 (94%) |

| | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| UC | 213 | 122 (57%) | 177 (83%) |
| GN | 397 | 232 (58%) | 304 (77%) |
| SC | 297 | 196 (66%) | 238 (80%) |
| NW | 135 | 121 (90%) | 133 (99%) |
| SW | 77 | 74 (96%) | 76 (99%) |
| MD | 347 | 324 (93%) | 339 (98%) |
| Total | 2082 | 1554 | 1839 |
| Statewide % Timely | | 75% | 88% |

Table 7.2 reports number/(percentage) of timely initial IFSPs without and then with omitting family reasons for delay by the nine TEIS Point of Entry (POE) Offices for September 2006. It was decided to include data from the September 15 report as it reports further progress made by the Lead Agency towards correction of noncompliance. This table identifies each TEIS district with an '**' denoting Cohort 1 districts for which there is also monitoring compliance data reflected in Table 7.3. Totals were calculated by the following formula: total number of IFSP meetings held 'timely' and then 'timely omitting family reasons' divided by the total number of IFSP meetings held for the report. The Table also reflects a summary of the statewide average % timely IFSPs.

Table 7.3: CIMP Data for Cohort 1 regarding Compliance with Timely Initial IFSPs

| District | # and (%) Findings of Noncompliance Self-Assessment: 4/15/05 | # Corrections <1 Year from Identification APR 1: 3/1/06 | # Corrections =1 Year from Identification APR 2: 12/15/06 | # and (%) of Continued Findings of Noncompliance |
|-----------------|--|---|---|--|
| FT | 1 (33%) | 0 | 0 | 1 (33%) |
| GN | 1 (33%) | 0 | 0 | 1 (33%) |
| NW | 1 (33%) | 0 | 0 | 1 (33%) |
| Cohort 1 Totals | 3 (100%) 15 Programs N/A | 0 | 0 | 3 (100%) 15 Programs N/A |

Table 7.3 reports district monitoring data contained in CIMP reports for Cohort 1. The Table also reflects a statewide summary for the number/(percentage) across findings and corrections.

Discussion of Data

The Lead Agency reports progress towards compliance for this indicator. The Statewide percentage of timely initial IFSP meetings, omitting family reasons for delay, increased from 58% as reported in the SPP to 87% reported in this APR. Based on additional data in the September 2006 TEIS Quarterly Caseload Report, the Lead Agency continues to report progress towards compliance beyond this APR reporting period at 88%. CIMP data for Cohort 1 in Table 7.3 supports the conclusion that though progress has been made towards compliance, timely initial IFSP meetings remain an issue of continued noncompliance. Program improvement plans were included in Cohort 1 CIMP reports to address this issue. Cohort 1 data report: FT district has made steady improvement of +17% (76% in March 2006, 96% in June 2006, and 93% in September 2006). GN has made overall improvement of 20% (57% in March 2006, 79% in June 2006, and 77% in September 2006). NW has sustained improvements for 99% compliance (99% in March 2006, 95% in June 2006, and 99% in September 2006). All TEIS POEs have made improvements since the 2005 SPP. Ending with the September 2006 Quarterly Caseload Report, TEIS POEs range from low 77% (GN) to high 99% (NW and SW) for compliance with initial IFSP meetings within 45 days of referral into the early intervention system.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005-2006:

| Activities/Resources | Timelines | Resources | Activity Status 2005-2006 |
|---|----------------------|--|---|
| The lead agency will encourage the utilization of the Quarterly Case Report tool as a monthly district compliance measure. A number of offices have developed this approach. The state has initiated intensive targeted technical assistance to the | Begin September 2005 | DSE Data and Monitoring Personnel, Quarterly Report Submission | Use of Quarterly Caseload Reports was initiated September 2005. It was not until March 2006 that data began to be reviewed by reasons for delay, including family reasons. This change coincided with a change in DSE Monitoring Personnel. |

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| <p>districts that have not seen a significant increase in the timeliness of Eligibility Determination and IFSP development. The state lead agency is exploring the idea of requiring monthly submissions.(Please note above the baseline trend of timely IFSP development since the initiation of the "Quarterly Case Report" and the associated monitoring functions</p> | | | <p>Beginning March 2006, a data summary from this report was provided by the State office back to District TEIS Point of Entries (POEs) which also included a summary of reason for delay in timely initial IFSP Meetings. Districts were encouraged to utilize this information for tracking performance and in addressing issues specific to their offices or providers for improvement.</p> <p>Beginning March 2006, a state-wide summary of performance based on these reports was provided by the State office to District POEs for their information and use.</p> <p>The Quarterly Caseload Report is now used as a 'primary data source' for compliance tracking by POEs in their CIMP reporting to the State.</p> <p>Capacity to capture data for all types of IFSPs is being built into the Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS). Until such time, data regarding timely initial IFSPs will continue to be reported through this quarterly report.</p> |
| <p>Specific Case by Case Reporting will continue to be Required from the Districts to the State regarding any Initial IFSP that is not completed within 45 days of the referral into the Part C system</p> | <p>Ongoing with through submission of Quarterly Caseload Report</p> | <p>Point of Entry Staff, DSE Data and Monitoring Personnel</p> | <p>See previous "activity" for information regarding status.</p> |

Summary of Data:

The Lead Agency reports progress towards compliance for this indicator. The Statewide percentage of timely initial IFSP meetings, omitting family reasons for delay, increased from 58% as reported in the SPP to 87% reported in this APR. Based on additional data in the September 2006 TEIS Quarterly Caseload Report, the Lead Agency continues to report progress towards compliance beyond this APR reporting period at 88%. CIMP data for Cohort 1 in Table 7.3 supports the conclusion that though progress has been made towards compliance, timely initial IFSP meetings remain an issue of continued noncompliance. Program improvement plans were included in Cohort 1 CIMP reports to address this issue. Cohort 1 data report: FT district has made steady improvement of +17% (76% in March 2006, 96% in June 2006, and 93% in September 2006). GN has made overall improvement of 20% (57% in March 2006, 79% in June 2006, and 77% in September 2006). NW has sustained improvements for 99% compliance (99% in March 2006, 95% in June 2006, and 99% in September 2006). All TEIS POEs have made improvements since the 2005 SPP. Ending with the September 2006 Quarterly Caseload Report, TEIS POEs range from low 77% (GN) to high 99% (NW and SW) for compliance with initial IFSP meetings within 45 days of referral into the early intervention system.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005-2006:

Improvement activities have been revised for 2006-2007. Activities are more reflective of targeted actions needed for continued progress towards compliance with this indicator as this is an indicator with an issue of continued noncompliance. These activities have also been included in the revised SPP.

| Improvement Activities for 2006-2007 | | |
|--|--|---|
| Activities/Resources | Timelines | Resources |
| Quarterly Caseload Report submissions around timely initial IFSPs, including reasons for delay through current FileMaker Pro Database until such time as data can be pulled from TEIDS. | Begin March 2006 | DSE Data Manager and Monitoring Personnel, Quarterly Report Submissions |
| Data verification for "reasons of delay" through written confirmation by TEIS POEs pertaining to the accuracy of data they submit to the State. | Begin March 2007 and each quarter thereafter | DSE Data Manager and Monitoring Personnel, Quarterly Report Submissions, TEIS POE Project Coordinators, Contract Coordinators, and Principal Investigators |
| Data verification regarding "reasons of delay" via periodic on-site sampling of data for verification of accuracy. | Begin May 2007 | DSE Data Manager and Monitoring Personnel, Quarterly Report Submissions, TEIS POE Project Coordinators |
| District and state-wide summaries provided to POEs for the tracking of performance and utilization for correction of systematic issues of noncompliance. | Begin March 2007 | DSE Data Manager and Monitoring Personnel, TEIS POE Project Coordinators, Contract Coordinators and Principal Investigators |
| District POEs utilize data from Quarterly Caseload Report for tracking and reporting on indicator compliance in Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) reporting | Begin December 2006 | TEIS POE Project Coordinators, Contract Coordinators and Principal Investigators, District Quarterly Caseload Reports, CIMP Reports |
| Language added to TEIS Scope of Services to address contract compliance related to issue of timely initial IFSP meetings pending recommendations from the Governor's Office of Children's Care Coordination (GOCCC). | July 2007 pending GOCCC | DSE Director, DSE Contract Coordinator, TEIS POE Project Coordinators, Contract Coordinators and Principal Investigators; Scope of Services |
| Monitoring and implementation of sanctions for noncompliance. | Begin monitoring cycle 7/1/07-6/30/08 | DSE Director, DSE Contract Coordinator, Monitoring and TA Personnel; TEIS POE Project Coordinators, Contract Coordinators and Principal Investigators |
| Work with TEIDS development team to ensure reporting requirements are implemented in data system. | Begin implementation December 2006 | TEIDS development team, Monitoring Personnel |

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to Overview, page 3.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Indicator 8: Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:

- A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;
- B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and
- C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.

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

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

A. All IFSPs for children in Tennessee include transition steps and procedures, at age 2 and beyond.

B. 81% = 2161 / 2662 x 100

C. 88% = 1543 / 1359 x 100

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|-----------|---|
| 2005-2006 | 100% of children exiting Part C will receive timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community service by their third birthday. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 100% of children exiting Part C will have IFSPs that include transition steps and services. b. 100% of LEAs will receive notification when there is parental consent for children |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>exiting Part C who are potentially eligible for Part B services.</p> <p>c. 100% of children exiting Part C who are potentially eligible for Part B services will have a transition conference.</p> |
|--|---|

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005-2006:

Future reporting regarding transition plans and timelines will be captured through Tennessee’s new web based, statewide data system, Tennessee’s Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS). TEIDS includes transition information regarding the following:

- LEA location
- Date due for notification at age 2
- Parent consent date at age 2 for LEA notification
- Date of LEA Notification
- Notification method
- Transition planning due date
- Days between transition meeting and third birthday
- Parent consent to release transition records to LEA
- Date Transition records released
- Transition meeting note
- Transition participants
- Transition participant detail
- Parent consent information
- Date parent signed transition form
- Target date for Part B eligibility
- Actual date for Part B eligibility
- Transition steps and services

Training for TEIDS was provided by OEC staff to all nine TEIS District Point of Entry service coordinators and staff by October 2006. Training for providers was completed by November 2006. All active records were entered into TEIDS by November 30, 2006.

A. IFSPs with Transition Steps and Services

For purposes of this report, the Lead Agency collected and reviewed information from Tennessee state regulations, training modules for this indicator and data from the Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) Cohort 1.

Tennessee State Regulations; Rule 0520-1-10-.02 (12) require that TEIS staff provide opportunities for families to be included in all aspects of transitional planning and implementation. Formal transition planning begins no later than the child’s second birthday and is included in the IFSP. At a minimum, transition plans include information regarding notification to the LEA and plans to convene a transition planning conference. Purposes of the transition conference include the discussion of possibilities for preschool services that the child may possibly receive if determined eligible for IDEA Part B services, review the child’s program options from the third birthday through the remainder of the school year and further develop and document the child’s transition plan.

Tennessee’s Service Coordination Training Modules include training for the development of transition plans that involve individualized attention based upon a child’s needs. The service coordination training modules were implemented during FFY 2005-2006. All TEIS Point of Entry (POE) service coordinators completed training including portfolio requirements by

6/30/06. The training modules are located on the Tennessee website at: <http://tennessee.gov/education/speced/TEIS/training/index>. The training consisted of two tracks. One track was available for experienced service coordinators and a second track was used for inexperienced service coordinators. A total of 140 service coordinators completed the service coordination training modules by June 30, 2006. When new service coordinators are hired, service coordination training is provided and completed within six months of employment. Module 9, Preparing the Path to a New Destination; Transition in Early Intervention, specifically describes methods for the development of transition plans that will begin when a child reaches two years of age or upon admission when a child enters the system after age two. Training materials include transition preparation checklists that assist the service coordinators in individualizing transition plans and ensuring that a broad range of topics are discussed with the family. Some of the items included on the checklist are as follows:

1. Process to determine eligibility for preschool special education placement
2. Preparation for the child's evaluation to determine eligibility for the school system
3. Information regarding the parents' legal rights and responsibilities after the child turns three years of age
4. Information about preschool special education programs and services
5. Activities to prepare for the child's IEP
6. Arrangements for visits to preschool classrooms
7. Activities to prepare the child for the new classroom

Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) indicator 3.1E specifically addresses the issue of transition activities that need to be developed when a child turns two years of age. Programs completing the CIMP report (Self-Assessment or Annual Performance Report) must address this indicator. CIMP data for this report was taken from Cohort 1. Cohort 1 consists of 18 programs from three districts (FT, GN, and NW). These programs include the three TEIS Point of Entry (POEs) offices and 15 early intervention providers. All 18 programs have completed the full process of TN's revised monitoring system through the submission a self-assessment/program improvement plan (PIP) and subsequent annual performance reports (APR) from which status of noncompliance correction can be tracked. For additional information regarding TN's monitoring system see SPP Indicator 9. Refer to Table 8.1 for results of CIMP compliance data.

Table 8.1: CIMP 3.1.E. Indicator: The IFSP Includes Steps to Support Transition.

| District | # and (%) Findings of Noncompliance Self-Assessment: 4/15/05 | # Corrections <1 Year from Identification APR 1: 3/1/06 | # Corrections =1 Year from Identification APR 2: 12/15/06 | # and (%) Continued Findings of Noncompliance |
|------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| FT | 2 (11%) | 1 | 1 | 0 (0%) |
| GN | 6 (33%) | 2 | 2 | 2 (11%) |
| NW | 3 (17%) | 2 | 0 | 1 (6%) |
| Cohort 1 Totals | 11/18 (61%) Non Compliance | 5 Total Corrections | 3 Total Corrections | 3/18 (17%) Non Compliance |
| | 7/18 (39%) Compliant | | | 15/18 (83%) Compliant |
| | 0 Programs N/A | | | 0 Programs N/A |

Table 8.1 reflects district monitoring data contained in CIMP reports for Cohort 1. Cohort 1 consists of 18 programs - three district point of entries along with 15 early intervention programs (FT=4, GN=7, NW=4).

The Table also reflects a statewide summary for the average number/(percentage) across findings and corrections. For this indicator all 18 programs were required to respond in the self assessment. A total of 11 programs (61%) were non-compliant at the time of the self assessment submission on 4/15/05. Seven programs (39%) of the 18 programs were compliant. A total of eight programs were able to correct their areas of non-compliance, reducing the number of non-compliant programs to 3(17%). By the time of APR 2, a total of eight programs had improved their status to compliance and an overall total of 15 programs (83%) were compliant by 12/15/06

B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B

Tennessee State Regulations; Rule 0520-1-10-.02 (12) requires that families be included in all aspects of transitional planning and implementation. Formal transition planning begins no later than the child's second birthday and is included

in the IFSP. At a minimum, transition plans include information regarding notification to the LEA and plans to convene a transition planning conference. Rule 0520-1-10-.02 (12b) specifically require that the service coordinator shall provide written notification or referral to the local education agency (LEA) for that child on or before the child's second birthday with parental consent. In reference, the Office of Special Education Programs' Letter to Elder (2/11/04) indicates the following:

"The SEA may require instead that the lead agency or any other agency that makes referrals under the State's child find system notify the parent that the child is being referred to the SEA for child find purposes and allow the parent an opportunity to object: if the parent objects during the period provided for objection, then the IDEA does not require that the referral be made and, consequently in this situation, parental consent is required before the referral can be made."

By requiring parental consent prior to the release of information to the LEA, Tennessee does establish a system for families to object (decline) notification to the LEA. Information regarding the families who decline notification is collected in the state's new web based data system (TEIDS) and the information will be reported separately.

Service Coordination training modules included training for the development of transition plans that include individualized attention based upon the child's needs. The service coordination training modules were implemented during FFY 2005-2006. All TEIS point of entry service coordinators completed training including portfolio requirements by 6/30/06. The training modules are located on the Tennessee website at: <http://tennessee.gov/education/speced/TEIS/training/index>. A total of 140 service coordinators completed the service coordination training modules. As new service coordinators are hired, ongoing training is provided. Module 9, Preparing the Path to a New Destination; Transition in Early Intervention, specifically describe methods for the development of transition plans that will begin when a child reaches two years of age or upon admission when a child enters the system after age two.

For purposes of this report, the Lead Agency collected data through two avenues to address this indicator: (1) Focused data review; and (2) Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) report data for Cohort 1.

1. Tennessee's established data system, FileMaker Pro, required by all nine TEIS district point of entry offices (POEs) had the capacity to collect the number of children in FFY 2005-2006 with active IFSPs who turned two years of age, thus creating a sample of children who would be eligible for notification to the LEA. The report consisted of a list of each child with a current IFSP who turned two years of age during the reporting time. It included the child's second birthday, initial IFSP date, current IFSP date, notification to LEA date, exit date and whether the family refused services. The initial query for the sample was formatted and conducted by the Lead Agency Technical Assistance staff members who were able to derive a population of all children in Part C services who turned two years of age during FY 2006. The State Technical Assistance staff was able to identify gaps in information and request clarification from each district based on specific children. For children who were active in services, it was possible to access the child's record directly through Tennessee's new web based data system, TEIDS. Directions were given for each district to follow creating a consistent measure of information. The child's specific data was reviewed by Lead Agency staff and questions were referred to the specific district for clarification. As required by OSEP, Tennessee excluded those families who refused services to the LEA. TEIS District POE staff members were able to identify delays based upon family reasons, system/ service coordinator reasons or data errors. The family reasons were factored out of one calculation.

Table 8.2: Number and Percent of Timely Notifications to the LEA at Age 2 FFY 2005-2006 (Source: FileMaker Pro Data Base)

| TEIS District | # of Children age 2 with active IFSPs | # and (%) Timely Notifications to LEA | # and (%) Timely Notification to LEA-Omitting Family Reasons for Delay |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| FT | 155 | 123 (79%) | 144 (93%) |
| ET | 613 | 368 (60%) | 514 (85%) |
| SE | 249 | 173 (69%) | 216 (87%) |

| | | | |
|------------------|------|------------|------------|
| UC | 216 | 117 (54%) | 176 (81%) |
| GN | 392 | 266 (68%) | 364 (93%) |
| SC | 322 | 158 (49%) | 182 (56%) |
| NW | 139 | 126 (91%) | 134 (96%) |
| SW | 130 | 122 (94%) | 123 (95%) |
| MD | 446 | 266 (60%) | 308 (69%) |
| Statewide | 2662 | 1719 (65%) | 2161 (81%) |

Table 8.2 reflects the results of a statewide data review utilizing the current data base of FileMaker Pro regarding the timely notification to the LEA of children who were 2 years of age during FFY 2005-2006. This table includes the total number of children who were 2 years of age and had an active IFSP during FFY 2005-2006. If the child was 2 years of age or older at the time of the initial IFSP, 10 days after the IFSP meeting were allowed for the notification to the LEA to occur before it was considered delayed. Totals were calculated by the following formula: total number of timely notifications at age 2 divided by total number of children age 2 with an active IFSP. Statewide results indicate that 65% of children who turned 2 years of age with an active IFSP during FFY 2005-2006 and were potentially eligible for notification to the LEA did receive a timely notification to the LEA.

2. Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) indicator 5.1A specifically addresses the issue of notification to the LEA when a child is two years of age. All programs completing CIMP report (Self-Assessment or Annual Performance Report) must address indicator. CIMP data for this report was taken from Cohort 1. Cohort 1 consists of three districts (FT, GN, and NW) for a total of 18 programs. These programs include the three TEIS POEs and 15 early intervention providers. The programs in Cohort 1 have completed the full process of TN's revised monitoring system through the submission a self-assessment/program improvement plan (PIP) and subsequent annual performance reports (APR) from which status of noncompliance correction can be tracked. For additional information regarding Tennessee's monitoring system see SPP Indicator 9.

Table 8.3: Tennessee CIMP Indicator 5.1.A: LEA Notification by Age Two Years:

| District | # and (%) Findings of Noncompliance Self-Assessment: 4/15/05 | # Corrections <1 Year from Identification APR 1: 3/1/06 | # Corrections =1 Year from Identification APR 2: 12/15/06 | # and (%) of Continued Findings of Noncompliance |
|-----------------|--|---|---|--|
| FT | 1 (17%) | 0 | 0 | 1 (17%) |
| GN | 3 (50%) | 2 | 0 | 1 (17%) |
| NW | 1 (17%) | 0 | 0 | 1 (17%) |
| Cohort 1 Totals | 5/6 (83%) Noncompliance | 2 Total Corrections | 0 | 3/6 (50%) Noncompliance |
| | 1/6 (17%) Compliant | | | 3/6 (50%) Compliant |
| | 12 Programs N/A | | | 12 Programs N/A |

Table 8.3 reflects district monitoring data contained in CIMP reports for Cohort 1. Cohort 1 consists of 18 programs - three district point of entries along with 15 early intervention programs (FT=4, GN=7, NW=4). The Table also reflects a statewide summary for the average number/(percentage) across findings and corrections. For this indicator, six programs were required to respond in the self assessment. This indicator was not applicable for twelve programs. A total of 5 programs (83%) were noncompliant at the time of the self assessment submission on 4/15/05. One program (17%) was compliant as of 4/15/05. A total of two programs were able to correct their areas of noncompliance, reducing the number of noncompliant programs to 3 (50%). An overall total of 3 programs (50%) were compliant by 12/15/06.

C. Transition Conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.

For purposes of this report, the Lead Agency collected data through two avenues to address this indicator (1) Quarterly Caseload Data Reports; and (2) Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) report data for Cohort 1:

1. In Table 8.4 below, TEIS Quarterly Caseload Data Reports were used to identify the number of children who received a transition conference meeting within the timeframe required. The Quarterly Caseload Reports are submitted by each of the nine TEIS district offices on a per child basis. The information is verified by state staff in the Office of Early Childhood (OEC). Transition conference meetings that are late or not held are identified and returned to the TEIS district for explanation. The TEIS district staff submits the reasons for late conference meetings to OEC. The OEC staff calculates the total number of meetings held and the total number of meetings that were late. On June 15, 2006, a total of 809 transition conference meetings were held. By reviewing the number of meetings only, and not considering any reasons for the delay of the meetings, 63% of those meetings were held on time. When family reasons for the delay of the transition meetings are considered, the total number of transition meetings held on time increases to 91% which is 10.86% increase from the June 15, 2005 reported number of 80.14%. Tennessee demonstrated progress in the area of conducting timely transition planning conferences.

Table 8.4: TEIS Quarterly Caseload Data Regarding Timeliness of Transition Conference Meetings

| District | March 15, 2006 | | | June 15, 2006 | | |
|----------------------------|--|----------------|--|--|----------------|--|
| | Total Number of Transition Meetings | # and % Timely | # and % Time (omitting family reasons) | Total Number of Transition Meetings | # and % Timely | # and % Timely (omitting family reasons) |
| FT* | 48 | 20 (42%) | 43 (90%) | 63 | 49 (78%) | 58 (92%) |
| ET | 149 | 85 (57%) | 138 (93%) | 175 | 112 (64%) | 169 (97%) |
| SE | 50 | 21 (42%) | 38 (76%) | 53 | 33 (62%) | 50 (94%) |
| UC | 60 | 10 (17%) | 47 (78%) | 58 | 16 (28%) | 41 (71%) |
| GN* | 139 | 81 (58%) | 121 (87%) | 169 | 93 (55%) | 163 (96%) |
| SC | 123 | 60 (49%) | 108 (88%) | 118 | 83 (70%) | 99 (84%) |
| NW* | 31 | 26 (84%) | 30 (97%) | 30 | 21 (70%) | 29 (97%) |
| SW | 27 | 22 (84%) | 24 (89%) | 26 | 22 (85%) | 25 (96%) |
| MD | 107 | 45 (42%) | 73 (68%) | 117 | 78 (85%) | 103 (88%) |
| Statewide Average % Timely | 734 Total Transition Meetings Statewide | 370(50%) | 62280 80 (85%) | 809 Total Transition Meetings Statewide | 507(63%) | 737(91%) |

Table 8.4 reflects the results of data collected at two points in time; March 15 2006 and June 15, 2006. This table indicates the total numbers of children who received a timely transition meeting as well as the percentage of children based upon Quarterly Caseload Reports. This table identifies each TEIS district with an (*) denoting Cohort 1 for which there is also compliance reflected in 8.5. Totals were calculated by the following formula: total number of timely transition meetings divided by the total number of children with active IFSP eligible for a transition meeting.

2. Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) for indicator 5.1B specifically addresses the issue of notification to the LEA when a child is two years of age. All programs completing CIMP report (Self-Assessment or Annual Performance Report) must address indicator. CIMP data for this report was taken from Cohort 1. Cohort 1 consists of three districts (FT, GN, and NW) for a total of 18 programs. These programs include the three TEIS POEs and 15 early intervention providers. The programs in Cohort 1 have completed the full process of TN's revised monitoring system through the submission of a self-assessment/program improvement plan (PIP) and subsequent annual performance reports (APR) from which status of noncompliance correction can be tracked. For additional information regarding Tennessee's monitoring system see SPP Indicator 9.

Table 8.5: Tennessee CIMP Report from Cohort 1- Indicator 5.1.B; Timely Transition Planning Conferences:

| District | # and (%) Findings of Noncompliance Self-Assessment: 4/15/05 | # Corrections <1 Year from Identification APR 1: 3/1/06 | # Corrections =1 Year from Identification APR 2: 12/15/06 | # and (%) of Longstanding Findings of Noncompliance |
|-----------------|--|---|---|---|
| FT | 1 (17%) | 0 | 0 | 1 (17%) |
| GN | 2 (33%) | 1 | 0 | 1 (17%) |
| NW | 1 (17%) | 0 | 0 | 1 (17%) |
| Cohort 1 Totals | 4/6 (67%) Noncompliance | 1 Total Correction | 0 | 3/6 (50%) Noncompliance |
| | 2/6 (33%) Compliant 12 Programs N/A | | | 3/6 (50%) Compliant 12 Programs N/A |

Table 8.5 reflects district monitoring data contained in CIMP reports for Cohort 1 regarding the number and percentage of noncompliance regarding timely transition planning conferences. Cohort 1 consists of 18 programs - three district point of entries along with 15 early intervention programs (FT=4, GN=7, NW=4). The Table also reflects a statewide summary for the average number/(percentage) across findings and corrections. For this indicator, six programs were required to respond in the self assessment. This indicator was not applicable for twelve programs. A total of 4 programs (67%) were noncompliant at the time of the self assessment submission on 4/15/05. Two programs (17%) were compliant as of 4/15/05. One program was able to correct their area of noncompliance, reducing the number of noncompliant programs to 3(50%). An overall total of 3 programs (50%) were compliant by 12/15/06.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005-2006:

| Activities | Timelines | Resources | Activity Status FY 2005-2006 |
|---|--------------------------|--|---|
| All persons providing Part C Service Coordination in Tennessee must complete required Service Coordinators Training Program (includes module on Transition). | Initiated September 2005 | TN Service Coordinator Training Curriculum; Approved Trainers | All TEIS district service coordinators completed service coordination training and corresponding portfolio requirements by 6/30/06. A total of 140 service coordinators were trained. Completed |
| Develop and implement Parent Training Curriculum and other resource documents regarding transition. Help parents prepare for transition by providing STEP/PTI preschool transition and basic | Initiate March 2006 | DSE Personnel; TN Parent Training and Information Center; National Early Childhood Transition Center (NECTC) | - DSE Part C and Part B preschool personnel have provided "Paving the Way" training. Parents are invited to those trainings. -Governor's Office of Children's Care Coordination (GOCCC) is studying the state's training curriculum. Recommendations will be forthcoming for state lead |

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

| | | | |
|--|----------------|---|---|
| workshops to all parents of two and three year olds. | | | agency decision making |
| Continue Quarterly Partnership meetings with Early Intervention programs and LEAs | Ongoing | State 619 Coordinator, DSE EI TA Consultants and Preschool Consultants | Regional partnership meetings held as needed. |
| Provide training to ensure accurate data entry by service coordinators | Ongoing | TEIDS Data Coordinator; DSE EI TA Consultants; TEIS Project Coordinators | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Verification of Quarterly Caseload Report data with district regarding transition data. - Monthly meetings with TEIS pilot districts regarding TEIDS - May 2006 orientation to TEIDS with all District Project Coordinators and Data Managers. - Annual state-wide 618 Child Count Training regarding exiting. |
| Monitor the number and timeliness of transition conferences and participation of E I and LEA personnel in transition conferences through current data system. | Ongoing | TEIDS Data Coordinator; TEIS Project Coordinators | CIMP and Quarterly Caseload Reports- CIMP and Quarterly Caseload Reports are an ongoing endeavor. |
| Finalize the full implementation of the web-based data system so that data is readily available at the state office. Modifications to local data base will be made for transition timelines in order to identify reason for delay in transition meetings | September 2006 | Data System Development Contractor; GSEG Management Team; TEIDS Coordinator | <p>TEIS district staff and service providers have been trained. Active records have been entered into the system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Addition made to FileMaker pro to capture this data in QCR. <p>Completed</p> |
| Continue emphasis on local self-assessment Including local analysis and reporting performance in the | Ongoing | DSE/DMRS EI TA Consultants and validation team | CIMP– cohort 1. Reference to indicator 9. |

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

| | | | |
|---|----------------|---|---|
| area of transition through the Part C Monitoring System | | | |
| Provide joint training and TA opportunities for EI, LEA, and community programs in order to improve transitions for children exiting the Part C system (includes "Paving the Way" powerpoint, Early Childhood strand at the DSE Annual Spring Conference and implementation of Part C Service Coordination Training Modules/Transition Module #9). | Ongoing | DSE E I and Preschool Personnel; Parent Training and Information Centers; TEIS Approved Service Coordination Trainers | Paving the Way Training has been provided by Part B and Part C state staff. Paving the Way is incorporated within Module 9 of service coordination training. |
| Implement Quarterly Case Report data collection from 9 TEIS district offices (including data fields for Transition Meeting Date). | Ongoing | TEIDS Data Coordinator and TEIS Part C Monitoring Coordinator | QCR is a continuing requirement for each TEIS District point of entry office. |
| Children will be assigned a unique identifier in the TEIDS statewide database that will follow them into Part B (if eligible) or upon school entry at age 5. This will allow for seamless tracking into the Part B data system. This will improve TN's ability to obtain and analyze transition data and help identify areas and programs in need of improvement. | September 2006 | Data System Development Contractor; GSEG Management Team; TEIDS Coordinator | TEIS district staff and service providers have been trained. Active records have been entered into the system. Completed |
| Include a field in electronic database related to reasons | December 2005 | Data System Development Contractor; GSEG Management Team; TEIDS | TEIS district staff and service providers have been trained. Active |

years of age and had an active IFSP. In the SPP, the Lead agency reported information using primarily the Tennessee Quantitative Data Report to address this indicator. For FFY 2005, 658 notifications were reported. By more fully utilizing the File Maker Pro data base, information was obtained for all children that was verified by OEC staff. For FFY 2006, a total of 1719 notifications to the LEA were made in a timely manner by the child's second birthday. An increase of 1061 notifications was made during FFY 2006. In addition, the Lead Agency was able to ascertain the total number of potential notifications thus creating an opportunity to obtain a percentage of children. For FY 2006, 65% of all statewide notifications were made in a timely manner.

CIMP Data from Cohort 1 revealed that there were a total of five programs in noncompliance, but compliance was achieved by two programs during the reporting period (GN). Program improvement plans were included in Cohort 1 CIMP reports to address this issue.

8C: The Lead Agency reports progress towards compliance for this indicator. The statewide percentage of timely transition meetings (omitting family reasons) increased from 80.14% as reported in the FY2005 SPP to 91% reported in this APR based upon Quarterly Caseload Reports of June 15, 2005 and 2006. CIMP reports from Cohort 1 indicate that 4 programs were identified as noncompliant. One program corrected the area of noncompliance. (Table 8.5) Further analysis of the data indicated that the districts involved in cohort 1 (FT, GN, NW) demonstrated steady progress based on percentage of timely transition meetings (omitting family reasons) on Quarterly Caseload Report from March 15, 2006 and June 15, 2006 (Table 8.4) as indicated below:

| Cohort 1 | March 15, 2006 | June 15, 2006 |
|----------|----------------|---------------|
| FT | 90% | 92% |
| GN | 85% | 96% |
| NW | 97% | 97% |

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005-2006:

Improvement activities have been revised for 2006-2007. Activities are more reflective of targeted actions needed for continued progress towards compliance with this indicator as this is an indicator with an issue of continued noncompliance. These activities have also been included in the revised SPP.

| Improvement Activities for 2006-2007 | | |
|---|--|--|
| Activities/Resources | Timelines | Resources |
| Quarterly Caseload Report submissions around transition plans, timely notifications to LEA and timely transition conference meetings including reasons for delay through current FileMaker Pro Database until such time as data can be pulled from TEIDS. | Begin March 2007 | DSE Data Manager and Monitoring Personnel, Quarterly Report Submissions |
| Data verification for "reasons of delay" through written confirmation by TEIS POEs pertaining to the accuracy of data they submit to the State. | Begin March 2007 and each quarter thereafter | DSE Data Manager and Monitoring Personnel, Quarterly Report Submissions, TEIS POE Project Coordinators, Contract Coordinators, and Principal |

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

| | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|
| | | Investigators |
| Data verification regarding "reasons of delay" via periodic on-site sampling of data for verification of accuracy. | Begin May 2007 | DSE Data Manager and Monitoring Personnel, Quarterly Report Submissions, TEIS POE Project Coordinators |
| District and state-wide summaries provided to POEs for the tracking of performance and utilization for correction of systematic issues of noncompliance. | Begin March 2007 | DSE Data Manager and Monitoring Personnel, TEIS POE Project Coordinators, Contract Coordinators and Principal Investigators |
| District POEs utilize data from Quarterly Caseload Report for tracking and reporting on indicator compliance in Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) reporting | Begin December 2006 | TEIS POE Project Coordinators, Contract Coordinators and Principal Investigators, District Quarterly Caseload Reports, CIMP Reports |
| Language added to TEIS Scope of Services to address contract compliance related to issue of timely initial IFSP meetings pending recommendations from the Governor's Office of Children's Care Coordination (GOCCC). | July 2007 pending GOCCC | DSE Director, DSE Contract Coordinator, TEIS POE Project Coordinators, Contract Coordinators and Principal Investigators; Scope of Services |
| Monitoring and implementation of sanctions for noncompliance. | Begin monitoring cycle 7/1/07-6/30/08 | DSE Director, DSE Contract Coordinator, Monitoring and TA Personnel; TEIS POE Project Coordinators, Contract Coordinators and Principal Investigators |
| Work with TEIDS development team to ensure reporting requirements are implemented in data system. | Begin implementation December 2006 | TEIDS development team, Monitoring Personnel |

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to Overview, page 3.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 9: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.

48% = 15 / 31 x 100

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|-----------|---|
| 2005-2006 | Programs (covers 6 of the 9 Districts) will demonstrate 100% compliance for non-compliance on CIMP indicators within one year of identification as evidenced in the Annual Performance Reports (APR). |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005-2006:

Early Intervention Service (EIS) Programs:

Tennessee’s Early Intervention System (TEIS) is composed of nine (9) geographical districts. The Lead Agency maintains a local TEIS Point of Entry (POE) in each district through contractual arrangements. Responsibilities of the POE include local public awareness, child find, data collection and reporting, facilitation of eligibility determination and generation of the IFSP, service coordination, and establishing local contracts for early intervention services as payor of last resort.

Subcontracted providers for early intervention services specified on the IFSP are provided by programs operating within each TEIS District. Providers, which are considered ‘core’ Early Intervention Service Programs include:

- The Tennessee Infant Parent Services (TIPS): A statewide program of home-based services funded by the TN Department of Education. TIPS maintain a local office in each of the nine TEIS Districts.

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

- Early Intervention Resource Agency (EIRA) – Five (5) programs in the state funded by the TN Department of Education. Each of these agencies has a specific focus including rural service delivery, outreach and service delivery to the Hispanic community, and specialty services related to children with autism and behavioral concerns.
- TN Division of Mental Retardation Service Providers (DMRS): Thirty seven (37) early intervention agencies across the State funded by DMRS. Several of DMRS programs also receive additional support from DOE.

Part C Monitoring:

Refer to the SPP Indicator 9 (December 2005) for description of revisions to TN's monitoring process. As of the December 2006 report submission date, the Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) process has been implemented in all nine districts in the State which includes at total of 60 programs. Districts were phased into the revised monitoring system, thus there are three different phases of CIMP beginning with Cohort 1 through Cohort 3. For a detail of EIS Programs in TN refer to Tables 1 (Cohort 1), 2 (Cohort 2) and 3 (Cohort 3) below:

Table 9.1: EIS Program Type for Monitoring Cohort 1 (18 programs)

| Point of Entry Office (POE) | Tennessee Infant Parent Services (TIPS) | Early Intervention Resource Agencies (EIRA) | Division of Mental Retardation Services (DMRS) Early Intervention Providers |
|--|---|---|--|
| First Tennessee District (FT) | | | |
| TEIS POE | TIPS | Arc of Washington County Teaching Hands | Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program |
| Greater Nashville District (GN) | | | |
| TEIS POE | TIPS | | Foundations Outlook Center, including Ayundando Ninos (EIRA) Progressive Directions Prospect First Steps Easter Seals |
| Northwest District (NW) | | | |
| TEIS POE | TIPS | | C.S. Patterson U.T. Infant Stimulation Program Small Steps |

Table 9.1: Cohort 1 consists of 18 programs. They have submitted a Self-Assessment with Program Improvement Plan (PIP) April 15, 2005; Annual Performance Report 1 (APR) March 1, 2006; and APR 2 December 15, 2006.

Table 9.2: EIS Program Type for Monitoring Cohort 2 (20 programs)

| Point of Entry Office (POE) | Tennessee Infant Parent Services (TIPS) | Early Intervention Resource Agencies (EIRA) | Division of Mental Retardation Services (DMRS) Early Intervention Providers |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| East Tennessee District (ET) | | | |
| TEIS POE | TIPS | Claiborne County | Douglas Cooperative Emory Valley Center Sunshine Early Intervention Little TN Valley Educational Cooperative Henry Center Morristown-Hamblen Child Care Center U.T. Developmental and Genetic Center U.T. Pediatric Language Clinic |

| Upper Cumberland District (UC) | | | |
|--------------------------------|------|--|--|
| TEIS POE | TIPS | | Rainbow Early Intervention Kids Inc. Kids Putnam |
| Southwest District (SW) | | | |
| TEIS POE | TIPS | | Kiwanis Center for Child Development Advances Community Enterprises |

Table 9.2: Cohort 2 consists of 20 programs. They have submitted a Self-Assessment with PIP April 14, 2006; APR 1 December 15, 2006.

Table 9.3: EIS Program Type for Monitoring Cohort 3 (21 programs)

| Point of Entry Office (POE) | Tennessee Infant Parent Services (TIPS) | Early Intervention Resource Agencies (EIRA) | Division of Mental Retardation Services (DMRS) Early Intervention Providers |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Southeast Tennessee District (SE) | | | |
| TEIS POE | TIPS | | Grundy County Schools Signal Center Siskin Children's Institute Expanding Horizons |
| South Central District (SC) | | | |
| TEIS POE | TIPS | | Community Development Center King's Daughters' Project Help Skills School for Child Development Waves Susan Gray School |
| Memphis Delta District (MD) | | | |
| TEIS POE | TIPS | Harwood Center | Special Kids and Families LEAD Project Memphis Children and Family Services |

Table 9.3: Cohort 3 consists of 21 programs. They have submitted a Self-Assessment with PIP December 15, 2006.

The monitoring system continues to consist of the following eight topical areas called Clusters: Public Awareness, Evaluation and Assessment, Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP), Service Coordination, Transition, Family-Centered Services, Personnel and General Supervision. Cluster areas are broken down into Outcome statements (15) and Outcomes statements are further broken down into Indicators (34). The 34 Indicators are the actual 'question' programs address related to compliance. Indicators also have related Guidance statements which provide definition material in answering the question of compliance with an Indicator. Programs answer status of compliance with each indicator based on the Guidance for which they are responsible. The overall responsibilities categories include: incoming service coordination, ongoing/designated service coordination, conducting evaluations for the TEIS POE for the determination of eligibility, and early intervention service provision. Some Guidance is identified as a 'critical element'. These are Guidance for which those who have responsibility must address specifically when addressing status of compliance with an indicator. Critical elements are typically 'timeline-specific' issues such as timely delivery of early intervention services, timely initial IFSP meeting, etc. Depending on a program's responsibility, they may be "N/A" for an indicator and/or may also be N/A for some of critical elements within an indicator. Programs utilize a document entitled the *Guidance Matrix* in order to know which Guidance needing to be addressed based on their responsibilities for Part C eligible children. As roles/responsibilities may change from reporting period to reporting period (i.e., program completed eligibility evaluations for TEIS POE during 2004-2005 reporting period, but did not during 2005-2006 reporting period), the Lead Agency

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

develops a *Program Profile* for each EIS Program each year which identifies their responsibilities related to CIMP reporting.

Statewide training is updated and provided annually by the Division of Special Education (DSE) personnel in preparation for CIMP report submissions. Technical Assistance by DSE and DMRS personnel is made available to programs as they work on report submissions and as they implement their program improvement plans. Programs are strongly encouraged to utilize technical assistance resources in relation to these activities.

The reader will notice that there have been changes in CIMP report submission due dates. Annual report submission dates were changed from the original April submission to a December submission date in order to more closely link the report with the actual reporting year. For example, the original April 2005 submission was based on data from 7/1/03-6/30/04. This meant that programs were submitting reports based on data that was nine months old. The December submission date enabled programs to utilize more current information in their reports. This schedule has been revised once again for the submissions from all three cohorts which will now be due October 15, 2007. This additional change was made in order for the Lead Agency to have sufficient time to compile information for the OSEP APR due in February. The changes in submission date have caused some programs to have multiple reports within a one year timeframe.

Upon receipt of CIMP reports, the validation team conducts a full review. The validation team consists of the DSE Monitoring Coordinator and the DMRS Education and Family Services Director. Beginning with the March and April 2006 report submissions, regional technical assistance personnel from DSE and DMRS have been invited to sit in on reviews for the programs in their districts of responsibility. This new process has been useful for technical assistance as they provide follow-up with programs related to their improvement plans. When insufficient data is contained in a report submitted, such that the validation team is unable to confirm status of compliance, the program is requested to re-submit their report. If a re-submission continues to provide insufficient data, then an on-site visit is made by the validation team in order address issues with the program before a final review of the report can be completed. Programs have one year to correct issues of noncompliance from the date of identification which is the final letter from the validation team. See further information regarding this point in the "Summary of Data" section below.

Table 9.4: Status of CIMP Indicator Compliance for Programs in Cohort 1

| CIMP Indicators | SA/PIP 4/15/05 | | | APR-1 3/1/06 | | | APR-2 12/15/06 | |
|--|----------------------------------|--|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| | # and % programs compliant | # and % programs non- compliant | # corrected by 3/1/06 | # and % programs compliant | # and % programs non- compliant | # corrected by 12/15/06 | # and % programs compliant | # and % programs non- compliant |
| 1.0 Public Awareness | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1 The agency participates in the development of an effective district-wide child-find system, which results in the early identification of all children with special developmental needs. | | | | | | | | |
| A. The agency shows evidence of identifying children who are delayed through child find procedures including screenings. | 15 (85%) | 3 (17%) | 3 | 18 (100%) | | | | |
| 1.2 The agency has procedures related to referrals to other agencies and the receipt of referrals from families, programs, and | | | | | | | | |

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

| CIMP Indicators | SA/PIP 4/15/05 | | | APR-1 3/1/06 | | | APR-2 12/15/06 | |
|--|----------------------------------|--|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| | # and % programs compliant | # and % programs non- compliant | # corrected by 3/1/06 | # and % programs compliant | # and % programs non- compliant | # corrected by 12/15/06 | # and % programs compliant | # and % programs non- compliant |
| agencies. | | | | | | | | |
| A. The agency has procedures for accepting referrals into their agency. | 15 (85%) | 3 (17%) | 3 | 18 (100%) | | | | |
| B. The agency has a reasonable time frame for notifying families and referral sources after receipt of referrals to their agency | 8 (44%) | 10 (56%) | 8 | 16 (89%) | 2 (11%) | 1 | 17 (94%) | 1 (6%) |
| C. The agency makes referrals to other programs or agencies when appropriate. | 9 (50%) | 9 (50%) | 4 | 13 (72%) | 5 (28%) | 2 | 15 (83%) | 3 (17%) |
| 2.0 Evaluation and Assessment | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1 Children receive a multidisciplinary evaluation to determine eligibility for early intervention services. | | | | | | | | |
| A. A multidisciplinary team will complete an evaluation to determine eligibility within 45 days of the infant or toddler's referral into the early intervention system | 4 (50%) N/A=10 | 4 (50%) | 1 | 5 (63%) N/A=10 | 3 (37%) | 1 | 6 (75%) N/A=10 | 2 (25%) |
| B. Families are fully informed of all activities that will occur and records that will be accessed in the completion of the multidisciplinary evaluation process. | 12 (17%) N/A=2 | 4 (25%) | 3 | 15 (94%) N/A=2 | 1 (6%) | 1 | 16 (100%) N/A=2 | |
| C. A minimum of two different disciplines that best meet the needs of the child are involved in the evaluation/assessment | 15 (88%) N/A=1 | 2 (12%) | 2 | 17 (100%) N/A=1 | | | | |
| D. The agency documents the child's initial or continuing eligibility for early intervention services through a comprehensive multidisciplinary evaluation. | 10 (56%) | 8 (44%) | 5 | 15 (83%) | 3 (17%) | 2 | 17 (94%) | 1 (6%) |
| E. The evaluation/assessment process is culturally sensitive and administered in the native language of the parents or other mode | 16 (89%) | 2 (11%) | 1 | 17 (94%) | 1 (6%) | 1 | 18 (100%) | |

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

| CIMP Indicators | SA/PIP 4/15/05 | | | APR-1 3/1/06 | | | APR-2 12/15/06 | |
|---|----------------------------------|--|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| | # and % programs compliant | # and % programs non- compliant | # corrected by 3/1/06 | # and % programs compliant | # and % programs non- compliant | # corrected by 12/15/06 | # and % programs compliant | # and % programs non- compliant |
| of communication, unless it is clearly not feasible to do so. | | | | | | | | |
| 2.2 Children who have been determined eligible for early intervention services receive ongoing assessments. | | | | | | | | |
| A. Infants and toddlers who are eligible for early intervention services receive ongoing assessments in order to identify the child's unique strengths and needs. | 7 (39%) | 11 (61%) | 4 | 11 (61%) | 7 (39%) | 4 | 15 (83%) | 3 (17%) |
| 2.3 Families have the opportunity to participate in a voluntary family assessment. | | | | | | | | |
| A. The family is given the opportunity to participate in a family assessment, which identifies their concerns, priorities and resources, and the supports and services necessary to enhance the family's capacity to meet the developmental needs of the child. | 9 (53%) N/A=1 | 8 (47%) | 3 | 12 (71%) N/A=1 | 5 (29%) | 4 | 16 (94%) N/A=1 | 1 (6%) |
| 3.0 IFSP | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1 Each child receiving early intervention services has a current Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). | | | | | | | | |
| A. An initial meeting to develop the IFSP is held within 45 days of the child's referral into the early intervention system. | 0 (0%) N/A=15 | 3 (100%) | 0 | 0 (0%) N/A=15 | 3 (100%) | 0 | 0 (0%) N/A=15 | 3 (100%) |
| B. The results of the evaluation/assessment process are used to develop a comprehensive IFSP for the child. | 17 (94%) | 1 (6%) | 1 | 18 (100%) | | | | |
| C. The written IFSP includes statements of major outcomes, action steps, specific services and natural supports expected for | 13 (72%) | 5 (28%) | 1 | 14 (78%) | 4 (22%) | 1 | 15 (83%) | 3 (17%) |

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

| CIMP Indicators | SA/PIP 4/15/05 | | | APR-1 3/1/06 | | | APR-2 12/15/06 | |
|--|----------------------------------|--|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| | # and % programs compliant | # and % programs non- compliant | # corrected by 3/1/06 | # and % programs compliant | # and % programs non- compliant | # corrected by 12/15/06 | # and % programs compliant | # and % programs non- compliant |
| the child and the family. | | | | | | | | |
| D. A periodic review of the IFSP is conducted every six months and annually. | 11 (61%) | 7 (39%) | 4 | 15 (83%) | 3 (17%) | 1 | 16 (89%) | 2 (11%) |
| E. The IFSP includes steps to support the transition of the infant or toddler from Part C. | 7 (39%) | 11 (61%) | 5 | 12 (67%) | 6 (33%) | 3 | 15 (83%) | 3 (17%) |
| 4.0 Service Coordination | | | | | | | | |
| 4.1 Families have access to a Service Coordinator that facilitates ongoing, timely early intervention services in natural environment. | | | | | | | | |
| A. The incoming service coordinator oversees the eligibility process. | 2 (67%) N/A=15 | 1 (33%) | 1 | 3 (100%) | | | | |
| B. The ongoing service coordinator assists the family in facilitating the timely delivery of services, the coordination of EI services, and other services as needed by the child or family. | 3 (43%) N/A=11 | 4 (57%) | 2 | 5 (71%) N/A=11 | 2 (29%) | 2 | 7 (100%) | |
| 5.0 Transition | | | | | | | | |
| 5.1 The agency participates in the development and implementation of a transition plan for each child prior to exiting the early intervention system (Part C). | | | | | | | | |
| A. The agency delivers services and supports beginning at age 2 that prepare the child and family for transition. | 6 (33%) | 12 (67%) | 5 | 11 (61%) | 7 (39%) | 3 | 14 (78%) | 4 (22%) |
| B. A transition planning conference is held for each child receiving early intervention services in order to ensure a smooth transition to preschool or other appropriate services. | 8 (44%) | 10 (56%) | 5 | 13 (72%) | 5 (28%) | 0 | 13 (72%) | 5 (28%) |
| C. Families of children, who are exiting the EI system, including those children who are eligible and those children not eligible for Part B services, will be | 7 (39%) | 11 (61%) | 9 | 16 (89%) | 2 (11%) | 1 | (17 (94%) | 1 (6%) |

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

| CIMP Indicators | SA/PIP 4/15/05 | | | APR-1 3/1/06 | | | APR-2 12/15/06 | |
|--|----------------------------------|--|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| | # and % programs compliant | # and % programs non- compliant | # corrected by 3/1/06 | # and % programs compliant | # and % programs non- compliant | # corrected by 12/15/06 | # and % programs compliant | # and % programs non- compliant |
| informed of opportunities to participate in community based services and all other options available at transition. | | | | | | | | |
| 6.0 Procedural Safeguards | | | | | | | | |
| 6.1 Procedural safeguards protect the rights of parents throughout the early intervention process. | | | | | | | | |
| A. The agency has policies and procedures that ensure that parents are informed of procedural safeguards. | 10 (100%) N/A=8 | | | | | | | |
| B. Agencies implement policies and procedures that protect the rights of parents. | 3 (17%) | 15 (83%) | 10 | 13 (72%) | 5 (28%) | 2 | 15 (83%) | 3 (17%) |
| 7.0 Family Centered Services | | | | | | | | |
| 7.1 Early intervention service providers provide appropriate early intervention services. | | | | | | | | |
| A. Early intervention services providers provide appropriate early intervention services to children who are Part C eligible in accordance with each IFSP. | 12 (67%) | 6 (33%) | 3 | 15 (83%) | 3 (17%) | 1 | 16 (89%) | 2 (11%) |
| B. Early intervention service providers provide services in natural environments based on the individual needs of the child and family. | 14 (78%) | 4 (22%) | 2 | 16 (89%) | 2 (11%) | 1 | 17 (94%) | 1 (6%) |
| 8.0 Personnel | | | | | | | | |
| 8.1 Agency procedures assure qualified personnel to maintain high quality early intervention services. | | | | | | | | |
| A. The agency assures that their early intervention personnel and service providers | 17 (94%) | 1 (6%) | 1 | 18 (100%) | | | | |

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

| CIMP Indicators | SA/PIP 4/15/05 | | | APR-1 3/1/06 | | | APR-2 12/15/06 | |
|---|----------------------------------|--|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| | # and % programs compliant | # and % programs non- compliant | # corrected by 3/1/06 | # and % programs compliant | # and % programs non- compliant | # corrected by 12/15/06 | # and % programs compliant | # and % programs non- compliant |
| are appropriately qualified. | | | | | | | | |
| B. Personnel employment processes include (1) background checks, (2) personal and professional references, and (3) follow-up on required references for early intervention service providers. | 17 (94%) | 1 (6%) | 0 | 17 (94%) | 1 (6%) | 1 | 18 (100%) | |
| 8.2 The agency has procedures to ensure that their early intervention service providers (including agency personnel, individual service providers and contract service providers) are competent to provide early intervention services. | | | | | | | | |
| A. A personnel development plan is written for each professional and paraprofessional staff member. | 14 (78%) | 4 (22%) | 2 | 16 (89%) | 2 (11%) | 2 | 18 (100%) | |
| B. The agency's early intervention service providers (including agency personnel, individual service providers and contract service providers) demonstrate knowledge and understanding of: (1) abuse and neglect laws; (2) policies and procedures; (3) individual reporting responsibilities prior to actual service delivery. | 16 (89%) | 2 (11%) | 0 | 16 (89%) | 2 (11%) | 2 | 18 (100%) | |
| 8.3 The agency adequately allocates personnel resources to meet individual child and family needs through home or community based services. | | | | | | | | |
| A. The agency's personnel are adequate to ensure that children and | 17 (94%) | 1 (6%) | 0 | 17 (94%) | 1 (6%) | 0 | 17 (94%) | 1 (6%) |

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

| CIMP Indicators | SA/PIP 4/15/05 | | | APR-1 3/1/06 | | | APR-2 12/15/06 | |
|---|----------------------------------|--|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| | # and % programs compliant | # and % programs non- compliant | # corrected by 3/1/06 | # and % programs compliant | # and % programs non- compliant | # corrected by 12/15/06 | # and % programs compliant | # and % programs non- compliant |
| families receive the services and supports that the agency is specified to provide according to the IFSP. | | | | | | | | |
| 9.0 General Supervision | | | | | | | | |
| 9.1 Early intervention agencies provide services within State and Federal requirements. | | | | | | | | |
| A. Agency facilities maintain adequate health, safety and accessibility for children and families. | 18 (100%) | | | | | | | |
| B. The agency establishes and maintains a system of operation that meets the requirements as defined within the Grant Agreement Between the State of Tennessee Department of Education and the Agency. | 8 (100%) N/A=10 | | | | | | | |
| C. The agency is responsible for collecting information on services provided and submitting reports to the Department of Education as required or requested. | 16 (89%) | 2 (11%) | 2 | 17 (100%) | | | | |
| 9.2 The agency participates in ongoing self-assessment and monitoring activities. | | | | | | | | |
| A. The agency's self-assessment includes all elements of agency program evaluation as part of monitoring by the Department of Education. | 17 (94%) | 1 (6%) | 1 | 18 (100%) | | | | |

Table 9.4: reflects the monitoring results from Cohort 1 in relation to the 34 CIMP indicators. Refer to Section "Actual Target Date for 2005-2006" above for a description of Cohort 1. Data in Table 9.4 reports compliance, noncompliance and correction of noncompliance across three report submissions: Self-Assessment/PIP: 4/15/05, APR-1: 3/1/06, and APR-2: 12/15/06. Refer also to the above mentioned section regarding the varying report submission dates.

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for (2005-2006):

| Activities/Resources | Timelines | Resources | Activity Status 2005-2006 |
|--|----------------------------|---|--|
| Ongoing submission of CAPs (former monitoring system) and submission of APRs (CIMP system of monitoring). | Ongoing as reports are due | EIS Programs, DSE and DMRS TA personnel, DSE Monitoring personnel | Former system of monitoring discontinued. As of December 2006, all monitoring Cohorts have been incorporated into the revised system of monitoring and have submitted at least one report. |
| Follow-up with on-site visits for EIS Programs who continue to report areas of non-compliance as identified in Tables A and B to determine appropriate action to be taken. | Begin January 2006 | DSE and DMRS Monitoring Personnel | DSE and DMRS personnel provide technical assistance to programs related to report submissions and implementation of improvement plans. |
| 2 nd cycle of CIMP monitoring process begins for 3 districts (ET, UC & SW). | 09/2005 | DSE and DMRS TA and Monitoring Personnel | Refer to status of first activity listed in this table. |
| Quarterly reports submitted by 9 TEIS offices with required explanations | 9/15/2005 | TA and Monitoring | Received Quarterly Caseload Report submissions, which as of March 2006 included explanations. |
| 618 Child Count submitted by all programs | 12/1/2005 | EIS Programs | Completed for reporting period. |
| OSEP SPP due | 12/2/2005 | State DSE personnel | Completed for reporting period. |
| Quarterly reports submitted by 9 TEIS offices with required explanations. | 12/15/2005 | TEIS District Offices, DSE Monitoring personnel | Received Quarterly Caseload Report submissions which, as of March 2006 included explanations. |
| Annual Performance Reports (APR) submitted for 3 districts (FT, GN, NW) who completed CIMP self-assessment (2004-2005) for validation review. | 03/2006 | State DSE and DMRS Monitoring personnel | Refer to status of first activity listed in this table. |
| Quarterly reports submitted by 9 TEIS offices with required explanations. | 3/15/2006 | TEIS District Offices, DSE Monitoring personnel | Received Quarterly Caseload Report submissions which, as of March 2006 included explanations. |

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

| | | | |
|---|------------|---|---|
| Quantitative data submitted by 9 TEIS offices | 6/30/2006 | TEIS District Offices, DSE Monitoring personnel | See directly above. |
| Corrective Action Plans submitted for review. | ongoing | DSE Monitoring personnel | Refer to status of first activity listed in this table. |
| Self-assessment and Program Improvement Plans (PIP) submitted for 2 nd cycle CIMP for validation review (ET, UC, & SW). | 4/15/2006 | EIS Programs, DSE and DMRS TA personnel | Refer to status of first activity listed in this table. |
| Quarterly reports submitted with required explanations | 6/15/2006 | TEIS District Offices, DSE Monitoring personnel | Received Quarterly Caseload Report submissions which as of March 2006 included explanations. |
| Quantitative data submitted by 9 TEIS offices | 6/30/2006 | TEIS District Offices, DSE Monitoring personnel | See directly above. |
| 3 rd cycle of CIMP monitoring process begins for 3 districts (SE, SC, MD) | 7/2006 | State DOE & DMRS TA | Refer to status of first activity listed in this table. |
| Quarterly reports submitted by 9 TEIS offices with required explanations. | 9/15/2006 | TEIS District Offices, DSE Monitoring personnel | Received Quarterly Caseload Report submissions which, as of March 2006 included explanations. |
| 618 Child Count submitted by all programs. | 12/1/2006 | EIS Programs | Completed for reporting period. |
| Self-assessment and Program Improvement Plans (PIP) submitted for 3 rd cycle CIMP for validation review (SE, SC, & MD). | 12/1/2006 | State DOE & DMRSV-QA | Refer to status of first activity listed in this table. |
| Quarterly reports submitted by 9 TEIS offices with required explanations | 12/15/2006 | TEIS District Offices, DSE Monitoring personnel | Received Quarterly Caseload Report submissions which, as of March 2006 included explanations. |
| Quantitative data submitted by 9 TEIS offices. | 12/30/2006 | TEIS District Offices, DSE Monitoring personnel | See directly above. |
| OSEP APR due | 2/1/2007 | State DSE personnel | Status report on activity not due as of yet. |
| Annual Performance Reports (APR) submitted for 6 districts (FT, GN, NW, ET, UC, SW) who completed CIMP self-assessment (2004-2006) for validation review. | 3/1/2007 | EIS Programs, DSE and DMRS TA personnel | |

| | | | |
|---|-----------|---|--|
| Quarterly reports submitted by 9 TEIS offices with required explanations | 3/15/2007 | TEIS District Offices, DSE Monitoring personnel | Status report on activity not due as of yet. |
| Quarterly reports submitted by 9 TEIS offices with required explanations. | 6/15/2007 | TEIS District Offices, DSE Monitoring personnel | Status report on activity not due as of yet. |
| Quantitative data submitted by 9 TEIS offices. | 6/30/2007 | TEIS District Offices, DSE Monitoring personnel | |

Summary of Data

Table 9.5: Summary of Table 9.4 Regarding Status of Correction for Indicator Noncompliance Within One year of Identification

| Self-Assessment/PIP 4/15/05 | | APR-2 12/15/06 | |
|---|--|--|--|
| # and (%) Indicator Compliance based on Initial Self-Assessment | # and (%) Indicator Noncompliance based on Initial Self-Assessment | # and (%) Indicator Compliance Status based on Corrections within 1 year of Identification | # and (%) Indicator Continued Noncompliance |
| 3 (9%) | 31 (91%) | 17 (50%) | 17 (50%) |

Table 9.5 reflects a summary related to correction of CIMP indicator noncompliance for Cohort 1 based on their initial Self-Assessment report and their APR-2 submissions. Totals were calculated by the following four formulas: 1) Number of indicators in compliance divided by total number of CIMP monitoring indicators (34) for initial Self-Assessment. 2) Number of indicators of noncompliance divided by total number of indicators for initial Self-Assessment. This information then compared to: 3) Number of indicators in compliance based on corrections within one year divided by total number of monitoring indicators (34) for APR-2. 4) Number of indicators not reaching compliances within one year of identification divided by total number of indicators for APR-2

9.6: Status of CIMP Indicator Compliance and Noncompliance by Cohort 1 Programs

| APR-2: 12/15/06 | | |
|--|---|--|
| CIMP Indicators of Continued Noncompliance | Cohort 1 Programs with Indicator Compliance | Cohort 1 Programs with Continued Indicator Noncompliance |
| 1.2.B Cluster: Public Awareness | TEIS First Tennessee District: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TEIS POE Teaching Hands Arc of Washington County Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program TIPS TEIS Greater Nashville District: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TIPS Foundations Outlook Progressive Directions Prospect First Steps Easter Seals TEIS Northwest District: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TEIS POE TIPS | TEIS Greater Nashville District: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TEIS POE |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | |
| <p>1.2.C.</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> Public Awareness</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • Teaching Hands • Arc of Washington County • TIPS <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions • Prospect • First Steps <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | <p>First TN District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laughlin Infant Toddler Program <p>TEIS-Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • Easter Seals |
| <p>2.1.A</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> Evaluations and Assessments</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS-FT POE • Teaching Hands • Arc of Washington County • TIPS • Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions • Prospect • First Steps • Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE |
| <p>2.1.D</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> Evaluations and Assessments</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS-FT POE • Teaching Hands • Arc of Washington County • Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • TIPS • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions • Prospect | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First Steps • Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | |
| <p>2.2.A</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> Evaluations and Assessments</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS-FT POE • Arc of Washington County • TIPS • Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • TIPS • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions • First Steps • Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching Hands <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prospect <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE |
| <p>2.3.A</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> Evaluations and Assessments</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • Teaching Hands • Arc of Washington County • Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • TIPS • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions • Prospect • First Steps • Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS |
| <p>3.1.A</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> IFSP</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching Hands • Arc of Washington County • TIPS • Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE |

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions • Prospect • First Steps • Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE |
| <p>3.1.C</p> <p><u>Cluster: IFSP</u></p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • Teaching Hands • Arc of Washington County • Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions • Prospect • First Steps • Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • TIPS <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE |
| <p>3.1.D</p> <p><u>Cluster: IFSP</u></p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching Hands • Arc of Washington County • TIPS • Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions • Prospect • First Steps • Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE |
| <p>3.1.E</p> <p><u>Cluster: IFSP</u></p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • Teaching Hands • Arc of Washington County • TIPS | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Foundations Outlook Progressive Directions Prospect First Steps Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TIPS CS Patterson Infant Stimulation Small Steps | <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TEIS POE TIPS <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TEIS POE |
| <p>5.1.A</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> Transition</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching Hands Arc of Washington County TIPS Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TIPS Foundations Outlook Progressive Directions Prospect First Steps Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TIPS CS Patterson Infant Stimulation Small Steps | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TEIS POE Teaching Hands <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TEIS POE <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TEIS POE |
| <p>5.1.B</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> Transition</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching Hands Arc of Washington County Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TIPS Foundations Outlook Progressive Directions First Steps Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TIPS CS Patterson Infant Stimulation Small Steps | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TEIS POE TIPS <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TEIS POE Prospect <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TEIS POE |
| <p>5.1.C</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> Transition</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TEIS POE Teaching Hands Arc of Washington County TIPS | |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions • Prospect • First Steps • Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE |
| <p>6.1.B</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> Procedural Safeguards</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • Teaching Hands • Arc of Washington County • TIPS • Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions • First Steps • Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • Prospect <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE |
| <p>7.1.A</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> Family-Centered Services</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • Teaching Hands • Arc of Washington County • TIPS • Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions • Prospect • First Steps • Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>7.1.B</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> Family-Centered Services</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • Teaching Hands • Arc of Washington County • TIPS • Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions • Prospect • First Steps • Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE |
| <p>8.3.A</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> Personnel</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • Teaching Hands • Arc of Washington County • TIPS • Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions • Prospect • First Steps • Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE |

Table 9.6 reflects a summary related to CIMP indicators with continued noncompliance and the programs which are compliant and not compliant with those indicators for Cohort 1. Information is based on Cohort 1's initial Self-Assessment report and their APR-2 submissions.

Even though compliance with all TN CIMP monitoring indicators has not been achieved, the Lead Agency reports progress towards compliance with indicator 9 based on information provided in Tables 9.5 and 9.6. Programs in monitoring Cohort 1 improved results for correction of compliance from 3 indicators out of 34 (9%) overall compliance reported in their initial Self-Assessment to 17 indicators out of 34 (50%) compliance overall based on their APR-2. Two processes changed since March 2006 which is believed to have positively impacted improvement in correction of noncompliance: 1.) Closer linkage between validation team and regional technical assistance. DSE and DMRS technical assistance personnel are routinely invited to attend review of CIMP reports by validation team. This change has enabled technical assistance to be better informed regarding the validation process and related to issues for which they provide technical assistance. 2.) Updating statewide training with clarifications as to report process and expectations for content

of report based on findings from previous year report reviews. Both monitoring and technical assistance personnel are more competent in their communications related to the revised monitoring system. When looking at the specific issues of continued noncompliance, three primary Cluster areas rise to the surface: Evaluations and Assessments, IFSP, and Transition. This information shows a relationship with findings for Indicators 7 (IFSP) and 8 (Transition) in earlier sections of TN's APR. Where Cohort 1 programs have identified areas of continued noncompliance, they have been required to participate in DSE technical assistance activities related to the implementation of their program improvement plans. The requirement is reflected in the final validation letter from the Lead Agency. This action is standard procedure for all EIS Programs with continued noncompliance (i.e., non-compliance not corrected within one year of identification).

The DSE includes some additional information which falls outside of the 2005-2006 reporting timeframe for TN's APR submission. DSE experienced monitoring personnel changes beginning March 2006. After a review of the revised monitoring system two major weaknesses were discovered: 1) Linkage between monitoring/validation personnel and DSE and DMRS technical assistance personnel. This has been corrected as was mentioned earlier. 2) Date of identification of noncompliance – two issues: a.) DSE was tracking 'month' of correction due date, not actual date, and b) date of identification was based on final validation letter which was often as much as three to five months after the program's report submission. Both of these issues have now been corrected as of the December 2006 report submissions. A desk audit was instituted into the validation process in December. Desk audits for Cohort 2 and Cohort 3 were all completed with date of identification noted to program by one month to six-week timeframe after report submission. Also information regarding the actual date if identification is provided to programs now though report documents provided to the programs from the validation team. One additional DSE personnel was added to the monitoring/validation team in September of 2006. This has helped expedite a more timely response to programs.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005-2006:

| Activities/Resources | Timelines | Resources | Activity Status 2005-2006 |
|--|----------------------------|---|--|
| Ongoing submission of CAPs (former monitoring system) and submission of APRs (CIMP system of monitoring). | Ongoing as reports are due | EIS Programs, DSE and DMRS TA personnel, DSE Monitoring personnel | Former system of monitoring discontinued. As of December 2006, all monitoring Cohorts have been incorporated into the revised system of monitoring and have submitted at least one report. |
| Follow-up with on-site visits for EIS Programs who continue to report areas of non-compliance as identified in Tables A and B to determine appropriate action to be taken. | Begin January 2006 | DSE and DMRS Monitoring Personnel | DSE and DMRS personnel provide technical assistance to programs related to report submissions and implementation of improvement plans. |
| 2 nd cycle of CIMP monitoring process begins for 3 districts (ET, UC & SW). Quarterly reports submitted by 9 TEIS offices with required explanations | 09/2005 9/15/2005 | DSE and DMRS TA and Monitoring Personnel TA and Monitoring | Refer to status of first activity listed in this table. Received Quarterly Caseload Report submissions, which as of March 2006 included explanations. |

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

| | | | |
|---|------------|---|---|
| 618 Child Count submitted by all programs | 12/1/2005 | EIS Programs | Completed for reporting period. |
| OSEP SPP due | 12/2/2005 | State DSE personnel | Completed for reporting period. |
| Quarterly reports submitted by 9 TEIS offices with required explanations. | 12/15/2005 | TEIS District Offices, DSE Monitoring personnel | Received Quarterly Caseload Report submissions which, as of March 2006 included explanations. |
| Annual Performance Reports (APR) submitted for 3 districts (FT, GN, NW) who completed CIMP self-assessment (2004-2005) for validation review. | 03/2006 | State DSE and DMRS Monitoring personnel | Refer to status of first activity listed in this table. |
| Quarterly reports submitted by 9 TEIS offices with required explanations. | 3/15/2006 | TEIS District Offices, DSE Monitoring personnel | Received Quarterly Caseload Report submissions which, as of March 2006 included explanations. |
| Quantitative data submitted by 9 TEIS offices | 6/30/2006 | TEIS District Offices, DSE Monitoring personnel | See directly above. |
| Corrective Action Plans submitted for review. | ongoing | DSE Monitoring personnel | Refer to status of first activity listed in this table. |
| Self-assessment and Program Improvement Plans (PIP) submitted for 2 nd cycle CIMP for validation review (ET, UC, & SW). | 4/15/2006 | EIS Programs, DSE and DMRS TA personnel | Refer to status of first activity listed in this table. |
| Quarterly reports submitted with required explanations | 6/15/2006 | TEIS District Offices, DSE Monitoring personnel | Received Quarterly Caseload Report submissions which as of March 2006 included explanations. |
| Quantitative data submitted by 9 TEIS offices | 6/30/2006 | TEIS District Offices, DSE Monitoring personnel | See directly above. |
| 3 rd cycle of CIMP monitoring process begins for 3 districts (SE, SC, MD) | 7/2006 | State DOE & DMRS TA | Refer to status of first activity listed in this table. |
| Quarterly reports submitted by 9 TEIS offices with required explanations. | 9/15/2006 | TEIS District Offices, DSE Monitoring personnel | Received Quarterly Caseload Report submissions which, as of March 2006 included explanations. |
| 618 Child Count submitted by all | 12/1/2006 | EIS Programs | Completed for reporting |

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

| | | | |
|---|------------|---|---|
| programs. Self-assessment and Program Improvement Plans (PIP) submitted for 3 rd cycle CIMP for validation review (SE, SC, & MD). | 12/1/2006 | State DOE & DMRSV-QA | period. Refer to status of first activity listed in this table. |
| Quarterly reports submitted by 9 TEIS offices with required explanations | 12/15/2006 | TEIS District Offices, DSE Monitoring personnel | Received Quarterly Caseload Report submissions which, as of March 2006 included explanations. |
| Quantitative data submitted by 9 TEIS offices. | 12/30/2006 | TEIS District Offices, DSE Monitoring personnel | See directly above. |
| OSEP APR due | 2/1/2007 | State DSE personnel | Status report on activity not due as of yet. |
| Annual Performance Reports (APR) submitted for 6 districts (FT, GN, NW, ET, UC, SW) who completed CIMP self-assessment (2004-2006) for validation review. | 3/1/2007 | EIS Programs, DSE and DMRS TA personnel | |
| Quarterly reports submitted by 9 TEIS offices with required explanations | 3/15/2007 | TEIS District Offices, DSE Monitoring personnel | Status report on activity not due as of yet. |
| Quarterly reports submitted by 9 TEIS offices with required explanations. | 6/15/2007 | TEIS District Offices, DSE Monitoring personnel | Status report on activity not due as of yet. |
| Quantitative data submitted by 9 TEIS offices. | 6/30/2007 | TEIS District Offices, DSE Monitoring personnel | |

Discussion of Data

Table 9.5: Summary of Table 9.4 Regarding Status of Correction for Indicator Noncompliance Within One year of Identification

| Self-Assessment/PIP 4/15/05 | | APR-2 12/15/06 | |
|---|--|--|--|
| # and (%) Indicator Compliance based on Initial Self-Assessment | # and (%) Indicator Noncompliance based on Initial Self-Assessment | # and (%) Indicator Compliance Status based on Corrections within 1 year of Identification | # and (%) Indicator Continued Noncompliance |
| 3 (9%) | 31 (91%) | 18 (53%) | 16 (47%) |

Table 9.5 reflects a summary related to correction of CIMP indicator noncompliance for Cohort 1 based on their initial Self-Assessment report and their APR-2 submissions. Totals were calculated by the following four formulas: 1) Number of indicators in compliance divided by total number of CIMP monitoring indicators (34) for initial Self-Assessment. 2) Number of indicators of noncompliance divided by total number of indicators for initial Self-Assessment. This information then compared to: 3) Number of indicators in compliance based on corrections within one year divided by total number of monitoring indicators (34) for APR-2. 4) Number of indicators not reaching compliances within one year of identification divided by total number of indicators for APR-2

9.6: Status of CIMP Indicator Compliance and Noncompliance by Cohort 1 Programs

| APR-2: 12/15/06 | | |
|---|--|--|
| CIMP Indicators of Continued Noncompliance | Cohort 1 Programs with Indicator Compliance | Cohort 1 Programs with Continued Indicator Noncompliance |
| <p>1.2.C.</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> Public Awareness</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • Teaching Hands • Arc of Washington County • TIPS <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions • Prospect • First Steps <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | <p>First TN District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laughlin Infant Toddler Program <p>TEIS-Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • Easter Seals |
| <p>2.1.A</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> Evaluations and Assessments</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS-FT POE • Teaching Hands • Arc of Washington County • TIPS • Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions • Prospect • First Steps • Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE |
| <p>2.1.D</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> Evaluations and Assessments</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS-FT POE • Teaching Hands • Arc of Washington County • Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • TIPS • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prospect • First Steps • Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | |
| <p>2.2.A</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> Evaluations and Assessments</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS-FT POE • Arc of Washington County • TIPS • Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • TIPS • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions • First Steps • Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching Hands <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prospect <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE |
| <p>2.3.A</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> Evaluations and Assessments</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • Teaching Hands • Arc of Washington County • Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • TIPS • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions • Prospect • First Steps • Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS |
| <p>3.1.A</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> IFSP</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching Hands • Arc of Washington County • TIPS • Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> |

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions • Prospect • First Steps • Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE |
| <p>3.1.C</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> IFSP</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • Teaching Hands • Arc of Washington County • Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions • Prospect • First Steps • Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • TIPS <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE |
| <p>3.1.D</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> IFSP</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching Hands • Arc of Washington County • TIPS • Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions • Prospect • First Steps • Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE |
| <p>3.1.E</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> IFSP</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • Teaching Hands • Arc of Washington County | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions • Prospect • First Steps • Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • TIPS <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE |
| <p>5.1.A</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> Transition</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching Hands • Arc of Washington County • TIPS • Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions • Prospect • First Steps • Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • Teaching Hands <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE |
| <p>5.1.B</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> Transition</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching Hands • Arc of Washington County • Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions • First Steps • Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • TIPS <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • Prospect <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE |
| <p>5.1.C</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> Transition</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • Teaching Hands • Arc of Washington County | |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions • Prospect • First Steps • Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE |
| <p>6.1.B</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> Procedural Safeguards</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • Teaching Hands • Arc of Washington County • TIPS • Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions • First Steps • Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • Prospect <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE |
| <p>7.1.A</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> Family- Centered Services</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • Teaching Hands • Arc of Washington County • TIPS • Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions • Prospect • First Steps • Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation | <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>7.1.B</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> Family-Centered Services</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small Steps <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • Teaching Hands • Arc of Washington County • TIPS • Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions • Prospect • First Steps • Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE |
| <p>8.3.A</p> <p><u>Cluster:</u> Personnel</p> | <p>TEIS First Tennessee District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • Teaching Hands • Arc of Washington County • TIPS • Laughlin Infant-Toddler Program <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS • Foundations • Outlook • Progressive Directions • Prospect • First Steps • Easter Seals <p>TEIS Northwest District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE • TIPS • CS Patterson • Infant Stimulation • Small Steps | <p>TEIS Greater Nashville District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIS POE |

Table 9.6 reflects a summary related to CIMP indicators with continued noncompliance and the programs which are compliant and not compliant with those indicators for Cohort 1. Information is based on Cohort 1's initial Self-Assessment report and their APR-2 submissions.

Even though compliance with all TN CIMP monitoring indicators has not been achieved, the Lead Agency reports progress towards compliance with indicator 9 based on information provided in Tables 9.5 and 9.6. Programs in monitoring Cohort 1 improved results for correction of compliance from 3 indicators out of 34 (9%) overall compliance reported in their initial Self-Assessment to 18 indicators out of 34 (53%) compliance overall based on their APR-2. Two processes changed since March 2006 which is believed to have positively impacted improvement in correction of noncompliance: 1.) Closer linkage between validation team and regional technical assistance. DSE and DMRS technical assistance personnel are routinely invited to attend review of CIMP reports by validation team. This change has enabled technical assistance to be better informed regarding the validation process and related to issues for which they provide technical assistance. 2.) Updating statewide training with clarifications as to report process and expectations for content

of report based on findings from previous year report reviews. Both monitoring and technical assistance personnel are more competent in their communications related to the revised monitoring system. When looking at the specific issues of continued noncompliance, three primary Cluster areas rise to the surface: Evaluations and Assessments, IFSP, and Transition. This information shows a relationship with findings for Indicators 7 (IFSP) and 8 (Transition) in earlier sections of TN's APR. Where Cohort 1 programs have identified areas of continued noncompliance, they have been required to participate in DSE technical assistance activities related to the implementation of their program improvement plans. The requirement is reflected in the final validation letter from the Lead Agency. This action is standard procedure for all EIS Programs with continued noncompliance (i.e., non-compliance not corrected within one year of identification).

The DSE includes some additional information which falls outside of the 2005-2006 reporting timeframe for TN's APR submission. DSE experienced monitoring personnel changes beginning March 2006. After a review of the revised monitoring system two major weaknesses were discovered: 1) Linkage between monitoring/validation personnel and DSE and DMRS technical assistance personnel. This has been corrected as was mentioned earlier. 2) Date of identification of noncompliance – two issues: a.) DSE was tracking 'month' of correction due date, not actual date, and b) date of identification was based on final validation letter which was often as much as three to five months after the program's report submission. Both of these issues have now been corrected as of the December 2006 report submissions. A desk audit was instituted into the validation process in December. Desk audits for Cohort 2 and Cohort 3 were all completed with date of identification noted to program by one month to six-week timeframe after report submission. Also information regarding the actual date if identification is provided to programs now though report documents provided to the programs from the validation team. One additional DSE personnel was also added to the monitoring/validation team September 2006 which has helped expedited a more timely response to programs.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005-2006:

Improvement activities have been revised for 2006-2007. Activities are more reflective of targeted actions needed for continued progress towards compliance with this indicator. These activities have also been included in the Revised SPP.

| Improvement Activities for 2006-2007 | | |
|--|---|---|
| Activities/Resources | Timelines | Resources |
| Submission of CIMP reports from Cohort 1 (FT, GN, and NW), Cohort 2 (ET, UC, and SW), and Cohort 3 (SE, SC, and MD). | October 15, 2007 and ongoing | EIS Programs |
| Technical Assistance available to EIS Programs related to the preparation of CIMP Reports. | January 2007 and ongoing | EIS Programs with support from regional DOE and DMRS Technical Assistance Personnel |
| Completion of Desk Audit for all CIMP report submissions. | Within 1 to 2 months of submission date | DSE Monitoring Personnel, EIS Programs |
| Completion of Validation review reports for all CIMP report submissions. Note: Some reports may require re-submission and/or onsite visit by validation team before final report can be issued due to insufficient or conflicting information. | Within 3 to 4 months of submission date | DSE Monitoring Personnel and DMRS Personnel with invitation to DSE and DMRS regional Technical Assistance Personnel to sit in on review meeting; EIS Programs |
| Update State-wide trainings for CIMP report preparation. | May 2007 | DSE Monitoring Personnel with input from regional DSE and DMRS Technical Assistance Personnel |
| Delivery of annual state-wide CIMP Training. | June-July 2007 and ongoing | DSE Technical Assistance Personnel with support from DSE Monitoring Personnel |
| Follow-up with EIS Programs related to implementation of program improvement plans | January 2007 and ongoing | Regional DSE and DMRS Technical Assistance Personnel |

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| utilizing validation report findings. | | |
| Focused monitoring activities based on findings from EIS CIMP report submissions. Note: Activities targeted to specific monitoring issue(s) identified either statewide or across one or several districts. | Begin monitoring cycle 7/1/07-6/30/08 | DSE Monitoring Personnel, Director, Part C Coordinator, DSE Data Manager, and EIS Programs. Additional resources: State Contact from Mid-South RRC, NECTAC, and OSEP |
| <p>Implementation of Tennessee monitoring determinations along with sanctions for issues of longstanding compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify OSEP's monitoring determinations document to make information specific to Tennessee. Develop draft document for implementation pending final recommendations from the Governor's Office of Children's Care Coordination (GOCCC). • Letter of communication to EIS Programs • Incorporate information into statewide CIMP trainings • Implementation and monitoring of sanctions for noncompliance. | <p>March 2007 pending recommendations GOCCC</p> <p>March 2007 pending recommendations GOCCC</p> <p>May 2007 pending recommendations of GOCCC</p> <p>Begin monitoring cycle 7/1/07-6/30/08</p> | <p>DSE Director, Monitoring Coordinator, and Part C Coordinator.</p> <p>DSE Director, EIS Programs</p> <p>DSE Monitoring Personnel</p> <p>DSE Director, DSE Contract Coordinator, Monitoring and TA Personnel; TEIS POE Project Coordinators, Contract Coordinators and Principal Investigators</p> |
| Language added to TEIS Scope of Services to address contract compliance related to issues of general supervision which include monitoring pending recommendations from the GOCCC. | July 2007 pending GOCCC | DSE Director, DSE Contract Coordinator, TEIS POE Project Coordinators, Contract Coordinators and Principal Investigators; Scope of Services |
| Revised monitoring procedures and process based on newly implemented Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS). | Begin FFY 7/1/07-6/30/08 | DSE Monitoring Personnel, OEC Director, and designated workgroup. Additional resources: State Contact from Mid-South RRC, NECTAC, and OSEP |

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to Overview, page 3.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 10: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

100% = 3 + 0 / 3 x 100

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|-----------|--|
| 2005-2006 | 100% of Part C written complaints received by the Division will be resolved within 60 calendar day timeline. |

Actual Target Data for 2005-2006:

The Division of Special Education’s Office of Early Childhood (DSE/OEC) received three written administrative complaints during this reporting year. All three complaints originated in Middle Tennessee Region; one from the Greater Nashville District and two from the South Central District. Each complaint alleged denial of service by the TEIS POE office. Both complaints from South Central involved the same service coordinator. Two of the complaints, one from Greater Nashville and the other from South Central, involved children with a diagnosis of autism. Each complaint was addressed following the procedure described in our 2004-2005 SPP and resolved within the sixty calendar day requirement.

Table 10.1: Written Administrative Complaints 2005-2006

| Date Filed | Region/ District/ Agency | Number of Days to Resolution | Reason for Complaint | Action/ Outcome | Follow-up to ensure implementation |
|------------|--|------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 12/2/05 | Middle TN/ Greater Nashville/ TEIS POE | 55 | Parent alleged denial of early intervention service by TEIS. Parent of child diagnosed with autism requested increase in speech services. | Investigated by DSE/OEC: TEIS POE in compliance; however, the service provider failed to implement IFSP as written. Provider required to implement IFSP as written and provide compensatory services. | TEIS POE office reviewed submitted documentation to confirm implementation of findings. |
| 12/14/05 | Middle TN/ South Central/ TEIS POE | 13 | Parent alleged denial of TEIS to pay for piece of assistive technology. | Resolved by the district. Item funded by TEIS per IFSP as written by service coordinator. | TEIS office ensured retraining of staff on IFSP matters relating to assistive technology and outcome writing. Middle TN Infant Toddler Consultant provided IFSP |

| | | | | | |
|---------|------------------------------------|----|--|--|--|
| | | | | | Outcomes and Action Steps training to district. |
| 1/24/06 | Middle TN/ South Central/ TEIS POE | 49 | Parent alleged failure of TEIS to provide appropriate early intervention service for children (twins) diagnosed with autism. | Investigated by DSE/OEC. IFSP team failed to execute IFSP process in accordance with IDEA. Compensatory services provided for both children. | DSE/OEC required and received documentation for compensatory services. TEIS office addressed compliance issues resulting from this complaint with the service coordinator. |

Table 10.1 The three written complaints received by DSE/OEC during 2005-2006 fiscal year are listed. For each complaint, the following details are denoted: Date filed, Region of TN, TEIS District, Agency to whom the complaint is regarding, Number of days to resolution, Reason for the complaint, Actions taken and Outcomes of the resolutions, Follow-up to ensure implementation of resolutions.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-2006:

Table 10.2 Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

| Activities | Timelines | Resources | Activity Status |
|---|-----------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Continue to inform families of rights and procedural safeguards. | Ongoing | TN DSE; Part C Service Coordinators | All nine TEIS offices complied with directive from DOE to implement service coordination training which included instruction on procedures related to the Rights of infants and Toddlers in TEIS, including Procedural Safeguards. 140 service coordinators were trained. |
| Continue to follow established procedures and timelines for follow-up and investigation of complaints | Ongoing | TN DSE Regional EI Consultants | 100% of written complaints filed with the DSE/OEC were resolved within sixty calendar days, as established by procedure (described in 2004-2005 SPP). |

Table 10.2 describes the improvement activities, timelines for completion of those activities, resources available to the OEC to accomplish activities, and the status of the activities determined necessary for Indicator 10.

The Lead Agency is compliant with this indicator. The DSE/OEC’s baseline data from the 2004-2005 SPP noted two complaints, one unfounded and one resolved by default when family moved out of state during the investigative process. Comparison of data from the 2004-2005 year to this year indicates 100% of written administrative complaints were resolved within the sixty day timeframe or family moved prior to resolution. Also noted is that of the five total complaints, four were from the Middle TN region (two from Greater Nashville, two from South Central) and one from East TN region (East TN district). There were no written complaints from West TN, our third and final region. Readers will note Table 4, Report of Dispute Resolutions is located within the attachment section of this document.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005-2006: no changes

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to Overview, page 3.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 11: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.
No due process hearings.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|-----------|--|
| 2005-2006 | 100% due process hearings will have written decisions within the required timelines. |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005-2006:

No due process hearings were requested of DSE/OEC during this fiscal reporting year. Due process hearings continue to be available as a method of dispute resolution. Refer to 2004-2005 SPP for description of the process.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005-2006:

Table 11.1 Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

| Activities | Timelines | Resources | Activity Status |
|---|-----------|--|--|
| Maintain availability of qualified attorneys to conduct due process hearings. Continue to inform families of availability of mediation process and encourage use of mediation as a dispute resolution process. | Ongoing | TN DSE Office of Legal Services; TEIS Service Coordinators | DSE/OEC continues to maintain qualified attorneys to conduct due process hearings if requested. All nine TEIS offices complied with directive from DOE to implement service coordination training which included instruction on procedures related to the Rights of infants and Toddlers in TEIS, including Procedural Safeguards. 140 service coordinators were trained. |

Table 11.1 describes the improvement activities, timelines for completion of those activities, resources available to the OEC to accomplish activities, and the status of the activities determined necessary for Indicator 11.

One (1) due process hearings was requested of DSE/OEC during the 2004-2005 year which did not result in a formal hearing, as described in the baseline data of the 2004-1005 report. No due process hearings were requested during the 2005-2006 reporting year.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005-2006: no changes

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to Overview, page 3.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 12: 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)

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

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|-----------|--|
| 2005-2006 | Indicator #12 is a new indicator. Measurable and Rigorous Targets are located in the State Performance Plan. |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005-2006:

Indicator #12 is a new indicator. The baseline data, discussion of baseline data, targets, timelines and activities can be referenced in the Updated State Performance Plan (pages 64-65).

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005-2006: not applicable

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005-2006: not applicable

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to Overview, page 3.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 13: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.
No mediations.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|------------------|---|
| 2005-2006 | Since there has been no activity in this area, no targets are being established at this time. |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005-2006:

No mediations were requested of DSE/OEC during this reporting year. Mediation continues to be available and is encouraged as a method of dispute resolution. Refer to 2004-2005 SPP for description of the process.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005-2006:

No mediations were requested of DSE/OEC during the baseline period of 2004-2005 or the current reporting year.

Table 13.1 Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

| Activities | Timelines | Resources | Activity Status |
|--|-----------|--|--|
| Maintain availability of qualified attorneys to conduct mediations. Encourage use of mediation as a dispute resolution process. Continue to inform families of availability of mediation process and encourage use of mediation as a dispute resolution process | Ongoing | TN DSE Office of Legal Services; TEIS Service Coordinators | DSE/OEC continues to maintain qualified attorneys to conduct due process hearings if requested. All nine TEIS offices complied with directive from DOE to implement service coordination training which included instruction on procedures related to the Rights of infants and Toddlers in TEIS, including Procedural Safeguards. 140 service coordinators were trained. |

Table 13.1 describes the improvement activities, timelines for completion of those activities, resources available to the OEC to accomplish activities, and the status of the activities determined necessary for Indicator 13.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005-2006: no changes

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to Overview, page 3.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 14: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

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

Measurement: State reported data, including 618 data, State performance plan, and annual performance reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, settings and November 1 for exiting, personnel, dispute resolution); and
- b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring error free, consistent, valid and reliable data and evidence that these standards are met).

Tennessee’s data reports due during this reporting period were both timely and accurate.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|-----------|--|
| 2005-2006 | <p>100% of all required data reports (child count - including race and ethnicity, settings exiting, personnel, dispute resolution, etc) will be submitted on or before OSEP established due dates.</p> <p>TN DSE will ensure 100% accuracy in Part C data collection and reporting through informational resources, training, technical assistance, and ongoing monitoring procedures.</p> |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005-2006:

The State of Tennessee continues to develop the Annual Performance Report in a manner that allows for significant stakeholder input. The Lead Agency utilizes the State Interagency Coordinating Council as well as other stakeholders throughout the process of APR development.

TN Division of Special Education (DSE) Infant-Toddler Consultants, in partnership with the Technical Assistance Data Coordinator continues to administer a comprehensive training plan regarding appropriate interpretation and submission and of Part C 618 Data.

TN DSE Infant-Toddler Consultants and TEIS Technical Assistance Data Coordinator conduct annual statewide training for Part C service providers regarding 618 data collection and reporting including onsite distribution of reporting packets. The trainings clarify and stress the appropriate interpretation and reporting of 618 data. All consultants will provide TA and clarification by phone following training, as needed.

The Director of the DSE Office of Early Childhood continues to receive the support of the State Interagency Coordinating Council, especially the member from the Division of Mental Retardation Services, in ensuring comprehensive and accurate reporting for the 618 data.

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

TN DSE, in partnership with the TEIS Technical Assistance Data Coordinator, continues to monitor the State's established deadline (December 12, 2005) for submitting reports. Information regarding agencies who have not reported by the deadline established by the Lead Agency are submitted to the appropriate governing State agency for follow-up.

TEIS Part C Coordinator – State Performance Plan processed and report submitted to OSEP within required timeline.

TEIS TA Project Coordinator – 618 Data processed and reports have been submitted to OSEP by February 1, 2006 timeline.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005-2006:

Table 14.1

| Activities | Timelines | Resources | Activity Status |
|--|------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| DSE Regional Infant/Toddler Consultants, DSE Preschool Consultants; TEIS TA Project Data Coordinator Statewide – Completion of Statewide Training on procedures for 618 data reporting; | November 2005 | DSE Staff, TEIS-TA Contract | completed |
| Agency Data Reports Submitted to the TEIS Technical Assistance Project Data Coordinator by December 12, 2005. Follow-up with agencies who have not reported by December 12, 2005, if necessary. | December 12, 2005 | Point of Entry Staff, DSE Staff, TEIS-TA Contract | completed |
| TEIS TA Project Coordinator – 618 Data processed and reports submitted to OSEP by February 2006. | February 2006 | TEIS-TA Contract | completed |
| Follow-up to areas of concern, DSE EI Personnel; March – September 2006 | March – September 2006 | DSE Staff | completed |
| Reports issued to respective agencies and programs clarifying reporting concerns, TDE; as appropriate | September 2006 | TEIS-TA Contract, DSE Staff | Completed |
| Meeting with TEIS Project Coordinators will include addressing any concerns about data management with the current TEIS Quantitative Data | Quarterly | DSE Early Intervention Personnel; Part C Data Coordinator | Completed and ongoing |

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

| | | | |
|--|--|--|-----------------------|
| System. | | | |
| Part C Data Consultant and TEIS TA Consultant will work with individual districts to correct any data concerns that are identified. Telephone, email, and on-site technical support will be provided as needed. | Ongoing, as needed | Part C Data Coordinator; TEIS TA Consultant | Completed and ongoing |
| Development of the Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) ongoing including providing monthly training and feedback sessions from pilot sites. Elements to assist in ensuring accuracy will be incorporated in the system design. | Pilot Complete March 2006; Statewide implementation October 2006 | TEIDS Contractor; DSE Part C Data Coordinator | Completed and ongoing |
| Contractor for Development of the TEIDS will include manual to ensure users are informed on data entry procedures and use of the system to ensure accuracy of data. Part C Data Consultant and DSE staff will provide ongoing training and TA. | October 2006 forward | TEIDS Contractor; DSE Part C Data Coordinator and EI Personnel | Completed and ongoing |

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005-2006:

Improvement activities have been revised for 2006-2007. Activities are more reflective of targeted actions needed for continued progress towards compliance with this indicator. These activities have also been included in the Revised SPP.

| Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|-------------------|--|
| DSE Regional Infant/Toddler Consultants, DSE Preschool Consultants; TEIS TA Project Data Coordinator Statewide – Completion of Statewide Training on procedures for 618 data reporting; | November 2005 | DSE Staff, TEIS-TA Contract |
| Agency Data Reports Submitted to the TEIS Technical Assistance Project Data Coordinator by December 12, 2005. Follow-up with agencies who have not reported by December 12, 2005, if necessary. | December 12, 2005 | Point of Entry Staff, DSE Staff , TEIS-TA Contract |

Annual Performance Plan: Part C

TENNESSEE

State

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| TEIS TA Project Coordinator – 618 Data processed and reports submitted to OSEP by February 2006. | February 2006 | TEIS-TA Contract |
| Follow-up to areas of concern, DSE EI Personnel; March – September 2006 | March – September 2006 | DSE Staff |
| Reports issued to respective agencies and programs clarifying reporting concerns, TDE; as appropriate | September 2006 | TEIS-TA Contract, DSE Staff |
| Meeting with TEIS Project Coordinators will include addressing any concerns about data management with the current TEIS Quantitative Data System. | Quarterly | DSE Early Intervention Personnel; Part C Data Coordinator |
| Part C Data Consultant and TEIS TA Consultant will work with individual districts to correct any data concerns that are identified. Telephone, email, and on-site technical support will be provided as needed. | Ongoing, as needed | Part C Data Coordinator; TEIS TA Consultant |
| Development of the Tennessee Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS) ongoing including providing monthly training and feedback sessions from pilot sites. Elements to assist in ensuring accuracy will be incorporated in the system design. | Pilot Complete March 2006; Statewide implementation October 2006 | TEIDS Contractor; DSE Part C Data Coordinator |
| Contractor for Development of the TEIDS will include manual to ensure users are informed on data entry procedures and use of the system to ensure accuracy of data. Part C Data Consultant and DSE staff will provide ongoing training and TA. | October 2006 forward | TEIDS Contractor; DSE Part C Data Coordinator and EI Personnel |

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 3.1 TN Child Outcome Summary Form at Entrance Directions for Completion

Complete this form for every child birth through five who enters the Part C or Part B preschool system, beginning with the initial IFSPs/IEPs developed 8-15-06 and thereafter. Do not complete a form for a child who is new to the TEIS or LEA district who received Part C/ Part B preschool services in another district.

Complete the form as follows:

1. **TEIS or LEA** – TEIS or LEA district name
2. **Initial IFSP or IEP Date** – Fill in the date of the initial IFSP/IEP, which is also the date the child summary form is completed.
3. **EI Program Setting or LEA School** – List the EI program setting or LEA school where the child is receiving services. For a child receiving services in multiple settings, list the primary service setting.
4. **Service Coordinator/Teacher** – List the Service Coordinator for Part C, and the Teacher, SLP, or case-manager for Part B.
5. **Child's Name** – Child's full name, including middle name or initial
6. **DOB** – Child's date of birth
7. **R – Race** – Enter **A** for Asian, Pacific Islander, **I** for American Indian, **H** for Hispanic, **B** for Black, and **W** for white
8. **Gender** – check male of female

At the initial IFSP/IEP meeting, after reviewing and discussing all current information about the child, including all assessment/evaluation information, present levels of performance and all pertinent information, the team should, as a group, consider the three child outcomes questions. At this time the team will complete the child outcomes summary form.

Questions 1a, 2a, 3a: Circle only one number for each outcome. Definitions for the scale points are provided at the end of the instructions. Other sources of information to make this determination may be used, including the Tennessee Early Learning Developmental Standards, and observations. All information used to support an outcome determination must be documented in the present levels of performance section of the IFSP or IEP.

Keep a copy of the completed outcomes form in the child's record with the IFSP or IEP, and submit a duplicate copy to your district office, following the submission procedure your TEIS office or school district has established.

Further information on making outcomes determinations may be obtained in the Instructions for completing the Child Outcomes Summary form provided by the Early Childhood Outcomes Center, dated 4-20-06.

Attachment 3.2 Tennessee Child Outcomes Summary Form at Entrance

Complete this form for every child birth through five at the initial IFSP or IEP meeting.

TEIS/LEA _____

Initial IFSP/IEP Date _____

Program/School _____

SC/Teacher _____

Child's Name _____

DOB _____ R ___ M ___ F ___

1. POSITIVE SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL SKILLS (INCLUDING SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS)

Think about the child's functioning in these and closely related areas (as indicated by assessments and based on observations from individuals in close contact with the child):

- Relating with adults
- Relating with other children
- Following rules related to groups or interacting with others (if older than 18 months)

1a. To what extent does this child show age-appropriate functioning, across a variety of settings and situations, on this outcome? (Circle one number)

| Not Yet | | Emerging | | Somewhat | | Completely | |
|---------|---|----------|---|----------|---|------------|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |

2. ACQUIRING AND USING KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

Think about the child's functioning in these and closely related areas (as indicated by assessments and based on observations from individuals in close contact with the child):

- Thinking, reasoning, remembering, and problem solving
- Understanding symbols
- Understanding the physical and social worlds

2a. To what extent does this child show age-appropriate functioning, across a variety of settings and situations, on this outcome? (Circle one number)

| Not Yet | | Emerging | | Somewhat | | Completely | |
|---------|---|----------|---|----------|---|------------|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |

3. TAKING APPROPRIATE ACTION TO MEET NEEDS

Think about the child's functioning in these and closely related areas (as indicated by assessments and based on observations from individuals in close contact with the child):

- Taking care of basic needs (e.g., showing hunger, dressing, feeding, toileting, etc.)
- Contributing to own health and safety (e.g., follows rules, assists with hand washing, avoids inedible objects) (if older than 24 months)
- Getting from place to place (mobility) and using tools (e.g., forks, strings attached to objects)

3a. To what extent does this child show age-appropriate functioning, across a variety of settings and situations, on this outcome? (Circle one number)

| Not Yet | | Emerging | | Somewhat | | Completely | |
|---------|---|----------|---|----------|---|------------|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |

Tennessee Department of Education, Division of Special Education, modified from ECO child outcomes form 7-06.

Attachment 4.1 TEIS Survey Introduction Letter to Parents



STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
DIVISION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
7TH FLOOR, ANDREW JOHNSON TOWER
710 JAMES ROBERTSON PARKWAY
NASHVILLE, TN 37243-0380

PHIL BREDESEN
GOVERNOR

LANA C. SEIVERS, Ed.D.
COMMISSIONER

MEMORANDUM

TO: Tennessee’s Early Intervention System (TEIS) Parents

FROM: Jamie Thomas Kilpatrick, Director
Office of Early Childhood Programs, Division of Special Education

RE: Tennessee’s Early Intervention System Parental Quality Surveys

DATE: November 2, 2006

The support for implementation of Tennessee’s Early Intervention System is provided in part by funding from the federal Office of Special Education Programs. Tennessee’s Early Intervention System is seeking your involvement in gathering family perceptions about the early intervention system in Tennessee. In an attempt to best implement this management initiative, we are asking for your assistance. Therefore, we would like for all of you to be aware that the attached survey will be mailed to you with a self-addressed stamped envelope. Please help us in implementing this important measure of the systemic success.

* TEIDS technical assistance staff will gather your input and perceptions on the system, especially on areas where the system meets family needs.

* Participation in these surveys is strongly encouraged, because these data will be used to shape future improvement activities.

You have an opportunity to be involved with program measurement. Please return your results in the contained envelope.

As always, we value and appreciate your commitment to helping the State of Tennessee with the implementation of TEIS.

Attachment 4.2 NCSEAM Survey Bank of Items

NATIONAL CENTER FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION ACCOUNTABILITY MONITORING
Early Childhood Parent/Family Participation Survey

INFORMATION ABOUT MY CHILD

Race / Ethnicity

- White
- Black or African - American
- Hispanic or Latino
- Asian or Pacific Islander
- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- State of Residence

Version C2

Child's Age at Time of Survey Completion

- Birth to 6 months
- 6 - 12 months
- 12 - 18 months
- 18 months - 2 years
- 2 - 2 ½ years
- 2 ½ - 3 years
- Over 3 years

Child's Age Upon Referral to Early Intervention

- Birth to 6 months
- 6 - 12 months
- 12 - 18 months
- 18 months - 2 years
- 2 - 2 ½ years
- 2 ½ - 3 years
- Over 3 years

Please select all areas in which your child has special needs:

- Understanding and using language
- Learning and cognition
- Social skills / behavior
- Emotional
- Adaptive skills
- Physical / movement
- Health / medical
- I completed the survey independently OR
- I completed the survey as someone read the items to me.

Select one of the following:

I read or heard the items read in: English Spanish Another language

SURVEY ADMINISTRATION

-Learning and cognition

Impact on My Child

Over the past year, early intervention services have had a positive impact on my child's progress in the following areas:

- Social skills/behavior
- Understanding and using language
- Physical/movement
- Emotional
- Adaptive skills
- Health/medical

Very Strongly Disagree

Strongly Disagree
 Disagree
 Agree
 Strongly Agree
 Very Strongly Agree

Over the past year, early intervention services have helped me and/or my family:

Impact on Parents and Families

- feel more confident in my skills as a parent.
- be more optimistic about my child's future.

Draft

Page 2 of 5

Over the past year, early intervention services have helped me and/or my family:

Impact on Parents and Families (cont.)

Very Strongly Disagree
 Strongly Disagree
 Disagree
 Agree
 Strongly Agree
 Very Strongly Agree

Version C2

- feel that I can handle the challenges of parenting a child with special needs.
- feel that I can get the services and supports that my child and family need.
- feel that my child will be accepted and welcomed in the community.
- feel that my family will be accepted and welcomed in the community.
- improve my family's quality of life.
- participate in typical activities for children and families in my community.
- cope with stressful situations.
- get the services that my child and family need.
- be able to evaluate how much progress my child is making.
- communicate more effectively with the people who work with my child and my family.
- do things with and for my child that are good for my child's development.
- help other children in my family (if there are other children) adjust to their brother's or sister's special needs.
- find information I need.
- know about services in the community.
- know where to go for help or support to meet my family's needs.
- know where to go for help or support to meet my child's needs.
- figure out solutions to problems as they come up.
- be more effective in managing my child's behavior.
- make changes in our family routines that will benefit my child with special needs.
- do activities that are good for my child even in times of stress.
- keep up friendships for my child and family.
- understand how the special education system works.
- know about my child's and family's rights concerning special education services.
- understand the roles and responsibilities of the people who work with my child and family.
- understand my child's special needs.
- feel that my efforts are helping my child.
- understands the unique needs of my child and family.
- respects my culture and language.
- acknowledges my family's efforts.
- answers my questions.
- is good at working with families.
- is knowledgeable and professional.

My service coordinator:

Service Coordinator

- respects my family's values.
- shows a willingness to learn about the strengths and needs of my child and family.
- understands my child's behavior.
- is available to speak with me on a regular basis.
- is easy to contact.
- is willing to meet and work with other people important to my family.
- helps me find solutions to the challenges my family faces.

Draft

Page 3 of 5 **Version C2**

Very Strongly Disagree

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

Very Strongly Agree

Service Coordinator (cont.)

My service coordinator:

- recognizes the good things I do as a parent.
- does what he/she says he/she is going to do.
- does everything he/she can do to help my family get the services we need.

I have a good working relationship with my service coordinator.

If I am not satisfied with a service, I feel I can tell my service coordinator what I think without negative consequences for me or my child.

If I disagree with a decision about services for my child or my family, I (would) feel comfortable discussing this with my service coordinator.

- show a willingness to learn about the strengths and needs of my child and family.
- understand my child's behavior.
- understand the unique needs of my child and family.
- recognize the good things I do as a parent.
- do what they say they are going to do.
- are willing to meet and work with other people important to my family.
- help me find solutions to the challenges my family faces.

The early intervention service provider(s) that work with my child:

Service Providers

- are available to speak with me on a regular basis.
- respect my culture and language.
- acknowledge my family's efforts.
- answer my questions.
- are knowledgeable and professional.
- are easy for me to talk to about my child and my family.
- respect my family's values.

My family's needs (such as transportation, child care, etc.) were considered when planning for my child's services.

I was given an opportunity to discuss the evaluation.

I was given all reports and evaluations related to my child prior to the IFSP meeting(s).

I felt part of the decision-making process.

My view of my child's development was considered.

IFSP meetings are scheduled at a time and place that are convenient for me.

I was offered help I needed, such as child care services or transportation, to enable me to participate in the IFSP meeting(s).

Everyone at the IFSP meeting(s) was introduced to me.

Developing the Individualized Family Service Plan

People at the meeting discussed my suggestions and ideas.

My questions about early intervention services were answered.

My family's schedule and daily routines were considered when planning for my child's services.

I was asked to share what I believe are my child's needs and strengths.

The IFSP reflects my hopes and dreams for my child.

The IFSP is keeping up with my family's changing needs.

Draft

Page 4 of 5 **Version C2**

Very Strongly Disagree

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

Very Strongly Agree

- my child's developmental needs.

My family was given information about:

- how different interventions or therapies would benefit my child.

- activities that I could do with my child in our everyday lives.

- modifications of routines, activities, and the physical setting that would help my child in different environments.

- how to communicate effectively with professionals and agencies.

- positive discipline methods I can use with my child.

I was told who to call if I had questions about any materials I received.

The written information I receive is in a language I understand.

Information Exchange

The written information I receive is clear to me.

Receiving Early Intervention Services

I was given choices concerning my family's services and supports.

Someone from the early intervention program visited my home to give me ideas on helping my child at home.

I receive advance notice of upcoming IFSP meetings.

My child receives services in the setting that we prefer.

My child receives services in settings where children without special needs participate.

I receive regular communication about my child's development.

I know who to call if I have problems with the services and supports my child and family are receiving.

It was fairly easy to get the services written on our IFSP.

The services on our IFSP have been provided in a timely manner.

Someone from the early intervention program helped me get in touch with other parents for help and support.

Someone from the early intervention program helped me get services like child care, transportation, respite care, pre-school programs, WIC/Food stamps, etc.

An interpreter is available for meetings if I want one.

If I disagree with a decision about services for my child or my family, I (would) feel comfortable discussing this with someone in the early intervention program.

If I am not satisfied with a service, I feel I can talk about it and people from the early intervention program won't hold it against me or my child.

Early intervention staff expect positive outcomes for my child.

Early intervention staff keep information about my child and family confidential.

I have felt part of the team when meeting to discuss my child.

I have a good working relationship with my child's service providers.

Early intervention staff asked:

- what I thought could be done to improve services for my child.
 - whether the services and help my family was receiving were meeting our needs.
- Any changes in personnel working with my child were discussed with me prior to the change.

Draft

Page 5 of 5 **Version C2**

Very Strongly Disagree

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

Very Strongly Agree

Information Exchange (cont.)*My family was given information about:***--Thank you for your participation.--**

- whether other children in the family needed help in understanding the needs of their brother or sister with a disability.
- whether I wanted help in dealing with stressful situations.

My family was asked:

- how to access different programs and services in the community.
- community programs that are open to all children.
- organizations that offer information and training for parents, for example, Parent Training and Information Centers, Family Resource Centers, disability support groups, etc.
- different people's roles in the early intervention system.
- where to go for help or support if I feel worried or stressed.
- my rights as a parent of a child who is eligible for early intervention services.
- how to request additional assessments if I think they are necessary.
- who to call if I am not satisfied with the services my child receives.
- what my options are if I disagree with a decision about my child's services.
- different programs or places where my child could receive services.
- support groups for parents.

I was given information about the public school system's programs and services for children age three and older.

I was given help throughout the transition process.

I was encouraged to participate in the transition planning meeting.

The concept of Least Restrictive Environment / Inclusion was explained to me when we discussed preschool special education.

Transition

Before my child's third birthday, a meeting was held to discuss various service and program options for my child.

I have been given information or reports about plans to improve early intervention services.

I am working with others to improve the early intervention system.

Efforts to Improve the Early Intervention System

I have been asked for my opinion about how well the early intervention services my child and family receive are meeting our needs.

The early intervention program regularly evaluates whether early intervention services are effective.

The early intervention program regularly holds public meetings to gather family input on early intervention services.

Attachment 10.1 Table 4

Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part C of the IDEA 2005-2006 Data

| SECTION A: Signed, written complaints | |
|---|---|
| (1) Signed, written complaints total | 3 |
| (1.1) Complaints with reports issued | 3 |
| (a) Reports with findings | 3 |
| (b) Reports within timeline | 3 |
| (c) Reports within extended timelines | 0 |
| (1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed | 0 |
| (1.3) Complaints pending | 0 |
| (a) Complaint pending a due process hearing | 0 |

| SECTION B: Mediation requests | |
|---|------------------|
| (2) Mediation requests total | 0 |
| (2.1) Mediations | Calculated Value |
| (a) Mediations related to due process | 0 |
| (i) Mediation agreements | 0 |
| (b) Mediations not related to due process | 0 |
| (i) Mediation agreements | 0 |
| (2.2) Mediations not held (including pending) | 0 |

| SECTION C: Hearing requests | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| (3) Hearing requests total | 0 |
| (3.1) Resolution sessions | 0 |
| (a) Settlement agreements | 0 |
| (3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated) | 0 |
| (a) Decisions within timeline | 0 |
| (b) Decisions within extended timeline | 0 |
| (3.3) Resolved without a hearing | 0 |
| Specify timeline used (30 day Part C, 30 day Part B, or 45 day Part B): | Select on DP Hearings Worksheet |

