STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

For reporting on
FFY 2020

Tennessee

PART B DUE February 1, 2022

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

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

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

For additional information about how data collection and reporting for Indicators 1 through 17 were impacted by COVID-19, please see the narratives and "Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)" field within each Indicator section.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

146

General Supervision System:

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

The Tennessee Department of Education ("the department") utilizes a general supervision structure with multiple systems working in concert that includes monitoring, local determinations for LEAs based on indicators in the SPP/APR, and dispute resolution.

Monitoring System

Results-Based Monitoring: Tennessee's multi-tiered monitoring framework includes three distinctive levels: on-site, desktop, and self-assessment. A risk analysis comprised of multiple factors identifies the level of risk and likelihood that an LEA may not comply with certain requirements. Results from the analysis designate each LEA's risk as one of three levels: significant (which results in department staff conducting a monitoring visit with the LEA on-site), elevated (which identifies LEAs for participation in desktop monitoring), or low risk (with LEAs completing a self-assessment). Each LEA in the state must participate in one level of Results-Based Monitoring each year through the state's grants management platform, ePlan. A random selection of one or more LEAs to participate in an on-site monitoring occurs prior to determining the desktop and self-assessment selections.

Individualized Education Program (IEP) Self-Monitoring: The IEP monitoring system utilizes a four-step process that includes all LEAs in the state. All LEAs receive training and support on the process through available printed resources, office hours, webinars, or in-person training offered by the department annually.

In the first step of this monitoring process, the department provides each LEA with ten randomly selected student records the LEA is required to review and evaluate for compliance. These records are representative of the disability category makeup of each individual LEA. First, the case manager or teacher must assess these records using the protocol made available through a monitoring platform. Second, the LEA-level administrator (most often the IDEA Director) reviews the case managers' responses and may make revisions as appropriate before submitting the final review to the department. A copy of the IEP Self-Monitoring Protocol is available at https://eplan.tn.gov/DocumentLibrary/ViewDocument.aspx?DocumentKey=1629725&inline=true.

Upon completion of the first two levels of review by the LEA, the department conducts a two-level review of the LEA's IEP self-monitoring via the same platform. The third review is conducted by state-level monitoring specialists in the division of Federal Programs and Oversight (FPO) through a desktop audit. State-level monitoring specialists may agree or disagree with the LEA's responses based on the same protocol LEAs used to upload and assess the files. Their feedback and internal notes are housed in the monitoring system. Lastly, the state-wide IDEA compliance coordinator reviews and finalizes all decisions in the system. The system then generates a final IEP Monitoring Results Report, and the compliance coordinator notifies all LEAs when results are available to review. The department continues to hold office hours three times per week to discuss any questions that LEAs may have regarding the review process, the IEP Monitoring Results Report, or needed action steps.

Fiscal Monitoring: The fiscal monitoring of IDEA Part B funds and grants is completed by the Office of Local Finance. This monitoring ensures that LEAs are appropriately budgeting and spending IDEA Part B funds at both the LEA- and individual school-level. In addition, fiscal monitoring is completed for those LEAs awarded grants and discretionary funds from IDEA Part B to certify that those grants and funds are being used as intended and in accordance with IDEA Part B requirements.

Local Determinations

Since the FFY 2011 APR, the department has employed a local determinations process focused not only on compliance indicators but also on results. This process supports not only the overall goals of the department to continue redirecting focus on student performance and outcomes, but also aligns to the national shift toward results-driven accountability. Local determinations are made using LEA-specific data for almost all indicators and each indicator selected is weighted based on the department's priorities. The focus on student performance is evident in the heavy weighting of results-based indicators. Other indicators that are solely compliance focused and/or predicated on data such as survey results have a lesser weight.

The actual local determination assigned to each LEA is based on overall points allocated once the weights of each indicator are calculated. In addition, the department uses a growth metric to assess year-to-year improvement in LEA performance for each results-based indicator, when possible. Each LEA is provided a detailed matrix (see https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/special-education/lea_apr_indicator_summary_2019-20.pdf) listing their actual data for each indicator included in the determinations process, how their data compare with the state, and whether they met the state-established target.

All LEAs, regardless of their determination, must address any flagged indicators in their comprehensive LEA plan. These plans are submitted through the LEA planning platform, InformTN. This reduces the paperwork burden for LEAs, creates a continuum of communication throughout the entire

department, and ensures that improvement strategies and efforts for SWDs are included in the overall LEA improvement plan rather than being disparate and disconnected.

In addition to addressing flagged indicators, LEAs determined to be "Needs Assistance" are required to attend a virtual meeting to review the APR process, learn how to conduct a root case analysis, and brainstorm strategies to improve district performance.

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

LEAs that are determined to be "Needs Substantial Intervention" must complete all the tasks associated with the "Needs Intervention" designation and are also required to develop a detailed action plan to accompany the LEA improvement plan. LEAs must adhere to this action plan and meet with the Special Education Programming Team monthly to discuss progress and any challenges that may be preventing them from meeting the goals outlined in their plans.

Dispute Resolution

The department's Office of General Counsel (OGC) is responsible for overseeing dispute resolution throughout the course of each year. This includes investigating and resolving administrative complaints as well as processing and monitoring mediation and due process hearings requests. Signed written complaints should have reports issued and be resolved within the allotted 60-day timeline or the agreed upon extended timeline. Extended timelines could be due to exceptional circumstances relative to the particular complaint or because the parent/individual/organization and department agree to allow additional time to engage in mediation or alternative forms of dispute resolution. Mediation and due process requests are to be documented by the OGC. If due process requests are fully adjudicated, this must be done within the 45-day timeline or the agreed upon extended timeline (an extension can be approved by hearing officer at the request of either party).

Technical Assistance System:

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

Identifying Initiatives

The department has continued championing the initiatives outlined in Tennessee's State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) regarding access to high-quality instruction for all SWDs and ensuring educators are providing appropriate interventions to students that address their areas of deficit/need. Due to the successes seen as result of this work, both in classroom observations of participating teachers/schools and concrete student-level data, these initiatives expanded to even more LEAs.

Metrics are collected throughout the initiative to assess implementation success and adjust as necessary. Although Tennessee has made great strides in inclusive opportunities for K-12 in terms of setting, we have not yet closed the gap related to proficiency and student growth. The K-12 SPDG initiative is designed to increase access to instruction and intervention, not simply access to the educational environment. In terms of early childhood, Tennessee has had one of the lowest percentages in the nation of students ages 3-5 receiving the majority of their special education services in a regular early childhood program and receiving more than half of their special education services in that setting.

Given the extensive data on successes resulting from SPDG activities, as well as feedback from stakeholders and the need for continued support beyond the second year, the third cohort (SPDG 3.0) was expanded to a 4-year partnership and specific learning on math and writing intervention was added. 46 new LEAs (28 K-12 and 18 early childhood) were selected in February 2020 and began implementation in July 2020. With the pandemic challenges that began immediately after selection, the goals of year one for K-12 were shifted to provide virtual training on SWDs access to virtual instruction, then year two focused on access to high-quality Tier I instruction for SWDs. Year three (2022-23) will focus on providing increasingly intensive intervention and reading and year four (2023-24) on increasingly intensive intervention for math and writing. For the early childhood initiative, the goals have remained the same, but additional time in the partnership allows for individualized data dives, additional IEP development training, and additional Pyramid model training for behavior, and many adjustments have been made to account for impacts of the pandemic on schedules, size of gatherings, and trainee absences.

Training on Initiatives

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

The instructional programming team within the Division of Special Populations (changed to the "Division of Special Education and Intervention Programs" in October 2021) conducts the majority of instructional technical assistance and professional development for special education staff within Tennessee, particularly regarding the aforementioned initiatives. This assistance has included the development of a special education framework to assist teachers in the writing of Instructionally Appropriate IEPs and collaboration with others in the department relative to Response to Instruction and Intervention (RTI²). Each member of the programming team has a particular area of expertise, ranging from speech/language therapy to high school transition, so that the team can offer a wide gamut of professional development and technical assistance to LEAs in all areas of special education.

CORE interventionists, in collaboration with select programming team members, serve as regional support for LEAs across the state. They not only take the lead in working with "Needs Intervention" LEAs, but also assist with training on the aforementioned initiatives and supporting implementation and application at the district level. The CORE interventionists serve as the conduit to LEAs so that there is one main point of contact at the state for LEAs rather than a multitude of different people needed to answer different questions. The interventionists are able to connect LEAs to resources, training opportunities, and guidance regarding department initiatives. In addition, for the SPDG 3.0 districts, both K-12 and early childhood, eight new regional access coaches (RACs) have been trained and now provide one-on-one, teacher-directed, Cognitive Coaching cycles to work toward even greater behavioral change as educators implement the training in their district/schools/classrooms.

The Data Services team provides professional development and routine technical assistance to LEAs on the use of data to inform instructional decision-making and the effective use of the statewide IEP data management system (EasyIEP). This team develops documentation and manuals for LEAs regarding inputting special education information into the statewide system and goes to great lengths to link the technology platform to the department initiatives to ensure streamlined communication to LEAs. Embedded in this IEP data management system are many resources addressing crucial initiatives produced by the department to ensure such information can be readily accessed by users when writing IEPs and completing other special education documentation. In addition, the external evaluation team for SPDG 3.0 provides up to the minute data dashboards for districts with demographic filters for both survey and observation data, as well as providing coaching data statewide.

Identifying LEAs for Technical Assistance/Professional Development

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

In addition, the department utilizes a cross-divisional approach to identify additional technical assistance needs. This group, the IDEA collaborative, includes leadership from the Division of Special Education and Intervention Programs, the Office of General Counsel, FPO, and CORE. The collaborative meets weekly to review the findings from results-based monitoring, dispute resolution, and other communication with LEAs. This group subsequently makes recommendations for technical assistance, focused monitoring, or additional supports that may be needed.

Professional Development System:

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

In addition to the systems listed under the "Technical Assistance System" section above, the department currently operates an online professional development resource, "Best for All Central." This tool is designed to be a "one stop shop" for educators to access online training modules and additional resources to improve instructional practices. The Division of Special Education and Intervention Programs continues to add specific materials related to special education to this resource, including access to a network of supports called the Tennessee Technical Assistance Network (TN-TAN). Stakeholders request assistance from the network through a single request form that is directed by the coordination grantee to the appropriate technical assistance personnel, including preschool, behavior, autism, and RTI2-A and RTI2-B supports.

The Special Education Programming Team also provides several opportunities for in-person or virtual professional development for special educators throughout the year. The department hosts institutes for special education supervisors throughout the year that include professional development related to the requirements of IDEA as well as state initiatives to improve outcomes for SWDs. The Assistant Commissioner of Special Education and Intervention Programs, within the Office of Academics, also hosts a monthly two-hour virtual meeting with special education supervisors that provides guidance around IDEA-related issues, addresses concerns from the field, and gives educators an opportunity to engage with department staff in an open forum.

Finally, the division engages in professional development through activities that were initially funded by the SPDG 2015 grant from OSEP. The division has sustained work from this SPDG, expanding to a third cohort of districts and focusing on the three coherent improvement strategies included in Tennessee's SSIP: Access to core instruction, increasingly intensive interventions, and high-quality IEPs. The division was also awarded a new 2020 SPDG that engages high school teams in professional development opportunities related to the provision of high-quality instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities and/or complex needs.

Broad Stakeholder Input:

The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education supervisors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education supervisor study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The ARC Tennessee.

The department has made concerted efforts to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Further, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets." This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the

"Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

In addition, the department has continued to engage and solicit feedback from stakeholders during implementation of the SSIP in three cohorts. Various stakeholders have received information on the work, including: special education supervisors, educators, administrators, service providers, advocacy groups, other SEA divisions, the Dyslexia Advisory Council, and the AC. Information has been shared publicly through a variety of modes. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. In addition, partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. For the newest cohort of districts (3.0), participating superintendents and special education supervisors were provided with district-specific data infographics summarizing the work and subsequent data from the first year of implementation during the 2019-20 school year. Statewide data was also communicated within the SEA, via social media, and on the project's website. Success of the SSIP is contingent upon not just the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. In addition, the department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees and district facilitators who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content. The Senior Director of Data Analysis for Special Populations and the Senior Director of Special Education Programming lead discussion and feedback of the SSIP implementation and activities as a regular item in the quarterly AC meetings. AC members and other stakeholders in attendance at these meetings provide feedback through participation in roundtable conversations. These are open meetings which are recorded and available on the department's website for public viewing. In January, June, and October of 2021, the Senior Director of Special Education Programming led these sessions with members of the AC to engage in meaningful conversations about the work completed thus far as well as the impending implementation slated for the 2021-22 to 2023-24 school years. AC members confirmed the need for this content, continued expansion into additional districts, and retraining of districts from previous cohorts due to staffing turnover and the effects of the pandemic on access to instruction. Additionally, AC members reiterated the need to continue cohorts until every district is included in this important work and proceed with trainings focused on developing quality IEPs, expressing their excitement about the addition related to math and writing intervention in the 2023-24 school year.

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

YES

Number of Parent Members:

21

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

The department understands the value and importance of parent involvement in SPP/APR planning and provided parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents with opportunities to analyze data and provide feedback that informed the SPP/APR target setting process. The Senior Director of Data Analysis for Special Populations led discussions with the AC about the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package, emphasizing the new stakeholder requirements and the focus on parent engagement. He requested that AC members complete the survey themselves (both during the discussions and via email communications) and connect with parents, if possible, to reinforce the critical nature of reviewing the target setting presentations and providing feedback on the proposed targets. The Senior Director of Data Analysis for Special Populations also met with one of the department's family engagement partners, The ARC Tennessee, to provide the target setting feedback process information and convey a similar message around the importance of involving parents in this work. He met directly with The ARC Tennessee's director to discuss ways to effectively disseminate the feedback survey and reach parents. Finally, the department made all SPP/APR target setting materials available to the public on its website (https://www.tn.gov/education/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback tab), encouraging responses from the broader community including individual parents of SWDs.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

The department engages in numerous activities to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for SWDs, most notably working with a variety of organizations and partners to gather parent feedback. First, the AC includes four parent representatives who attend quarterly meetings and participate in discussions/activities around the content presented at those meetings. Second, the department contracts with The ARC Tennessee to consult on family engagement. This group communicates parent feedback to the appropriate stakeholders and supports the department in the creation of family friendly resources in response to identified needs. The ARC Tennessee also holds monthly DOE "listening sessions" and Facebook Live sessions in which stakeholders can interact with and voice concerns directly to department staff. Third, there are many organizations with which the department collaborates throughout the year either have parent representatives and/or parent feedback mechanisms for collecting and sharing input with the department. Examples include the Tennessee Dyslexia Advisory Council; Tennessee Council for the Deaf, Deaf-Blind and Hard of Hearing; Tennessee Deaf-Blind Project Advisory Council; Tennessee Council on Developmental Disabilities; Tennessee Council on Autism Spectrum Disorder; Tennessee Works Partnership; Tennessee State Rehabilitation Council; Tennessee Employment Roundtable; Tennessee Employment First Task Force; and the TransitionTN State Leadership Team. Finally, the department has specific initiatives and partnerships it has launched to provide parents with resources to improve outcomes for SWDs, including but not limited to: S.I.M.P.L.E. Moments (a social media campaign and district partnerships with families around literacy development and engagement); Public Broadcasting Service (foundational literacy and math lessons for families and Tennessee teachers); Family Literacy Nights Turnkey Package (LEA resources for hosting family literacy nights w/ specific guidance for SWDs); and the Ready4K text-based program (text messaging program that provides practical ways for families to engage in literacy and math activities at home).

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

The department's primary mechanism for soliciting public input included the dissemination of short presentations (https://www.tn.gov/education/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab) with information and data about the SPP/APR target setting process and the administration of feedback surveys tied to these presentations. Discussions with internal and external stakeholders (such as the AC) regarding the APR target setting process began in October 2021. The presentations and surveys were made publicly available on the department website in late November/early December 2021 and remained open until late January 2021. Each presentation followed the same format and included a quick overview of the SPP/APR, a definition of the APR indicator on which the presentation was focused, the overall five-year data trend, the proposed targets for the APR indicator, and a link to the stakeholder feedback survey.

The stakeholder feedback surveys for each APR indicator were also similar in format. They collected respondent demographic information (role, race/ethnicity, geographic location) and asked stakeholders to respond to the following questions:

1. How did you hear about this APR target feedback opportunity?
   a. Through an advisory/advocacy group
   b. Through my local school/district
   c. Through social media/word-of-mouth
   d. I found it myself by searching the internet
   e. Other:
2. After reviewing the proposed targets for Indicator [#], which of the following statements best represents your opinion of the targets?
   a. The targets are too challenging
   b. The targets are not challenging enough
   c. The targets are just right
3. After reviewing the proposed targets, which of the following statements best represents your opinion of the data & analyses provided?
   a. The data & analyses are too complex
   b. The data & analyses are not complex enough
   c. The data & analyses are appropriate
4. Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets:
5. Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets:

The department received 153 responses across 14 different feedback surveys. Respondents reported being in a variety of stakeholder roles and were located in 28 different Tennessee counties across the state.

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

Once the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR targets are approved by OSEP, the department will post them to the "Special Education Data Services & Reports" page on the state website (https://www.tn.gov/education/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html) and communicate with relevant stakeholders that this information, along with an overview of the SPP/APR target setting process results, is available to the public.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2019 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.

The department reports annually to the public on the performance of the state and each LEA through the state website: https://www.tn.gov/education/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Reports provided on this site include the full SPPs/APRs for the past eight years, a file detailing LEA performance on each SPP/APR indicator as compared to state SPP/APR targets (a copy of this file from the FFY 2019 APR can be found here: https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/special-education/idea-part-b_annual_perf_rpt_2019-20.pdf), and OSEP's letter of determination for the state for each APR since FFY 2012. Specific data from individual indicators (such as Indicator 3) can be found on the website provided above, the Tennessee state report card (https://reportcard.tnedu.gov/), and the department's Data Downloads & Requests page (https://www.tn.gov/education/data/data-downloads.html).

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2021 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

Tennessee's IDEA Part B Determination for 2021 is Meets Requirements and verified with OSEP that there were no required actions for the FFY 2020 Introduction.

Intro - OSEP Response

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

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

Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	78.72%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	70.96%	71.87%	73.55%	74.43%	74.73%
Data	69.99%	71.79%	72.72%	73.04%	73.93%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	78.72%	79.25%	79.78%	80.83%	81.88%	82.93%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education supervisors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education supervisor study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The ARC Tennessee.

The department has made concerted efforts to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Further, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not

complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets. This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

In addition, the department has continued to engage and solicit feedback from stakeholders during implementation of the SSIP in three cohorts. Various stakeholders have received information on the work, including: special education supervisors, educators, administrators, service providers, advocacy groups, other SEA divisions, the Dyslexia Advisory Council, and the AC. Information has been shared publicly through a variety of modes. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. In addition, partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. For the newest cohort of districts (3.0), participating superintendents and special education supervisors were provided with district-specific data infographics summarizing the work and subsequent data from the first year of implementation during the 2019-20 school year. Statewide data was also communicated within the SEA, via social media, and on the project's website. Success of the SSIP is contingent upon not just the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. In addition, the department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees and district facilitators who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content. The Senior Director of Data Analysis for Special Populations and the Senior Director of Special Education Programming lead discussion and feedback of the SSIP implementation and activities as a regular item in the quarterly AC meetings. AC members and other stakeholders in attendance at these meetings provide feedback through participation in roundtable conversations. These are open meetings which are recorded and available on the department's website for public viewing. In January, June, and October of 2021, the Senior Director of Special Education Programming led these sessions with members of the AC to engage in meaningful conversations about the work completed thus far as well as the impending implementation slated for the 2021-22 to 2023-24 school years. AC members confirmed the need for this content, continued expansion into additional districts, and retraining of districts from previous cohorts due to staffing turnover and the effects of the pandemic on access to instruction. Additionally, AC members reiterated the need to continue cohorts until every district is included in this important work and proceed with trainings focused on developing quality IEPs, expressing their excitement about the addition related to math and writing intervention in the 2023-24 school year.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	5,241
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	782
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	113
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	522

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
5,241	6,658	73.93%	78.72%	78.72%	N/A	N/A

Graduation Conditions

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

The Tennessee Department of Education has raised standards and aligned graduation requirements to best prepare students for college and the workforce. All students must meet these criteria and conditions to graduate with a regular high school diploma, regardless of their disability status.

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

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

Total Required Credits: 22

•Math: 4 credits, including Algebra I, II, Geometry and a fourth higher level math course (Students must be enrolled in a mathematics course each school year)

•English: 4 credits
•Science: 3 credits, including Biology, Chemistry or Physics, and a third lab course
•Social Studies: 3 credits, including U.S. History and Geography, World History and Geography, U.S. Government and Civics, and Economics
•Physical Education and Wellness: 1.5 credits
•Personal Finance: 0.5 credits (Three years of JROTC may be substituted for one-half unit of Personal Finance if the JROTC instructor attends the Personal Finance training.)
•Foreign Language: 2 credits (May be waived by the LEA for students, under certain circumstances, to expand and enhance the elective focus)
•Fine Arts: 1 credit (may be waived by the local school district for students, under certain circumstances, to expand and enhance the elective focus)
•Elective Focus: 3 credits consisting of Math and Science, Career and Technical Education, Fine Arts, Humanities, Advanced Placement (AP) or International Baccalaureate (IB)

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In Tennessee, all schools were required to close for in-person learning by March 20, 2020 due to COVID-19. With this disruption, students who were working toward a 2020 graduation date were impacted in their ability to access coursework and instructors, complete assignments, and participate in required assessments.

Tennessee has reset the baseline in FFY 2020 to account for the change to the data source used for this calculation (EDFacts file FS009).

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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

Measurement

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

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

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

Options 1 and 2:

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	7.84%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	3.32%	3.27%	3.22%	3.20%	3.18%
Data	5.26%	2.46%	2.81%	2.78%	2.40%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	7.84%	7.45%	7.06%	6.28%	5.50%	4.72%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in

the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education supervisors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education supervisor study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The ARC Tennessee.

The department has made concerted efforts to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Further, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets. This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

In addition, the department has continued to engage and solicit feedback from stakeholders during implementation of the SSIP in three cohorts. Various stakeholders have received information on the work, including: special education supervisors, educators, administrators, service providers, advocacy groups, other SEA divisions, the Dyslexia Advisory Council, and the AC. Information has been shared publicly through a variety of modes. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. In addition, partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. For the newest cohort of districts (3.0), participating superintendents and special education supervisors were provided with district-specific data infographics summarizing the work and subsequent data from the first year of implementation during the 2019-20 school year. Statewide data was also communicated within the SEA, via social media, and on the project's website. Success of the SSIP is contingent upon not just the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. In addition, the department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees and district facilitators who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content. The Senior Director of Data Analysis for Special Populations and the Senior Director of Special Education Programming lead discussion and feedback of the SSIP implementation and activities as a regular item in the quarterly AC meetings. AC members and other stakeholders in attendance at these meetings provide feedback through participation in roundtable conversations. These are open meetings which are recorded and available on the department's website for public viewing. In January, June, and October of 2021, the Senior Director of Special Education Programming led these sessions with members of the AC to engage in meaningful conversations about the work completed thus far as well as the impending implementation slated for the 2021-22 to 2023-24 school years. AC members confirmed the need for this content, continued expansion into additional districts, and retraining of districts from previous cohorts due to staffing turnover and the effects of the pandemic on access to instruction. Additionally, AC members reiterated the need to continue cohorts until every district is included in this important work and proceed with trainings focused on developing quality IEPs, expressing their excitement about the addition related to math and writing intervention in the 2023-24 school year.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 1

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	5,241
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	782
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	113
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	522

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
522	6,658	2.40%	7.84%	7.84%	N/A	N/A

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

Students in Tennessee are considered dropouts if they meet any of the following criteria:

•A student has unexcused absences for 10 or more consecutive days and all requirements for truancy intervention on behalf of the LEA have been followed;
•A student transfers to an adult high school, GED program, or job corps and does not earn an on-time regular diploma;
•A student transfers to another LEA in Tennessee but has no subsequent enrollment records after transferring;
•A student transfers to another school in the same LEA in Tennessee but has no subsequent enrollment records after transferring;
•A student does not graduate with their cohort by obtaining a regular high school diploma, a special education diploma, or an occupational diploma, and does not enroll in the SEA the subsequent school year.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In Tennessee, all schools were required to close for in-person learning by March 20, 2020 due to COVID-19. With this disruption, students who were working toward a 2020 graduation date were impacted in their ability to access coursework and instructors, complete assignments, and participate in required assessments.

Tennessee has selected reporting option 1 for this indicator and has reset the baseline in FFY 2020 to account for the change to the data source used for this calculation (EDFacts file FS009).

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

      A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

      B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

      C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

      D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	97.78%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	95.95%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	94.56%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	98.46%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	96.87%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	97.07%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education supervisors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education supervisor study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The ARC Tennessee.

The department has made concerted efforts to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Further, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets." This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

In addition, the department has continued to engage and solicit feedback from stakeholders during implementation of the SSIP in three cohorts. Various stakeholders have received information on the work, including: special education supervisors, educators, administrators, service providers, advocacy groups, other SEA divisions, the Dyslexia Advisory Council, and the AC. Information has been shared publicly through a variety of modes. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. In addition, partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. For the newest cohort of districts (3.0), participating superintendents and special education supervisors were provided with district-specific data infographics summarizing the work and subsequent data from the first year of implementation during the 2019-20 school year. Statewide data was also communicated within the SEA, via social media, and on the project's website. Success of the SSIP is contingent upon not just the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. In addition, the department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees and district facilitators who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content. The Senior Director of Data Analysis for Special Populations and the Senior Director of Special Education Programming lead discussion and feedback of the SSIP implementation and activities as a regular item in the quarterly AC meetings. AC members and other stakeholders in attendance at these meetings provide feedback through participation in roundtable conversations. These are open meetings which are recorded and available on the department's website for public viewing. In January, June, and October of 2021, the Senior Director of Special Education Programming led these sessions with members of the AC to engage in meaningful conversations about the work completed thus far as well as the impending implementation slated for the 2021-22 to 2023-24 school years. AC members confirmed the need for this content, continued expansion into additional districts, and retraining of districts from previous cohorts due to staffing turnover and the effects of the pandemic on access to instruction. Additionally, AC members reiterated the need to continue cohorts until every district is included in this important work and proceed with trainings focused on developing quality IEPs, expressing their excitement about the addition related to math and writing intervention in the 2023-24 school year.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

03/30/2022

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	9,492	8,478	7,540
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	2,243	1,291	1,806
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	6,202	5,763	4,445
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	836	1,081	879

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

03/30/2022

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	9,460	8,433	7,822
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	2,251	1,285	1,928
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	6,232	5,801	4,786
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	831	1,083	879

*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	9,281	9,492		95.00%	97.78%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	8,135	8,478		95.00%	95.95%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	7,130	7,540		95.00%	94.56%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	9,314	9,460		95.00%	98.46%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	8,169	8,433		95.00%	96.87%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	7,593	7,822		95.00%	97.07%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

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

Assessment data for all students, including students with disabilities, can be found under the "Assessment Files" tab on the department's "Data Downloads and Requests" website: https://www.tn.gov/education/data/data-downloads.html. Additional assessment data, including participation and achievement data for SWDs on assessments, can be found under the "Students with Disabilities Participation/Performance on Assessments" tab on the department's "Special Education Data Services & Reports" website: https://www.tn.gov/education/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In January 2021, the Tennessee General Assembly passed the Accountability Hold Harmless Law (SB7001/HB7003) in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, which allowed districts certain flexibilities regarding school and district accountability if they administered assessments to at least 80% of students: https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/2020-21-leg-session/Accountability%20District%20&%20School%20Board%20Summary%20of%20Legislation%20-%20508%20(1).pdf. This action, which modified expectations and set a lower target for districts, may have affected the participation rate in some districts. In addition, the disruption caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, including but not limited to short-term school closures, shifts to virtual instruction, and student and staff absences due to mandatory isolation and quarantine periods may have contributed to slightly lower overall participation.

Tennessee has reset the baseline in FFY 2020 to account for the change to the grade levels (4, 8, and high school) being reported separately, which differs from previous years' requirements.

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3A - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

      A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

      B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

      C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

      D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	8.89%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	2.00%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	4.99%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	11.56%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	4.69%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	1.31%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	8.89%	9.89%	10.89%	11.89%	12.89%	13.89%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	2.00%	3.00%	4.00%	5.00%	6.00%	7.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	4.99%	5.99%	6.99%	7.99%	8.99%	10.99%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	11.56%	12.56%	13.56%	14.56%	15.56%	16.56%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	4.69%	5.69%	6.69%	7.79%	8.89%	9.89%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	1.31%	2.31%	3.31%	4.31%	5.31%	6.31%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education supervisors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education supervisor study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are

determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The ARC Tennessee.

The department has made concerted efforts to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Further, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets." This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

In addition, the department has continued to engage and solicit feedback from stakeholders during implementation of the SSIP in three cohorts. Various stakeholders have received information on the work, including: special education supervisors, educators, administrators, service providers, advocacy groups, other SEA divisions, the Dyslexia Advisory Council, and the AC. Information has been shared publicly through a variety of modes. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. In addition, partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. For the newest cohort of districts (3.0), participating superintendents and special education supervisors were provided with district-specific data infographics summarizing the work and subsequent data from the first year of implementation during the 2019-20 school year. Statewide data was also communicated within the SEA, via social media, and on the project's website. Success of the SSIP is contingent upon not just the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. In addition, the department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees and district facilitators who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content. The Senior Director of Data Analysis for Special Populations and the Senior Director of Special Education Programming lead discussion and feedback of the SSIP implementation and activities as a regular item in the quarterly AC meetings. AC members and other stakeholders in attendance at these meetings provide feedback through participation in roundtable conversations. These are open meetings which are recorded and available on the department's website for public viewing. In January, June, and October of 2021, the Senior Director of Special Education Programming led these sessions with members of the AC to engage in meaningful conversations about the work completed thus far as well as the impending implementation slated for the 2021-22 to 2023-24 school years. AC members confirmed the need for this content, continued expansion into additional districts, and retraining of districts from previous cohorts due to staffing turnover and the effects of the pandemic on access to instruction. Additionally, AC members reiterated the need to continue cohorts until every district is included in this important work and proceed with trainings focused on developing quality IEPs, expressing their excitement about the addition related to math and writing intervention in the 2023-24 school year.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	8,445	7,054	6,251
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	510	63	119
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	241	78	193

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	8,483	7,086	6,714
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	621	119	34
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	360	213	54

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	751	8,445		8.89%	8.89%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	141	7,054		2.00%	2.00%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	312	6,251		4.99%	4.99%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	981	8,483		11.56%	11.56%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	332	7,086		4.69%	4.69%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	88	6,714		1.31%	1.31%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

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

Assessment data for all students, including students with disabilities, can be found under the "Assessment Files" tab on the department's "Data Downloads and Requests" website: https://www.tn.gov/education/data/data-downloads.html. Additional assessment data, including participation and achievement data for SWDs on assessments, can be found under the "Students with Disabilities Participation/Performance on Assessments" tab on the department's "Special Education Data Services & Reports" website: https://www.tn.gov/education/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Tennessee has reset the baseline in FFY 2020 to account for the change to the grade levels (4, 8, and high school) being reported separately and the proficiency rate calculation (for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards only), which differs from previous years' requirements.

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

    A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

    B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

    C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

    D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time

of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	38.52%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	46.07%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	56.31%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	49.82%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	52.08%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	57.34%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	38.52%	42.52%	46.52%	50.52%	54.52%	58.52%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	46.07%	50.07%	54.07%	58.07%	62.07%	66.07%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	56.31%	60.31%	64.31%	68.31%	72.31%	76.31%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	49.82%	53.82%	57.82%	61.82%	65.82%	69.82%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	52.08%	56.08%	60.08%	64.08%	68.08%	72.08%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	57.34%	61.34%	65.34%	69.34%	73.34%	77.34%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education supervisors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education supervisor study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The ARC Tennessee.

The department has made concerted efforts to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Further, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets." This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

In addition, the department has continued to engage and solicit feedback from stakeholders during implementation of the SSIP in three cohorts. Various stakeholders have received information on the work, including: special education supervisors, educators, administrators, service providers, advocacy groups, other SEA divisions, the Dyslexia Advisory Council, and the AC. Information has been shared publicly through a variety of modes. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. In addition, partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. For the newest cohort of districts (3.0), participating superintendents and special education supervisors were provided with district-specific data infographics summarizing the work and subsequent data from the first year of implementation during the 2019-20 school year. Statewide data was also communicated within the SEA, via social media, and on the project's website. Success of the SSIP is contingent upon not just the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. In addition, the department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees and district facilitators who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content. The Senior Director of Data Analysis for Special Populations and the Senior Director of Special Education Programming lead discussion and feedback of the SSIP implementation and activities as a regular item in the quarterly AC meetings. AC members and other stakeholders in attendance at these meetings provide feedback through participation in roundtable conversations. These are open meetings which are recorded and available on the department's website for public viewing. In January, June, and October of 2021, the Senior Director of Special Education Programming led these sessions with members of the AC to engage in meaningful conversations about the work completed thus far as well as the impending implementation slated for the 2021-22 to 2023-24 school years. AC members confirmed the need for this content, continued expansion into additional districts, and retraining of districts from previous cohorts due to staffing turnover and the effects of the pandemic on access to instruction. Additionally, AC members reiterated the need to continue cohorts until every district is included in this important work and proceed with trainings focused on developing quality IEPs, expressing their excitement about the addition related to math and writing intervention in the 2023-24 school year.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	836	1,081	879
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	322	498	495

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	831	1,083	879
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	414	564	504

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	322	836		38.52%	38.52%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	498	1,081		46.07%	46.07%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	495	879		56.31%	56.31%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	414	831		49.82%	49.82%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	564	1,083		52.08%	52.08%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	504	879		57.34%	57.34%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

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

Assessment data for all students, including students with disabilities, can be found under the "Assessment Files" tab on the department's "Data Downloads and Requests" website: https://www.tn.gov/education/data/data-downloads.html. Additional assessment data, including participation and achievement data for SWDs on assessments, can be found under the "Students with Disabilities Participation/Performance on Assessments" tab on the department's "Special Education Data Services & Reports" website: https://www.tn.gov/education/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Tennessee has reset the baseline in FFY 2020 to account for the change to the grade levels (4, 8, and high school) being reported separately and the proficiency rate calculation (for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards only), which differs from previous years' requirements.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)
Instructions and Measurement
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

       A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

       B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

       C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

       D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	24.08
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	20.78
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	32.07
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	22.02
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	23.71
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	9.47

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	24.08	23.58	23.08	22.58	22.08	21.58
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	20.78	20.28	19.78	19.28	18.78	18.28
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	32.07	31.57	31.07	30.57	30.07	29.57
Math	A <=	Grade 4	22.02	21.52	21.02	20.52	20.02	19.52
Math	B <=	Grade 8	23.71	23.21	22.71	22.21	21.71	21.21
Math	C <=	Grade HS	9.47	8.97	8.47	7.97	7.47	6.97

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education supervisors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education supervisor study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The ARC Tennessee.

The department has made concerted efforts to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Further, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets." This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

In addition, the department has continued to engage and solicit feedback from stakeholders during implementation of the SSIP in three cohorts. Various stakeholders have received information on the work, including: special education supervisors, educators, administrators, service providers, advocacy groups, other SEA divisions, the Dyslexia Advisory Council, and the AC. Information has been shared publicly through a variety of modes. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. In addition, partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. For the newest cohort of districts (3.0), participating superintendents and special education supervisors were provided with district-specific data infographics summarizing the work and subsequent data from the first year of implementation during the 2019-20 school year. Statewide data was also communicated within the SEA, via social media, and on the project's website. Success of the SSIP is contingent upon not just the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. In addition, the department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees and district facilitators who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content. The Senior Director of Data Analysis for Special Populations and the Senior Director of Special Education Programming lead discussion and feedback of the SSIP implementation and activities as a regular item in the quarterly AC meetings. AC members and other stakeholders in attendance at these meetings provide feedback through participation in roundtable conversations. These are open meetings which are recorded and available on the department's website for public viewing. In January, June, and October of 2021, the Senior Director of Special Education Programming led these sessions with members of the AC to engage in meaningful conversations about the work completed thus far as well as the impending implementation slated for the 2021-22 to 2023-24 school years. AC members confirmed the need for this content, continued expansion into additional districts, and retraining of districts from previous cohorts due to staffing turnover and the effects of the pandemic on access to instruction. Additionally, AC members reiterated the need to continue cohorts until every district is included in this important work and proceed with trainings focused on developing quality IEPs, expressing their excitement about the addition related to math and writing intervention in the 2023-24 school year.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	69,679	72,710	65,665
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	8,445	7,054	6,251
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	22,070	16,301	23,776
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	906	265	559
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	510	63	119

f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	241	78	193

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	69,735	72,278	63,014
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	8,483	7,086	6,714
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	22,192	19,946	6,619
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,228	580	177
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	621	119	34
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	360	213	54

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	8.89%	32.97%		24.08	24.08	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	2.00%	22.78%		20.78	20.78	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	4.99%	37.06%		32.07	32.07	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	11.56%	33.58%		22.02	22.02	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	4.69%	28.40%		23.71	23.71	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	1.31%	10.78%		9.47	9.47	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Tennessee is establishing a FFY 2020 baseline for this new subindicator.

Assessment data for all students, including students with disabilities, can be found under the "Assessment Files" tab on the department's "Data Downloads and Requests" website: https://www.tn.gov/education/data/data-downloads.html. Additional assessment data, including participation and

achievement data for SWDs on assessments, can be found under the "Students with Disabilities Participation/Performance on Assessments" tab on the department's "Special Education Data Services & Reports" website: https://www.tn.gov/education/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html.

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

The State has established the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

> A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

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

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

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

> --The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

> --The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	20.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	2.20%	2.00%	1.80%	8.00%	8.00%
Data	22.22%	8.00%	20.00%	26.32%	20.83%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	17.19%	14.38%	11.57%	8.76%	5.95%	3.14%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education supervisors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education supervisor study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The ARC Tennessee.

The department has made concerted efforts to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Further, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets." This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

In addition, the department has continued to engage and solicit feedback from stakeholders during implementation of the SSIP in three cohorts. Various stakeholders have received information on the work, including: special education supervisors, educators, administrators, service providers, advocacy groups, other SEA divisions, the Dyslexia Advisory Council, and the AC. Information has been shared publicly through a variety of modes. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. In addition, partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. For the newest cohort of districts (3.0), participating superintendents and special education supervisors were provided with district-specific data infographics summarizing the work and subsequent data from the first year of implementation during the 2019-20 school year. Statewide data was also communicated within the SEA, via social media, and on the project's website. Success of the SSIP is contingent upon not just the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. In addition, the department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees and district facilitators who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content. The Senior Director of Data Analysis for Special Populations and the Senior Director of Special Education Programming lead discussion and feedback of the SSIP implementation and activities as a regular item in the quarterly AC meetings. AC members and other stakeholders in attendance at these meetings provide feedback through participation in roundtable conversations. These are open meetings which are recorded and available on the department's website for public viewing. In January, June, and October of 2021, the Senior Director of Special Education Programming led these sessions with members of the AC to engage in meaningful conversations about the work completed thus far as well as the impending implementation slated for the 2021-22 to 2023-24 school years. AC members confirmed the need for this content, continued expansion into additional districts, and retraining of districts from previous cohorts due to staffing turnover and the effects of the pandemic on access to instruction. Additionally, AC members reiterated the need to continue cohorts until every district is included in this important work and proceed with trainings focused on developing quality IEPs, expressing their excitement about the addition related to math and writing intervention in the 2023-24 school year.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

139

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage

5	7	20.83%	17.19%	71.43%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

In Tennessee, all schools were required to close for in-person learning by March 20, 2020 due to COVID-19. As a result, zero discipline incidents were reported between March 21, 2020 and the end of the reporting year (6/30/20). This resulted in a roughly 40% decrease in the total number of discipline incidents recorded from 2018-19 to 2019-20 and a roughly 60% decrease in the number of SWDs suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days from 2018-19 to 2019-20. Although the number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy for Indicator 4A remained the same from FFY 2019 to FFY 2020, these decreases in discipline incidents resulted in fewer districts meeting the minimum n/cell size for "Number of LEAs in the State" and caused the percentage to increase drastically from the previous year.

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

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The department utilizes a rate ratio calculation methodology for each LEA in the state that meets "n" size requirements. In this calculation, the number of SWDs suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days is divided by the total number of SWDs within that LEA. This suspension/expulsion rate is then divided by the statewide average (number of SWDs, ages 3-21, suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days divided by the total number of SWDs, ages 3-21, in the LEA). The quotient of this calculation is the rate ratio. To be identified with a significant discrepancy for Indicator 4A, the rate ratio for an LEA must be 2.0 or greater and the LEA must meet the "n" size requirement for students suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days, which is a minimum of 5 students.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

As stated in the "slippage" explanation, all Tennessee schools were required to close for in-person learning by March 20, 2020 due to COVID-19. As a result, zero discipline incidents were reported between March 21, 2020 and the end of the reporting year (6/30/20). This resulted in a roughly 40% decrease in the total number of discipline incidents recorded from 2018-19 to 2019-20 and a roughly 60% decrease in the number of SWDs suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days from 2018-19 to 2019-20. Although the number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy for Indicator 4A remained the same from FFY 2019 to FFY 2020, these decreases in discipline incidents resulted in fewer districts meeting the minimum n/cell size for "Number of LEAs in the State" and caused the percentage to increase drastically from the previous year.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Once the department compares the discrepancy rates of all LEAs, those identified with a significant discrepancy (have a rate ratio of 2.0 or greater AND have an "n" size of 5 or more SWDs suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days) are required to review their policies, procedures, and practices via a self-assessment. The purpose of the review is to determine if any policy, procedure, or practice is contributing to the identified significant discrepancy. The review includes LEA policies, education information system data entry verification, general procedures for disciplinary removals, analysis of suspension data by special education status or race/ ethnicity, IEP reviews, positive behavior supports and interventions implemented district and school wide, student specific behavior intervention considerations and implementation, and manifestation determination reviews. The LEA was required to provide a description of its LEA practices and attach supporting documents as evidence. Examples of items required included a description of the LEA plan for creating positive school climate, staff training, its process for preventing and/or reducing inappropriate behavior in schools, its process for determining when and how to develop individual behavior intervention plans, and LEA in-school and out-of-school suspension policies. Individual student file reviews also were conducted to track removal from classrooms, whether LEA policies were appropriately followed, whether manifestation determination reviews occurred if appropriate, and if required whether functional behavior assessments were completed.

The information provided by each LEA identified with a significant discrepancy was reviewed by the SEA. LEAs that did not have adequate policies, procedures, or practices in place were found to be non-compliant and were required to revise these policies, procedures, or practices to ensure the appropriate development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and adherence to procedural safeguards.

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

If YES, select one of the following:

The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

Due to staffing vacancies and transitions at the SEA, corrections of noncompliance were not verified. The SEA will ensure adequate corrections of noncompliance and report on revised policies, procedures, and practices in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
5	4		1

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

LEAs submitted revised policies, practices, and procedures, as well as evidence of training and communication of changes for SEA review and verification of implementation/revisions. Furthermore, the SEA reviewed updated discipline data in the fall of 2021 for the five LEAs with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 (based on discipline data from FFY 2018/2018-19 school year). Using FFY 2021 discipline data (i.e., data from the 2020-21 school year), approximately 10 discipline records of SWDs suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days were randomly pulled for each LEA.

After reviewing these records and all relevant data available within the statewide IEP data management system (EasyIEP), SEA reviewers found all to be in compliance and LEAs correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

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

The SEA reviewed all individual cases of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 (based on discipline data from FFY 2018/2018-19 school year) and verified that all children who are still active and within the jurisdiction of the LEA are in compliance for four out of five districts. In addition, the SEA examined records within the statewide IEP data management system (EasyIEP) with consideration given to whether compensatory services were needed as a result of noncompliance with Indicator 4A. Records were examined related to any subsequent manifestation determinations, discipline incidents, restraints, or isolations, as well as current IEP supports, functional behavior assessments (FBAs) completed, behavior intervention plan (BIPs) in place, and attendance at home school or alternate placement. The SEA determined that none of these SWDs were denied free and appropriate public education (FAPE), which did not result in a need for compensatory services. However, the SEA found that one LEA required subsequent correction of individual cases.

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

One LEA did not provide sufficient evidence that the identified individual files of noncompliance were corrected. The SEA will require a more intensive review of the individual files as well as a creation of an action plan to address the noncompliance. The action plan will be monitored by the SEA to ensure the individual cases of noncompliance are corrected and LEA staff are trained on appropriate practices and procedures.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2019 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each district with noncompliance identified by the State: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

Please refer to the "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019" section in the Indicator Data description.

4A - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State reported that it did not revise (or did not require the affected districts to revise) the district's policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b), for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2020, based on FFY 2019 discipline data.

4A - Required Actions

The State reported that it conducted the review required in 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b), but did not specify that it reviewed policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with the IDEA for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2020 based upon FFY 2019 discipline data.

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report on the correction of this noncompliance by describing the review, and if appropriate, revision of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with the IDEA for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2020 based upon FFY 2019 discipline data.

The State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2020 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each district with noncompliance identified by the State: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b) was partially corrected. When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

> A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

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

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

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

> --The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

> --The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	NVR	23.53%	21.05%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

139

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
5	5	7	21.05%	0%	71.43%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if not applicable

In Tennessee, all schools were required to close for in-person learning by March 20, 2020 due to COVID-19. As a result, zero discipline incidents were reported between March 21, 2020 and the end of the reporting year (6/30/20). This resulted in a roughly 40% decrease in the total number of discipline incidents recorded from 2018-19 to 2019-20 and a roughly 60% decrease in the number of SWDs suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days from 2018-19 to 2019-20. Although the number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy for Indicator 4B remained almost the same from FFY 2019 to FFY 2020, these decreases in discipline incidents resulted in fewer districts meeting the minimum n/cell size for "Number of LEAs in the State" and caused the percentage to increase drastically from the previous year.

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The department utilizes a rate ratio calculation methodology for each LEA in the state that meets "n" size requirements. In this calculation, the number of SWDs suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days in a specific racial/ethnic group is divided by the total number of SWDs within that LEA in the same specific racial/ethnic group. This suspension/expulsion rate is then divided by the statewide average (number of SWDs, ages 3-21, suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days divided by the total number of SWDs, ages 3-21, in the LEA). The quotient of this calculation is the rate ratio. To be identified with a significant discrepancy for Indicator 4B, the rate ratio for an LEA must be 2.0 or greater and the LEA must meet the "n" size requirement for students suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days in a specific racial/ethnic group, which is a minimum of 5 students.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

As stated in the "slippage" explanation, all schools were required to close for in-person learning by March 20, 2020 due to COVID-19. As a result, zero discipline incidents were reported between March 21, 2020 and the end of the reporting year (6/30/20). This resulted in a roughly 40% decrease in the total number of discipline incidents recorded from 2018-19 to 2019-20 and a roughly 60% decrease in the number of SWDs suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days from 2018-19 to 2019-20. Although the number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy for Indicator 4B remained almost the same from FFY 2019 to FFY 2020, these decreases in discipline incidents resulted in fewer districts meeting the minimum n/cell size for "Number of LEAs in the State" and caused the percentage to increase drastically from the previous year.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Once the department compares the discrepancy rates of all LEAs, those identified with a significant discrepancy (have a rate ratio of 2.0 or greater AND have an "n" size of 5 or more SWDs suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days in a specific racial/ethnic group) are required to review their policies, procedures, and practices via a self-assessment. The purpose of the review is to determine if any policy, procedure, or practice is contributing to the identified significant discrepancy. The review includes LEA policies, education information system data entry verification, general procedures for disciplinary removals, analysis of suspension data by special education status or race/ ethnicity, IEP reviews, positive behavior supports and interventions implemented district and school wide, student specific behavior intervention considerations and implementation, and manifestation determination reviews. The LEA was required to provide a description of its LEA practices and attach supporting documents as evidence. Examples of items required included a description of the LEA plan for creating positive school climate, staff training, its process for preventing and/or reducing inappropriate behavior in schools, its process for determining when and how to develop individual behavior intervention plans, and LEA in-school and out-of-school suspension policies. Individual student file reviews also were conducted to track removal from classrooms, whether LEA policies were appropriately followed, whether manifestation determination reviews occurred if appropriate, and if required whether functional behavior assessments were completed.

The information provided by each LEA identified with a significant discrepancy was reviewed by the SEA. LEAs that did not have adequate policies, procedures, or practices in place were found to be non-compliant and were required to revise these policies, procedures, or practices to ensure the appropriate development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and adherence to procedural safeguards.

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

If YES, select one of the following:

The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

Due to staffing vacancies and transitions at the SEA, corrections of noncompliance were not verified. The SEA will ensure adequate corrections of noncompliance and report on revised policies, procedures, and practices in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

LEAs submitted revised policies, practices, and procedures, as well as evidence of training and communication of changes for SEA review and verification of implementation/revisions. Furthermore, the SEA reviewed updated discipline data in the fall of 2021 for the four LEAs with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 (based on discipline data from FFY 2018/2018-19 school year). Using FFY 2021 discipline data (i.e., data from the 2020-21 school year), approximately 10 discipline records of SWDs suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days were randomly pulled for each LEA. After reviewing these records and all relevant data available within the statewide IEP data management system (EasyIEP), SEA reviewers found all to be in compliance and LEAs correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

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

The SEA reviewed all individual cases of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 (based on discipline data from FFY 2018/2018-19 school year) and verified that all children who are still active and within the jurisdiction of the LEA are in compliance. In addition, the SEA examined records within the statewide IEP data management system (EasyIEP) with consideration given to whether compensatory services were needed as a result of noncompliance with Indicator 4B. Records were examined related to any subsequent manifestation determinations, discipline incidents, restraints, or isolations, as well as current IEP supports, functional behavior assessments (FBAs) completed, behavior intervention plan (BIPs) in place, and attendance at home school or alternate placement. The SEA determined that none of these SWDs were denied free and appropriate public education (FAPE), which did not result in a need for compensatory service.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2019 have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data, such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Please refer to the "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019" section in the Indicator Data description.

4B - OSEP Response

The State did not report on the result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b), i.e., the State did not report whether it revised (or required the affected districts to revise) the district's policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2020, based on FFY 2019 discipline data.

4B- Required Actions

The State reported that it conducted the review required in 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b), but did not specify that it reviewed policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with the IDEA for districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2020, based upon FFY 2019 discipline data. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report on the correction of this noncompliance by describing the review and, if appropriate, revision of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with the IDEA for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2020, based upon FFY 2019 discipline data, as required in 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b). Further, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must provide FFY 2021 data (using 2020-2021 discipline data) for this indicator.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2020 have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data, such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;

B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and

C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)]times 100.

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2020	Target >=	69.50%	71.50%	73.50%	70.00%	70.00%
A	72.64%	Data	70.46%	70.16%	69.69%	70.88%	71.91%
B	2020	Target <=	11.30%	11.20%	11.10%	10.85%	10.85%
B	11.25%	Data	11.11%	11.48%	11.49%	11.38%	11.27%
C	2020	Target <=	1.50%	1.40%	1.30%	1.77%	1.77%
C	1.37%	Data	1.78%	1.79%	1.81%	1.61%	1.49%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	72.64%	73.78%	74.92%	76.06%	77.20%	78.34%
Target B <=	11.25%	11.07%	10.89%	10.71%	10.53%	10.35%
Target C <=	1.37%	1.19%	1.01%	0.83%	0.55%	0.37%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education supervisors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education supervisor study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The

ARC Tennessee.

The department has made concerted efforts to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Further, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets." This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

In addition, the department has continued to engage and solicit feedback from stakeholders during implementation of the SSIP in three cohorts. Various stakeholders have received information on the work, including: special education supervisors, educators, administrators, service providers, advocacy groups, other SEA divisions, the Dyslexia Advisory Council, and the AC. Information has been shared publicly through a variety of modes. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. In addition, partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. For the newest cohort of districts (3.0), participating superintendents and special education supervisors were provided with district-specific data infographics summarizing the work and subsequent data from the first year of implementation during the 2019-20 school year. Statewide data was also communicated within the SEA, via social media, and on the project's website. Success of the SSIP is contingent upon not just the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. In addition, the department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees and district facilitators who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content. The Senior Director of Data Analysis for Special Populations and the Senior Director of Special Education Programming lead discussion and feedback of the SSIP implementation and activities as a regular item in the quarterly AC meetings. AC members and other stakeholders in attendance at these meetings provide feedback through participation in roundtable conversations. These are open meetings which are recorded and available on the department's website for public viewing. In January, June, and October of 2021, the Senior Director of Special Education Programming led these sessions with members of the AC to engage in meaningful conversations about the work completed thus far as well as the impending implementation slated for the 2021-22 to 2023-24 school years. AC members confirmed the need for this content, continued expansion into additional districts, and retraining of districts from previous cohorts due to staffing turnover and the effects of the pandemic on access to instruction. Additionally, AC members reiterated the need to continue cohorts until every district is included in this important work and proceed with trainings focused on developing quality IEPs, expressing their excitement about the addition related to math and writing intervention in the 2023-24 school year.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	116,789
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	84,836
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	13,133
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	698
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	194
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	704

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.
NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	84,836	116,789	71.91%	72.64%	72.64%	N/A	N/A
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	13,133	116,789	11.27%	11.25%	11.25%	N/A	N/A
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,596	116,789	1.49%	1.37%	1.37%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Tennessee has reset the baselines in FFY 2020 to account for the change to the age group in the data source used for this calculation, as children aged 5 and enrolled in kindergarten who are served under IDEA are now included in EDFacts file FS002 along with children aged 6 through 21 who are served under IDEA.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

> A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and

> B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

> C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

> A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

> B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

> C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (*e.g.*, 75-85%). Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	Target >=	30.00%	32.00%	34.00%	38.00%	42.00%
A	Data	24.09%	24.17%	24.27%	26.58%	34.04%
B	Target <=	34.00%	29.00%	24.00%	29.00%	28.00%
B	Data	35.71%	34.14%	33.73%	32.42%	31.80%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education supervisors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education supervisor study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The ARC Tennessee.

The department has made concerted efforts to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Further, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets. This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

In addition, the department has continued to engage and solicit feedback from stakeholders during implementation of the SSIP in three cohorts. Various stakeholders have received information on the work, including: special education supervisors, educators, administrators, service providers, advocacy groups, other SEA divisions, the Dyslexia Advisory Council, and the AC. Information has been shared publicly through a variety of modes. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. In addition, partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. For the newest cohort of districts (3.0), participating superintendents and special education supervisors were provided with district-specific data infographics summarizing the work and subsequent data from the first year of implementation during the 2019-20 school year. Statewide data was also communicated within the SEA, via social media, and on the project's website. Success of the SSIP is contingent upon not just the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. In addition, the department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees and district facilitators who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content. The Senior Director of Data Analysis for Special Populations and the Senior Director of Special Education Programming lead discussion and feedback of the SSIP implementation and activities as a regular item in the quarterly AC meetings. AC members and other stakeholders in attendance at these meetings provide feedback through participation in roundtable conversations. These are open meetings which are recorded and available on the department's website for public viewing. In January, June, and October of 2021, the Senior Director of Special Education Programming led these sessions with members of the AC to engage in meaningful conversations about the work completed thus far as well as the impending implementation slated for the 2021-22 to 2023-24 school years. AC members confirmed the need for this content, continued expansion into additional districts, and retraining of districts from previous cohorts due to staffing turnover and the effects of the pandemic on access to instruction. Additionally, AC members reiterated the need to continue cohorts until every district is included in this important work and proceed with trainings focused on developing quality IEPs, expressing their excitement about the addition related to math and writing intervention in the 2023-24 school year.

Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range is used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2020	32.39%
B	2020	39.53%
C	2020	0.48%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	32.39%	36.20%	40.01%	42.55%	43.82%	45.09%
Target B <=	39.53%	36.08%	32.63%	30.33%	29.18%	28.03%

Inclusive Targets (with Target Ranges) – 6C

FFY	2020 (low)	2020 (high)	2021 (low)	2021 (high)	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target C <=	0.00%	0.48%	0.00%	0.48%	0.00%	0.48%	0.00%	0.48%	0.00%	0.48%	0.00%	0.47%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Part B

Date:
07/07/2021

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	2,463	4,088	1,757	8,308
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	528	1,487	676	2,691
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	1,225	1,423	590	3,238
b2. Number of children attending separate school	14	17	15	46
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	11	19	10	40

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.
NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	2,691	8,308	34.04%	32.39%	32.39%	N/A	N/A
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	3,284	8,308	31.80%	39.53%	39.53%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target(low)	FFY 2020 Target(high)	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C. Home	40	8,308		0.00%	0.48%	0.48%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Tennessee has reset the baseline for 6A and 6B in FFY 2020 to account for the change to the age group in the data source used for this calculation, as only children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program are now included in EDFacts file FS089.

Tennessee is establishing a FFY 2020 baseline for the new subindicator 6C.

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for 6A and 6B and established the baseline for 6C, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts those baselines.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

   C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

   a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
   b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
   c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
   d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
   e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

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

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1	2009	Target >=	92.82%	92.88%	92.94%	93.00%	93.06%
A1	91.70%	Data	90.29%	89.09%	90.10%	89.23%	90.05%
A2	2009	Target >=	59.20%	59.80%	60.40%	60.00%	60.30%

A2	57.40%	Data	59.61%	58.07%	58.55%	57.50%	57.82%
B1	2009	Target >=	90.62%	90.68%	90.74%	89.50%	89.80%
B1	89.50%	Data	88.81%	88.75%	88.32%	89.47%	89.39%
B2	2009	Target >=	58.20%	58.80%	59.40%	57.00%	57.30%
B2	55.70%	Data	57.33%	56.24%	55.49%	54.75%	56.35%
C1	2009	Target >=	93.72%	93.70%	93.80%	93.90%	94.00%
C1	92.60%	Data	90.14%	91.14%	90.27%	90.14%	90.49%
C2	2009	Target >=	69.80%	70.20%	70.60%	69.00%	69.30%
C2	68.00%	Data	68.74%	69.40%	68.80%	66.23%	67.06%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	91.70%	91.70%	91.70%	91.98%	92.25%	92.53%
Target A2 >=	57.81%	58.22%	58.63%	59.04%	59.45%	59.86%
Target B1 >=	89.74%	89.98%	90.22%	90.46%	90.70%	90.94%
Target B2 >=	56.19%	56.68%	57.17%	57.66%	58.15%	58.64%
Target C1 >=	92.60%	92.60%	92.60%	92.60%	92.60%	92.81%
Target C2 >=	68.00%	68.67%	69.34%	70.01%	70.68%	71.35%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education supervisors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education supervisor study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The ARC Tennessee.

The department has made concerted efforts to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Further, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets." This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

In addition, the department has continued to engage and solicit feedback from stakeholders during implementation of the SSIP in three cohorts. Various stakeholders have received information on the work, including: special education supervisors, educators, administrators, service providers, advocacy groups, other SEA divisions, the Dyslexia Advisory Council, and the AC. Information has been shared publicly through a variety of modes. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. In addition, partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. For the newest cohort of districts (3.0), participating superintendents and special education supervisors were provided with district-specific data infographics summarizing the work and subsequent data from the first year of implementation during the 2019-20 school year. Statewide data was also communicated within the SEA, via social

media, and on the project's website. Success of the SSIP is contingent upon not just the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. In addition, the department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees and district facilitators who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content. The Senior Director of Data Analysis for Special Populations and the Senior Director of Special Education Programming lead discussion and feedback of the SSIP implementation and activities as a regular item in the quarterly AC meetings. AC members and other stakeholders in attendance at these meetings provide feedback through participation in roundtable conversations. These are open meetings which are recorded and available on the department's website for public viewing. In January, June, and October of 2021, the Senior Director of Special Education Programming led these sessions with members of the AC to engage in meaningful conversations about the work completed thus far as well as the impending implementation slated for the 2021-22 to 2023-24 school years. AC members confirmed the need for this content, continued expansion into additional districts, and retraining of districts from previous cohorts due to staffing turnover and the effects of the pandemic on access to instruction. Additionally, AC members reiterated the need to continue cohorts until every district is included in this important work and proceed with trainings focused on developing quality IEPs, expressing their excitement about the addition related to math and writing intervention in the 2023-24 school year.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

6,712

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	93	1.39%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	487	7.26%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,409	35.91%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,676	39.89%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,044	15.56%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*	5,085	5,665	90.05%	91.70%	89.76%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*	3,720	6,709	57.82%	57.81%	55.45%	Did not meet target	Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	120	1.79%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	543	8.09%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,444	36.43%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,625	39.13%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	976	14.55%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*	5,069	5,732	89.39%	89.74%	88.43%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*	3,601	6,708	56.35%	56.19%	53.68%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	80	1.19%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	465	6.94%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,839	27.43%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,868	42.78%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,452	21.66%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*	4,707	5,252	90.49%	92.60%	89.62%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*	4,320	6,704	67.06%	68.00%	64.44%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A2	Historically, Tennessee A2 data have been in line with the national average. The current data reflects a minimal drop. Training is regularly provided throughout the year to ensure data quality and some fluctuation is expected. As utilization of ECO ratings improves with training, there could be an impact on LEA data as they are perhaps more accurately reflecting the ECO ratings.
B2	Historically, Tennessee B2 data have been in line with the national average. The current data reflects a minimal drop. Training is regularly provided throughout the year to ensure data quality and some fluctuation is expected. As utilization of ECO ratings improves with training, there could be an impact on LEA data as they are perhaps more accurately reflecting the ECO ratings.

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
C2	Historically, Tennessee C2 data have been in line with the national average. The current data reflects a minimal drop. Training is regularly provided throughout the year to ensure data quality and some fluctuation is expected. As utilization of ECO ratings improves with training, there could be an impact on LEA data as they are perhaps more accurately reflecting the ECO ratings.

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

To gather the initial data informing the results of this indicator, LEAs use the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF) to address performance in each of the three outcomes areas (social-emotional skills, acquisition of knowledge and skills, and use of appropriate behaviors). This form is augmented and supplemented with the use of qualitative data, including information from families and IFSP/IEP team input and/or observations. Quantitative data is also collected to inform the data in this indicator, including data from one or more assessment tool(s) that are norm-referenced, curriculum-based, and criterion-referenced. The department provides support to LEAs regarding the use of these tools and appropriate data collection processes.

Once this information is complete and a rating is selected for one of the three areas assessed in this indicator, LEAs are responsible for inputting the ratings into the statewide IEP data management system (EasyIEP) so that the information can be pulled in various reports for analysis. It is from this data source that the ratings for students are gathered and processed for this indicator. The aggregate level data for all LEAs are input into an Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA)-developed tool that employs various logic checks to clean the data. Logic checks include ensuring that outcome data is listed for all three areas, that entrance and exit data are tracked, etc. The tool employs the ratings outlined in the COSF to determine growth.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

While there is no easy way to measure the degree of impact, COVID-19 may have influenced early childhood outcomes for a variety of reasons, including but not limited to: many districts offering virtual options rather than face to face instruction; periodic district, school, and classroom shutdowns; increased teacher absences and staffing shortages; and the adjustment to both teachers and children wearing masks from a language and social-emotional development standpoint.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Instructions

*Sampling **of parents from whom response is requested** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

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

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

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

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

8 - Indicator Data

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education supervisors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education supervisor study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The ARC Tennessee.

The department has made concerted efforts to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with

accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Further, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets. This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

In addition, the department has continued to engage and solicit feedback from stakeholders during implementation of the SSIP in three cohorts. Various stakeholders have received information on the work, including: special education supervisors, educators, administrators, service providers, advocacy groups, other SEA divisions, the Dyslexia Advisory Council, and the AC. Information has been shared publicly through a variety of modes. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. In addition, partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. For the newest cohort of districts (3.0), participating superintendents and special education supervisors were provided with district-specific data infographics summarizing the work and subsequent data from the first year of implementation during the 2019-20 school year. Statewide data was also communicated within the SEA, via social media, and on the project's website. Success of the SSIP is contingent upon not just the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. In addition, the department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees and district facilitators who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content. The Senior Director of Data Analysis for Special Populations and the Senior Director of Special Education Programming lead discussion and feedback of the SSIP implementation and activities as a regular item in the quarterly AC meetings. AC members and other stakeholders in attendance at these meetings provide feedback through participation in roundtable conversations. These are open meetings which are recorded and available on the department's website for public viewing. In January, June, and October of 2021, the Senior Director of Special Education Programming led these sessions with members of the AC to engage in meaningful conversations about the work completed thus far as well as the impending implementation slated for the 2021-22 to 2023-24 school years. AC members confirmed the need for this content, continued expansion into additional districts, and retraining of districts from previous cohorts due to staffing turnover and the effects of the pandemic on access to instruction. Additionally, AC members reiterated the need to continue cohorts until every district is included in this important work and proceed with trainings focused on developing quality IEPs, expressing their excitement about the addition related to math and writing intervention in the 2023-24 school year.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	77.40%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	93.25%	93.50%	93.75%	94.00%	94.25%
Data	91.00%	90.60%	89.48%	91.33%	77.40%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	83.35%	89.30%	90.04%	90.78%	91.52%	92.26%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
4,798	5,434	77.40%	83.35%	88.30%	Met target	No Slippage

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

The surveys disseminated for pre-K students are identical to those disseminated to school age students. As well, the surveys collected for pre-K students are analyzed and collated under the same methodology employed for school age students. Thus, the validity and reliability for those in pre-K is identical to those who are school age and allows for continuity across all grade bands to ensure all the information collected is valid, reliable, and cohesive. For this reporting period, survey data was disaggregated by grade level and it was found that surveys were disseminated to: 771 P3 (three year old students in pre-K) students with 174 responses from the family and 1,266 P4 (four year old students in pre-K) students with 318 responses from the family.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

28,676

Percentage of respondent parents

18.95%

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	5.25%	18.95%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

First, there will be continued efforts to more consistently notify and subsequently remind LEAs selected to disseminate the survey to continue eliciting responses from parents. This will come in the form of emails from the department's survey administration partner, East Tennessee State University (ETSU), to LEA staff directly. Second, participating LEAs have also been given suggestions to improve response rate, such as providing the survey at IEP meetings for students to ensure the parents are able to get the survey and respond while in the LEA. Finally, Third, the department has expanded number of languages in which the survey is available. Prior to FFY 2020, only English and Spanish languages were offered. Beginning in FFY 2020, Arabic, Amharic, and Burmese translations were available. The department will continue to work with districts to better understand their language needs and provide additional translations. Finally, the department is currently working with its family engagement partner, The ARC Tennessee, to consider other ways/methods to communicate with families regarding this survey and identify opportunities that may increase responses and participation.

In addition, the department has been collaborating with IDC to complete the Data Processes Toolkit for all APR Indicators. Part of this work includes the development of methods to increase representativeness among Indicator 8 survey respondents. The department will continue working with IDC to research best practices and implement targeted strategies aimed at increasing underrepresented populations and decreasing overrepresented populations.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

Chi-square tests confirmed that there was no statistically significant difference between the proportion of respondents and the proportion in the total population of students with disabilities for female students and students with intellectual disabilities. For all other student groups, the difference in representativeness was statistically significant. Please see the "analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services" section below for additional analyses related to representativeness.

Steps to reduce identified bias, increase representativeness, and promote responses from a broad cross section of families that received Part B services are outlined in both the "strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year" section above and the "strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative" section below.

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

During FFY 2020 school year, the Parent Survey was administered to all parents of SWDs ages 3 through 21 in 35 LEAs selected through the OSEP-approved sampling process. Tennessee's three largest LEAs participate in this survey each year with different schools, representative of the LEA as a whole, sampled every year. A total of 28,676 surveys were distributed to parents. There were 5,559 survey responses with usable data for a response rate of 19.39%. Note that this response rate is different from the one in the above data table (response rate calculated was 18.95%). This disparity is due to differences in responses to each question in the survey. Tennessee employs a 10-question survey, and while item one on the survey addresses parental involvement pertinent to this indicator, responses to this question are sometimes omitted by respondents. The data table above only captures the number of responses to this first question, divided by all the surveys disseminated to get the response rate of 18.95%; however, the response rate of 19.39% reflects the overall percentage of surveys received, including those with missing responses.

In terms of Indicator 8 results, item one on the survey asked parents about the LEA's facilitation of parent involvement. Of the 5,434 parents responding to item one, 88.30% (4,798 / 5,434) agreed that the LEAs facilitated their involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. The department's target of 83.35% was met.

The table below provides a summary of representativeness data on all FFY 2019 Parent Survey respondents. The calculation, from the National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO), compares the respondent pool of parents against the demographics of children receiving special education services across the state (i.e., the target group). The difference row compares the two proportions (target proportion against respondent proportion) by selected attributes including: child disability, child gender, and child minority race/ethnicity. Cells in the difference row that are greater than +/- 3%, indicate that the respondent group over or underrepresents the entire group of targeted respondents. For this Parent Survey, parents of students with specific learning disabilities and parents of nonwhite minority students were underrepresented in the respondent group (-4.33% and -8.93% respectively) and parents of students from all other (non-listed) disability groups were overrepresented by the respondents (4.45%).

_____SLD /__ED___ / ___ID__ / __AO__ / Female / Minority

Target Leaver Representation:__26.88% / 2.70% / 6.77% / 63.64% / 33.10% / 38.11%
Respondent Representation:___22.56% / 2.16% / 7.20% / 68.09% / 33.91% / 29.18%
Difference:_____-4.33% / -0.54% / 0.42% / 4.45% / -0.80% / -8.93%

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

The department will continue working in the 2021-22 school year to ensure that the population of parents surveyed is representative of the population of children receiving special education services in Tennessee. Efforts from the 2020-21 school year to remedy some of the noteworthy over/underrepresentation manifested in a large decrease in underrepresentation of responses from families of students with a specific learning disability (improvement of 4.65% in representativeness to only 4.33% underrepresented) and a small reduction in overrepresentation of responses from families of students with an intellectual disability (decrease of 1.87% in overrepresentation).

The department will focus its efforts to improve representativeness on increasing the overall participation rate and developing targeted strategies aimed at increasing underrepresented populations and decreasing overrepresented populations, as outlined in the "Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented" section above.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

As mentioned above, the metric used to determine representativeness, from the National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO), compares the respondent pool of youth against the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school (i.e., the target group). The difference row compares the two proportions (target proportion against respondent proportion) by selected attributes including: child disability, child gender, and child minority race/ethnicity. Cells in the difference row that are greater than +/- 3%, indicate that the respondent group over or underrepresents the entire group of targeted respondents.

Chi-square tests confirmed that there was no statistically significant difference between the proportion of respondents and the proportion in the total population of students with disabilities for female students and students with intellectual disabilities. For all other student groups, the difference in representativeness was statistically significant.

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

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

LEAs are sampled based on their locations in the state so that all regions are represented and it is guaranteed that every four years an LEA will complete the survey. This sampling is done via the National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO) Sampling Calculator on a four-year sampling cycle. For the three LEAs with 50,000 or more students enrolled, a sampling method is utilized so that the LEA is surveyed each year, but that different schools within the LEA are selected every four years (similar to the process used for sampling smaller LEAs). To sample these three large LEAs, percentages of high schools, middle schools, and elementary schools are determined for each LEA. Then the number of schools in each school level are divided by four (for the four year cycle). Each school is given a unique code to randomize them for selection to remove bias. Once randomized, the number of high schools, middle schools, and elementary schools to be surveyed each year are predicated on the previously determined percentages (or weights) of the aforementioned school types in the LEA.

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

The department will continue to use its previously approved Indicator 8 sampling plan for the FFY 2020 through FFY 2025 SPP/APRs. An overview of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates is provided above. The only change to the sampling plan will be the years for which it is used. Due to staffing turnover and changes to data storage systems, Tennessee was not able to locate its original, previously approved sampling plan.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2020 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

Please refer to the "State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services" and "describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics" sections in the Indicator Data description.

8 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State reported that sampling was used to collect data for this indicator and that the previously approved sampling plan had not changed. In order to report data for this indicator using sampling for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR, OSEP required the State to submit its sampling plan to and provide data consistent with the approved sampling plan. The State did not provide its sampling plan but reported, "Due to staffing turnover and changes to data storage systems, Tennessee was not able to locate its original, previously approved sampling plan."

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2021 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

With the FFY 2021 APR, the State must submit its sampling plan and provide data consistent with the approved sampling plan.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

4

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	142	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Disproportionate representation is defined as the "extent to which membership in a given group affects the probability of being placed in a specific education category" (Oswald, et al. 1999). It is predicated on the comparison of a subgroup, such as racial/ethnic subgroups, within an LEA to the entire LEA population as a whole. Should an LEA be identifying students for special education services at a greater percentage than the rest of the students in the school population as a whole, and this is supported in their LEA policies, practices, and procedures, then there is disproportionate representation in the form of overrepresentation.

To determine disproportionate representation, the department uses the Westat spreadsheet for calculating both Relative Risk Ratio (RRR) and Weighted Risk Ratio (WRR) based on LEA racial/ethnic data. For FFY 2019, the methodology listed below was used to calculate and examine data to measure disproportionate representation (particularly overrepresentation) in special education.

Calculation Criteria

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

a. Both a RRR and a WRR of 3.00 or greater. Note: both RRRs and WRRs were generated for all LEAs based on the number of students receiving special education and related services in each LEA within each of the seven racial/ethnic categories;
b. Racial/ethnic subgroup enrollment (target group denominator) meets a minimum "n" size of 50 students;
c. Count of students with disabilities meets a minimum of 45 students; and
d. Count of students with disabilities in a specific racial/ethnic group (target group numerator) meets a minimum cell size of 5 students.

Data Sources

The October 1, 2020 Membership data (from EDFacts file FS052) and December 1, 2020 IDEA Child Count data (from the statewide IEP data management system, which populates EDFacts file FS002) were used in the disproportionate representation calculations for each of Tennessee's 146 LEAs.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

One LEA met the criteria outlined above, which are used to calculate disproportionate representation, and was required to complete a self-assessment of their policies, practices, and procedures related to referral, evaluation, and identification. The SEA conducted a review of the self-assessment submitted by the LEA meeting the criteria for disproportionate representation and determined that the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices did not contribute to the disproportionate representation.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Tennessee has reset the baseline in FFY 2020 to account for the change to the age group in the data source used for this calculation, as children aged 5 and enrolled in kindergarten who are served under IDEA are now included in EDFacts file FS002 along with children aged 6 through 21 who are served under IDEA.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2020, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	5.76%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	2.76%	2.82%	5.07%	2.90%	4.26%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

7

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
28	8	139	4.26%	0%	5.76%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Disproportionate representation is defined as the "extent to which membership in a given group affects the probability of being placed in a specific education category" (Oswald, et al. 1999). It is predicated on the comparison of a subgroup, such as racial/ethnic subgroups, within an LEA to the entire LEA population as a whole. Should an LEA be identifying students for special education services at a greater percentage than the rest of the students in the school population as a whole, and this is supported in their LEA policies, practices, and procedures, then there is disproportionate representation in the form of overrepresentation.

To determine disproportionate representation, the department uses the Westat spreadsheet for calculating both Relative Risk Ratio (RRR) and Weighted Risk Ratio (WRR) based on LEA racial/ethnic data. For FFY 2020, the methodology listed below was used to calculate and examine data to measure disproportionate representation (particularly overrepresentation) in special education.

Calculation Criteria

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

a. Both a RRR and a WRR of 3.00 or greater. Note: both RRRs and WRRs were generated for all LEAs based on the number of students receiving special education and related services in each LEA within each of the seven racial/ethnic categories;
b. Racial/ethnic subgroup enrollment (target group denominator) meets a minimum "n" size of 50 students;
c. Count of students with disabilities in the specific disability category meets the minimum "n" size of 20 students; and,
d. Count of students with disabilities in a specific racial/ethnic group meets the minimum "n" size of 5 students

Data Sources

The October 1, 2020 Membership data (from EDFacts file FS052) and December 1, 2020 IDEA Child Count data (from the statewide IEP data management system, which populates EDFacts file FS002) were used in the disproportionate representation calculations for each of Tennessee's 146 LEAs.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

All LEAs meeting the criteria outlined above, which are used to calculate disproportionate representation, are required to complete a self-assessment of their policies, practices, and procedures related to referral, evaluation, and identification. The SEA conducted a review of all self-assessments submitted by LEAs meeting the criteria for disproportionate representation and determined that 8 LEA's policies, procedures, and practices contributed to the disproportionate representation.

LEAs that are identified as having inappropriate identification practices are required to undergo a site visit in which student records are pulled for review and interviews with key LEA staff take place. Follow-up strategies to address problematic identification practices are developed as a result of this site visit, and SEA staff maintain contact with identified LEAs throughout the school year to monitor progress and improvement.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Tennessee has reset the baseline in FFY 2020 to account for the change to the age group in the data source used for this calculation, as children aged 5 and enrolled in kindergarten who are served under IDEA are now included in EDFacts file FS002 along with children aged 6 through 21 who are served under IDEA.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Four of the six LEAs identified with disproportionate representation in FFY 2019 whose noncompliance is not yet verified as corrected were also identified with disproportionate representation again in FFY 2020. Two of the six were not identified with disproportionate representation; however, monitoring for individual cases of noncompliance did not occur. Therefore, these six districts will undergo a more strenuous internal review process of evaluation procedures and policies, including site visits, interviews, file reviews, action plans, and required trainings in order to verify and correct noncompliance.

The following actions will take place to ensure noncompliance is corrected. In addition to meetings with LEA administrative staff, schools will be visited within the LEA and staff and documents will be observed to see the policies, procedures, and practices in action. The director of school psychology services along with other SEA staff will pull a sampling of student eligibility documents and IEPs to assess how they were written and determine if the documents reflected inappropriate policies, procedures, and practices employed in the LEA. This review process will determine if there are persistent themes and concerns within the referral, evaluation, and eligibility processes and practices.

All information gleaned from these site visits will be provided to LEA staff via written communication after the site visits. The six LEAs will be required to develop action plans based on these site visits and periodically submit evidence of activities completed throughout the 2021-22 SY to address findings of potential contributing factors to disproportionate representation. Department staff will continuously provide technical assistance as necessary to the six LEAs, giving them priority at relevant trainings and offering professional development opportunities tailored to the LEAs. All LEAs will complete any required trainings within their respective action plan with their district staff to ensure knowledge and understanding of compliant policies, practices, and procedures.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the six districts identified in FFY 2019 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

Please refer to the "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019" section in the Indicator Data description.

10 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

10 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the 8 districts identified in FFY 2020 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Further, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the remaining 6 districts identified in FFY 2019 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification, are in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311. In demonstrating the correction of the noncompliance identified in FFY 2019, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the State verified that each district with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100%

compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

> a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
> b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
> Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.
>
> Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

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

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	89.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	95.16%	95.24%	94.28%	94.88%	90.88%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
26,289	24,597	90.88%	100%	93.56%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

1,692

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

In Tennessee, an LEA is considered to be compliant if the evaluation is completed within 60 calendar days from the date the LEA received written consent for an initial evaluation. TN uses a student's final eligibility determination, which is recorded in the statewide IEP data management system (EasyIEP), to mark the end of the evaluation process. Per OSEP's letter to Geary (https://www2.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/memosdcltrs/geary112012sandydisaster4q2012.pdf), and in response to the emergence of COVID-19 and the devastation caused by tornadoes in Middle Tennessee in early March 2020, the Tennessee State Board of Education (TNSBE) passed an emergency rule to establish a state defined evaluation timeline for the second half of the 2019-20 school year and the beginning of the 2020-21 school year (https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/stateboardofeducation/documents/2020-sbe-meetings/april-9%2c-2020-sbe-conference-call-meeting/4-9-20%20III%20A%203%200520-01-09-.24%20Special%20Education-Evaluations%20Clean%20Copy.pdf). This rule effectively extended the initial evaluation timelines of any students who received initial consent between January 3, 2020 (60 days prior to the March 3, 2020 date established in the rule) and the end date of any stay at home "order, declaration, or recommendation" in their LEA. These end dates varied among districts and ranged anywhere from May 1, 2020 to September 30, 2021. The Division of Special Populations released guidance detailing how new timeline lengths are calculated for students who received initial consent during the affected timeframe (https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/health-&-safety/Special%20Education%20Emergency%20Rules%204.16.20_FINAL.pdf). LEAs also had access to a department-developed timeline calculator (https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/health-&-safety/SBEEmergencyRule_COVID_EvalTimeline_Calculator_Final_Locked.xlsx) to help them understand which students had extended timelines and how long they had to complete evaluations under the TNSBE emergency rule. For the analysis of Indicator 11 data, the department collected LEA order start and end dates from each of its 146 LEAs and used that information to calculate extended timelines for each student affected by the TNSBE rule.

Of the 26,289 students for whom parent consent to evaluate was granted in FFY 2020, 1,692 students did not have their evaluations completed within the 60 calendar day or state-established timeline. These 1,692 students did not have an approved timeline extension request and the evaluation exceeded the timeline OR they did not complete any timeline extension request and the evaluation exceeded the timeline. The number of days beyond the timeline ranged from one to 462 days, with many evaluations still open because of the disruption caused by COVID-19.

Pursuant to §§300.301(d) and §§300.309(c), LEAs can request timeline extensions for three approved reasons, and this request is submitted through the statewide IEP data management system (EasyIEP). Department staff review and approve or deny these requests. If the requests are approved, these students are not considered out of compliance. However, in instances in which extension requests are denied, these students are considered out of compliance. The three approved timeline extension reasons are:

1. For specific learning disability (SLD) evaluations, there is written mutual agreement on an extended timeframe by the child's parents and a group of qualified professionals;
2. The parent repeatedly failed or refused to produce the child for the evaluation;
3. The child transferred from the district that obtained consent prior to a completed evaluation and the receiving district has made progress toward completing the evaluation.

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

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

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

The state used a 60 calendar day timeline for all evaluations except those that were affected by the state-defined initial evaluation timeline per the TNSBE emergency rule, which was passed in response to the emergence of COVID-19 and the devastation caused by tornadoes in Middle Tennessee in early March 2020 (https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/stateboardofeducation/documents/2020-sbe-meetings/april-9%2c-2020-sbe-conference-call-meeting/4-9-20%20III%20A%203%200520-01-09-.24%20Special%20Education-Evaluations%20Clean%20Copy.pdf). This rule effectively extended the initial evaluation timelines of any students who received initial consent between January 3, 2020 (60 days prior to the March 3, 2020 date established in the rule) and the end date of any stay at home "order, declaration, or recommendation" in their LEA. These end dates varied among districts and ranged anywhere from May 1, 2020 to September 30, 2021. The Division of Special Populations released guidance detailing how new timeline lengths are calculated for students who received initial consent (https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/health-&-safety/Special%20Education%20Emergency%20Rules%204.16.20_FINAL.pdf). A total of 576 students had their initial evaluation timeline extended as a result of the TNSBE emergency rule, with 543 of those cases being compliant with the new timeline.

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

The department collected data on initial consents for evaluations for all students with signed consent forms during FFY 2020 (July 1, 2020 – June 30, 2021). Data were collected though the statewide IEP data management system for all of Tennessee's 146 LEAs. FFY 2020 was the twelfth year these student-level data were collected through this data management system. The student-level data obtained through EasyIEP include:

• Student name and basic demographics
• LEA information
• Date of initial consent for eligibility determination
• Date of eligibility determination
• Eligibility determination (eligible or ineligible)
• Days from date of initial parent consent to date of eligibility determination
• LEA in which initial consent was signed

Where applicable, the following were also collected:

• Number of days over the 60 calendar day (or SBE emergency rule extended) timeline
• Reasons for the delay
• Whether timeline extension request and made and whether it was approved
• Eligible disability category
• Exit date and reason
• District where consent was received

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2,347	2,302		45

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Prong 2

For those LEAs with 1 or more of the 2,347 late student evaluations during FFY 2019, the department staff conducted data pulls of parental permissions signed in FFY 2019 to determine 100% compliance once the individual instances of previously identified noncompliance were corrected. To determine if these LEAs were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, the department looked at additional initial referrals from each of these LEAs. For LEAs with less than 500 initial referrals for evaluation in FFY 2019, the department required them to demonstrate 100% compliance for initial evaluations for a minimum of 30 consecutive days in FFY 2020. For LEAs with more than 500 initial referrals for evaluation in FFY 2019, the department required them to demonstrate 100% compliance for initial evaluation determinations for a minimum of 10 consecutive days in FFY 2020. After the department verified that the LEA was 100% compliant for at least a 30-day or 10-day time period and that all student-level noncompliance from FFY 2019 had been corrected (Prong 1), the finding was closed.

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

Prong 1

The statewide IEP data management system (EasyIEP) is used to collect the data necessary to determine timely evaluation. This system was also used to follow-up on all instances of FFY 2019 student-level noncompliance when the evaluation exceeded established timelines. The department initially provided LEAs with guidance around how to correct noncompliance for FFY 2019 students whose initial evaluation was late and still open. These LEAs were required to research individual students and update EasyIEP if the evaluation had been completed. In the case of students whose evaluations were still pending, LEAs were required to complete the evaluation as soon as possible. In 2,302 instances, the evaluation or correction of other issues (e.g., mistakenly entered consent form, mistyping of date, etc.) for children whose initial evaluation was not timely was completed within one year. As of January 28, 2022, there are 45 students whose evaluations are still open. The department is conducting an investigation to ensure that these instances of noncompliance are addressed promptly.

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

As mentioned in the Prong 1 description, the IDEA Data Manager is conducting an investigation that includes contacting LEA special education supervisors to ensure that individual instances of noncompliance from FFY 2019 (i.e., open and overdue evaluations) are addressed immediately.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2018	2	2	0

FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

For the LEAs with instances of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 that were not yet verified as corrected at the time of the FFY 2019 APR submission on February 1, 2021, the department staff conducted data pulls of parental permissions signed in FFY 2018 to determine 100% compliance once the individual instances of previously identified noncompliance were corrected. To determine if these LEAs were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, the department looked at additional initial referrals from each of these LEAs. For LEAs with less than 500 initial referrals for evaluation in

FFY 2018, the department required them to demonstrate 100% compliance for initial evaluations for a minimum of 30 consecutive days in FFY 2020. For LEAs with more than 500 initial referrals for evaluation in FFY 2018, the department required them to demonstrate 100% compliance for initial evaluation determinations for a minimum of 10 consecutive days in FFY 2020. After the department verified that the LEA was 100% compliant for at least a 30-day or 10-day time period and that all student-level noncompliance from FFY 2018 had been corrected (Prong 1), the finding was closed.

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

There were two instances of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 that were not yet verified as corrected at the time of the FFY 2019 APR submission on February 1, 2021. The department immediately contacted the LEAs responsible for the two children whose evaluations were still open and required them to promptly correct the noncompliance. The department verified these corrections using the statewide IEP data management system (EasyIEP) and provided guidance to the LEAs to support timely initial evaluations and prevent future noncompliance.

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the remaining two uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2018: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

Please refer to the "FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected" and "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019" sections in the Indicator Data description.

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the remaining 45 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 were corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

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

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

> a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
> b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
> c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
> d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
> e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
> f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

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

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

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

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	99.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.53%	99.06%	96.37%	96.88%	75.89%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	6,011
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	583

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,524
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	2,568
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	367
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,524	2,493	75.89%	100%	61.13%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

There were 969 records that were determined to be out of compliance. Out of those 969 records, 648 were clearly impacted by the COVID-19 disruption with either third birthdays or Transition Planning Conferences occurring during each LEA's stay at home "order, declaration, or recommendation." Most LEAs' stay at home orders began in March 2019, and ended between May 1, 2020, to September 30, 2021. During this time, the COVID-19 pandemic created substantial problems for LEAs and families being able to meet in person, which negatively affected the ability to complete the necessary components of the evaluation and determine eligibility/non-eligibility in a timely manner.

The remaining 321 records that were out of compliance occurred after LEAs' stay at home orders had concluded. Nevertheless, COVID-19 continued to have an impact throughout the 2020-21 school year, as LEAs dealt with staff shortages, staff and/or children isolated or quarantined, and an overall decreased capacity to meet the needs of students' transitioning from Part C to Part B. In addition, the overall "n" size (data point "a." above) increased by 745 children since FFY 2018, which means that certain LEAs had more Part C to Part B transition children to evaluate under the challenging conditions created by the COVID-19 pandemic.

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

969

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

There were 969 children who were served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination who did not have eligibility determined by their third birthdays, and if eligible, did not have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. Of the 969 children, 705 had documentation and/or eligibility information completed by January 30, 2022. With some eligibility determinations still outstanding, the range of days beyond the third birthday until eligibility was determined or an IEP was developed and implemented could not be calculated. Although all unacceptable, reasons provided for delays included: parent scheduling conflicts, inclement weather, late referrals from Part C, school system staff training issues related to early childhood transition policies and procedures, and the general disruption caused by COVID-19. The IDEA APR Support Team is actively supporting LEAs with uncorrected noncompliance to ensure that children who were served in Part C and referred to Part B have eligibility determined and if eligible, an IEP developed and implemented as soon as possible.

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

Data were pulled from the Part C state database, Tennessee's Early Intervention Data System (TEIDS), and the statewide IEP data management system (EasyIEP). These data were collected, merged, compared, and analyzed into a unified data table to determine if any children had an untimely IEP. Each LEA with records showing an untimely outcome was given the opportunity to verify and respond to the data matched at the individual record level.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
79	78	0	1

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Prong 2

Training and technical assistance on the policies and procedures for early childhood transition were provided as a presentation to each LEA with a finding of noncompliance. Regional IDEA 619 Consultants provided training and submitted verification of LEA personnel attending the presentation (i.e., participant sign-in sheets) to the IDEA Early Childhood Transition Director. In addition, a new Early Childhood Transition team was formed within the department which began providing districts with real-time technical assistance related to currently transitioning children.

The department also conducted a subsequent review of additional data to determine that all LEAs with noncompliance for FFY 2019 were subsequently correctly implementing 34 CFR 300.124(b). Additional data were pulled from the Part C TEIDS system and the Part B statewide IEP data management system and analyzed to see if identified LEAs showed any children who had untimely IEPs. Department staff found that 78 of the 79 LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. For the one remaining LEA still demonstrating continued noncompliance, additional training delivered by the department will be required of the LEA staff. The LEA will also be assisted in completing an Early Childhood Transition Plan, which will outline their procedures for early childhood transition to ensure future compliance. Further monitoring and oversight will continue.

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

Prong 1

The department verified that all 79 LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for all 610 children for whom implementation of the IEP was untimely. The data from the Part B EasyIEP system identified the date in which the IEP was developed or a non-eligibility determination was made. This information was reviewed and verified by the department's IDEA 619 coordinator and IDEA 619 consultants.

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

Please refer to the "FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected" section of the Indicator Data description.

12 - OSEP Response

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system.

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the remaining 1 uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 was corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and the LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

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

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

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

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	50.03%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	71.84%	72.52%	74.03%	65.12%	81.22%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
146	318	81.22%	100%	45.91%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The SEA completed an annual update of the IEP Monitoring Protocol in FFY 2020. This included an updated set of expectations for LEAs which provided clarification and specificity to LEAs concerning IEP indicator requirements. There was also ongoing work by the SEA to improve the algorithm and platform to ensure all applicable LEAs have transition documents monitored. Lastly, a new SEA team was trained and normed on expectations before being tasked with monitoring the IEP files. These updated expectations, changes to the algorithm, and a new monitoring team all may have contributed to the significant increase in noncompliance identified.

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

State monitoring

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

For FFY 2020, staff from the Division of Federal Programs and Oversight (FPO) completed the monitoring requirements of this indicator. Analyses of student documents/records were completed via an IEP Monitoring platform embedded in the statewide IEP data management system (EasyIEP), where individual student documents are randomly selected and reviewed for completion and accuracy. LEAs were required to complete a two-level review of students' documents and evaluate the compliance elements for Indicator 13. After the LEA case manager and LEA IDEA director completed the IEP Monitoring, staff from FPO completed two levels of secondary review. LEAs were subsequently notified and required to address areas identified with noncompliance within 20 business days. Staff from FPO verified that all instances of noncompliance were corrected by July 1, 2021.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	YES
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	NO

If no, please explain

Tennessee State Board of Education rule 0520-01-09-.12 (https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/stateboardofeducation/documents/meetingfiles2/3-16-17_IV_A_Special_Education_Programs_and_Services_Rule_0520_01_09_11_Clean_Copy.pdf) requires that prior to 9th grade or age 14, the Individualized Education Program (IEP) for students with disabilities must include information on an initial four-year plan of study and identify possible transition service needs. However, not all components required for Indicator 13 must be addressed at that time. Therefore, the data used for Indicator 13 is collected only for students age 16 or above who are required to have all components of Indicator 13 completed.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
74	74	0	0

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Prong 2

All LEAs identified as noncompliant on Indicator 13 in FFY 2019 were required to hold a training regarding the corrective actions to retrain special education teams responsible for the completion of IEP transition plans. These LEAs were monitored again in FFY 2020 to confirm the correct implementation of regulatory requirements, and any further noncompliance was addressed through additional corrective actions.

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

Prong 1

The 74 individual cases of noncompliance outlined for Indicator 13 in FFY 2019 were corrected during FFY 2019 (2019-20 school year). Corrective actions were developed for each individual instance of noncompliance, and LEA-level staff members were required to provide evidence of corrected, compliant records within 20 business days. The submitted corrections were reviewed by SEA staff members to ensure that each individual case was compliant by the end of FFY 2019 (July 1, 2020).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

Please refer to the "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019" section in the Indicator Data description.

13 - OSEP Response

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system.

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 were corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

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

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. *Definitions*

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under "competitive employment":

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

II. *Data Reporting*

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of "leavers" who are:

> 1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
> 2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
> 3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
> 4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

"Leavers" should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, "leavers" who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, "leavers" who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

III. *Reporting on the Measures/Indicators*
Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2009	Target >=	24.00%	24.25%	24.50%	26.00%	26.50%
A	22.00%	Data	33.93%	21.17%	26.11%	21.99%	25.75%
B	2009	Target >=	59.50%	60.00%	60.50%	61.00%	62.00%
B	57.00%	Data	64.43%	54.60%	61.08%	33.30%	62.55%
C	2009	Target >=	69.50%	70.25%	71.00%	71.00%	72.50%
C	65.00%	Data	73.32%	64.62%	71.13%	74.63%	74.25%

FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	26.34%	26.93%	27.52%	28.11%	28.70%	29.29%
Target B >=	63.12%	63.69%	64.26%	64.83%	65.40%	65.97%
Target C >=	74.78%	75.31%	75.84%	76.37%	76.90%	77.43%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education supervisors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education supervisor study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The ARC Tennessee.

The department has made concerted efforts to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Further, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets." This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

In addition, the department has continued to engage and solicit feedback from stakeholders during implementation of the SSIP in three cohorts. Various stakeholders have received information on the work, including: special education supervisors, educators, administrators, service providers, advocacy groups, other SEA divisions, the Dyslexia Advisory Council, and the AC. Information has been shared publicly through a variety of modes. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. In addition, partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. For the newest cohort of districts (3.0), participating superintendents and special education supervisors were provided with district-specific data infographics summarizing the work and subsequent data from the first year of implementation during the 2019-20 school year. Statewide data was also communicated within the SEA, via social media, and on the project's website. Success of the SSIP is contingent upon not just the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. In addition, the department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees and district facilitators who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content. The Senior Director of Data Analysis for Special Populations and the Senior Director of Special Education Programming lead discussion and feedback of the SSIP implementation and activities as a regular item in the quarterly AC meetings. AC members and other stakeholders in attendance at these meetings provide feedback through participation in roundtable conversations. These are open meetings which are recorded and available on the department's website for public viewing. In January, June, and October of 2021, the Senior Director of Special Education Programming led these sessions with members of the AC to engage in meaningful conversations about the work completed thus far as well as the impending implementation slated for the 2021-22 to 2023-24 school years. AC members confirmed the need for this content, continued expansion into additional districts, and retraining of districts from previous cohorts due to staffing turnover and the effects of the pandemic on access to instruction. Additionally, AC members reiterated the need to continue cohorts until every district is included in this important work and proceed with trainings focused on developing quality IEPs, expressing their excitement about the addition related to math and writing intervention in the 2023-24 school year.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	1,977
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	1,409
Response Rate	71.27%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	176
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	68
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	27
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	667

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	176	1,409	25.75%	26.34%	12.49%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	244	1,409	62.55%	63.12%	17.32%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	938	1,409	74.25%	74.78%	66.57%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Given the sampling methodology outlined below for this indicator, in which LEAs must conduct student surveys on a four-year cycle, it is difficult to do a true comparison of data from year-to-year. While the department holds the same high standards for all LEAs with regard to this post-school outcomes data, the data from the FFY 2020 APR are not completely comparable to the FFY 2019 data, given that the LEAs and schools are different between the two years. In light of this, a more comparable data source would be the data reported from the FFY 2016 APR, which had the same LEAs and schools included as in the FFY 2020 reporting period. When comparing the FFY 2016 data to the FFY 2020 data, there was a less drastic decrease (from 21.17% to 12.49% instead of 25.75% to 12.49%) in students reporting that they were enrolled in higher education within one year of exiting high school. Further, the response rate for Indicator 14 increased by roughly 13 percent from FFY 2019 to FFY 2020, resulting in more valid data. Although the data collected in FFY 2020 were more representative of the total exiting population, the percentage of students enrolled in higher education within one year of exiting high school decreased.
B	As mentioned above, LEAs must conduct student surveys on a four-year cycle, it is difficult to do a true comparison of data from year-to-year. While the department holds the same high standards for all LEAs with regard to this post-school outcomes data, the data from the FFY 2020 APR are not completely comparable to the FFY 2019 data, given that the LEAs and schools are different between the two years. In light of this, a more comparable data source would be the data reported from the FFY 2016 APR, which had the same LEAs and schools included as in the FFY 2020 reporting period. When comparing the FFY 2016 data to the FFY 2020 data, there was a less drastic decrease (from 54.60% to 17.32% instead of 62.55% to 17.32%) in students reporting that they were enrolled in higher education or were competitively employed within one year of exiting high school. Further, the response rate for Indicator 14 increased by roughly 13 percent from FFY 2019 to FFY 2020, resulting in more valid data. Although the data collected in FFY 2020 were more representative of the total exiting population, the percentage of students enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of exiting high school decreased.
C	As mentioned above, LEAs must conduct student surveys on a four-year cycle, it is difficult to do a true comparison of data from year-to-year. While the department holds the same high standards for all LEAs with regard to this post-school outcomes data, the data from the FFY 2020 APR are not completely comparable to the FFY 2019 data, given that the LEAs and schools are different between the two years. In light of this, a more comparable data source would be the data reported from the FFY 2016 APR, which had the same LEAs and schools included as in the FFY 2020 reporting period. When comparing the FFY 2016 data to the FFY 2020 data, there was actually a slight increase (from 64.62% to 66.57% instead of 74.25% to 17.32%) in students reporting that they were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment. Further, the response rate for Indicator 14 increased by roughly 13 percent from FFY 2019 to FFY 2020, resulting in more valid data. Although the data collected in FFY 2020 were more representative of the total exiting population, the percentage of students enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of high school decreased.

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	58.71%	71.27%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

While most of the demographics of the survey respondents were representative of the overall cohort of students pulled in this sampling, there were two groups - students of minority racial/ethnic groups (i.e., nonwhite students) and dropouts - that were not completely representative. The lack of representativeness in the responses can be contributed to numerous factors, one of the most notable being not having the most accurate and current contact information for students/families. Absent current contact information, LEAs are unable to reach exited students. The department has continued to encourage LEAs to update all contact information for students whenever received, even if they are exiting the LEA at some point in the duration of the school year. Contact information for both students and families can be captured in LEA student information systems. To streamline the availability of this data for special educators, the department transfers student and family contact information from student information systems into the statewide IEP data management system (EasyIEP) nightly. Once in the system, users can augment, delete, add, and update the contact information as appropriate, and these data will remain linked to the appropriate student record. Continued housing of the contact information in a central location that special education staff can access will ideally help keep contact information current. The department provides this service of importing contact information free of charge to LEAs and makes them aware of this process/service multiple times through written and verbal communication/trainings.

The work done by the department in recent years to have contact information readily available in the statewide IEP data management system (EasyIEP), as well as the diligent efforts of the department to send updates, reminders, and suggested contact methods to LEAs required to participate in this indicator's survey, has and will continue to support higher response rates for this indicator. Improving the response rate for the indicator is yet another way to improve the representativeness of the respondents. After a slight dropoff from FFY 2017 to FFY 2018, the response rate for FFY 2019 (58.71%) returned to the level close to what was captured in FFY 2017. In FFY 2020, the response rate increased significantly from FFY 2019 (58.71 to 71.27%). While the department is pleased with this progress, it will continue to focus on increasing this number. The department anticipates that as the response rate climbs, gaps in representation will narrow.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Chi-square tests confirmed that there was no statistically significant difference between the proportion of respondents and the proportion in the target exiting population of students with disabilities for female students and students in each disability category. For minority and dropout students, the difference in representativeness was statistically significant. Please see the "analyses of the extent to which response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school" section below for additional analyses related to representativeness.

Steps to reduce identified bias, increase representativeness, and promote responses from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school are outlined in both the "strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year" section above and the "strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative" section below.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

The table below provides a summary of representativeness data on all FFY 2020 post-school survey respondents. The calculation, from the National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO), compares the respondent pool of students against the targeted group of students. This is done to determine whether the respondents represent the entire group of exited students that could have responded to the survey. The NPSO calculation compares two proportions (target proportion against respondent proportion) by selected attributes including: child disability, child gender, child minority race/ethnicity, English learner status, and whether the student was a dropout. Differences that are greater than +/- 3% indicate that the respondent group over or underrepresents the entire group of targeted respondents. For this post-school outcomes survey, the demographics were mostly representative; however, nonwhite minority students and students who dropped out were both slightly underrepresented in the respondent group (-4.43% and –3.81% respectively).

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

Target Leaver Representation: 44.66% / 4.40% / 13.45% / 37.48% / 35.61% / 38.85% / 0.00% / 9.21%

Respondent Representation:__44.85% / 3.48% / 14.83% / 36.83% / 36.34% / 34.42% / 0.00% / 5.39%

Difference:_____0.19% / -0.92% / 1.38% / -0.65% / 0.73% / -4.43% / 0.00% / -3.81%

The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

The department will continue working in the 2021-22 school year to ensure that the population of youth surveyed is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. Efforts from the 2020-21 school year to remedy some of the noteworthy over/underrepresentation manifested in a slight decrease in underrepresentation of responses from nonwhite minority students (improvement of 4.62% underrepresented to only 4.43% underrepresented). However, there was a slight increase in underrepresentation of responses from students who dropped out (2.81% underrepresented to 3.81% underrepresented).

The department will focus its efforts to improve representativeness on increasing the overall participation rate and developing targeted strategies aimed

at increasing underrepresented populations and decreasing overrepresented populations, as outlined in the "Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented" section above.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

As mentioned above, the metric used to determine representativeness, from the National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO), compares the respondent pool of youth against the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school (i.e., the target group). The difference row compares the two proportions (target proportion against respondent proportion) by selected attributes including: child disability, child gender, child minority race/ethnicity, English learner status, and whether the student was a dropout. Cells in the difference row that are greater than +/- 3%, indicate that the respondent group over or underrepresents the entire group of targeted respondents.

Chi-square tests confirmed that there was no statistically significant difference between the proportion of respondents and the proportion in the target exiting population of students with disabilities for female students and students in each disability category. For minority and dropout students, the difference in representativeness was statistically significant.

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

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

The LEAs are sampled based on their locations in the state so that all regions are represented and it is ensured that every four years an LEA will complete the survey. This sampling is done via the National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO) Sampling Calculator on a four-year sampling cycle. To ensure there is no potential bias or misrepresentation that can sometimes arise from student sampling, all students with disabilities within each selected LEA who exited school by (a) graduating with a regular diploma, (b) graduating with a special education diploma/certificate, (c) aging out of high school, or (d) dropping out are surveyed. For the three LEAs with 50,000 or more students enrolled, a sampling method is utilized so that the LEA is surveyed each year, but that different schools within the LEA are selected every four years (similar to the process used for sampling smaller LEAs). To sample these three large LEAs, percentages of high schools and middle schools are determined for each LEA. Then the number of schools in each school type category is divided by four (for the four-year cycle). Each school is given a unique code to randomize them for selection to remove bias. Once randomized, the number of high schools and middle schools to be surveyed each year are predicated on the previously determined percentages (or weights) of the aforementioned school types in the district.

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

The department contracts with East Tennessee State University (ETSU) to disseminate, collect, and analyze survey results. To complete the survey, LEA staff contact students who exited by telephone, in-person visits, mail, email, or virtual communication (e.g., FaceTime, Zoom). The LEA staff use an online secure website to enter the data collected through the surveys. The web survey data are housed at ETSU and data are automatically compiled for analysis and reporting by ETSU and provided to the department.

The department will continue to use its previously approved Indicator 14 sampling plan for the FFY 2020 through FFY 2025 SPP/APRs. An overview of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates is provided above. The only change to the sampling plan will be the years for which it is used. Due to staffing turnover and changes to data storage systems, Tennessee was not able to locate its original, previously approved sampling plan.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2020 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

Please refer to the "State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school" and "describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics" sections in the Indicator Data description.

14 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State reported that sampling was used to collect data for this indicator and that the previously approved sampling plan had not changed. In order to report data for this indicator using sampling for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR, OSEP required the State to submit its sampling plan to and provide data

consistent with the approved sampling plan. The State did not provide its sampling plan but reported, "Due to staffing turnover and changes to data storage systems, Tennessee was not able to locate its original, previously approved sampling plan."

14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2021 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

With the FFY 2021 APR, the State must submit its sampling plan and provide data consistent with the approved sampling plan.

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	18
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	15

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education supervisors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education supervisor study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The ARC Tennessee.

The department has made concerted efforts to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Further, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets." This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the

"Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

In addition, the department has continued to engage and solicit feedback from stakeholders during implementation of the SSIP in three cohorts. Various stakeholders have received information on the work, including: special education supervisors, educators, administrators, service providers, advocacy groups, other SEA divisions, the Dyslexia Advisory Council, and the AC. Information has been shared publicly through a variety of modes. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. In addition, partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. For the newest cohort of districts (3.0), participating superintendents and special education supervisors were provided with district-specific data infographics summarizing the work and subsequent data from the first year of implementation during the 2019-20 school year. Statewide data was also communicated within the SEA, via social media, and on the project's website. Success of the SSIP is contingent upon not just the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. In addition, the department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees and district facilitators who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content. The Senior Director of Data Analysis for Special Populations and the Senior Director of Special Education Programming lead discussion and feedback of the SSIP implementation and activities as a regular item in the quarterly AC meetings. AC members and other stakeholders in attendance at these meetings provide feedback through participation in roundtable conversations. These are open meetings which are recorded and available on the department's website for public viewing. In January, June, and October of 2021, the Senior Director of Special Education Programming led these sessions with members of the AC to engage in meaningful conversations about the work completed thus far as well as the impending implementation slated for the 2021-22 to 2023-24 school years. AC members confirmed the need for this content, continued expansion into additional districts, and retraining of districts from previous cohorts due to staffing turnover and the effects of the pandemic on access to instruction. Additionally, AC members reiterated the need to continue cohorts until every district is included in this important work and proceed with trainings focused on developing quality IEPs, expressing their excitement about the addition related to math and writing intervention in the 2023-24 school year.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	50.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	11.00%	12.00%	13.00%	14.00%	15.00%
Data	65.12%	69.23%	66.67%	47.27%	65.71%

Targets

FFY	2020 (low)	2020 (high)	2021 (low)	2021 (high)	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	60.00%	70.00%	60.00%	70.00%	60.00%	70.00%	60.00%	70.00%	60.00%	70.00%	60.00%	70.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target (low)	FFY 2020 Target (high)	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
15	18	65.71%	60.00%	70.00%	83.33%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1 Mediations held	17
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	7
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education supervisors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education supervisor study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The ARC Tennessee.

The department has made concerted efforts to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Further, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to

reach the proposed targets. This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

In addition, the department has continued to engage and solicit feedback from stakeholders during implementation of the SSIP in three cohorts. Various stakeholders have received information on the work, including: special education supervisors, educators, administrators, service providers, advocacy groups, other SEA divisions, the Dyslexia Advisory Council, and the AC. Information has been shared publicly through a variety of modes. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. In addition, partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. For the newest cohort of districts (3.0), participating superintendents and special education supervisors were provided with district-specific data infographics summarizing the work and subsequent data from the first year of implementation during the 2019-20 school year. Statewide data was also communicated within the SEA, via social media, and on the project's website. Success of the SSIP is contingent upon not just the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. In addition, the department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees and district facilitators who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content. The Senior Director of Data Analysis for Special Populations and the Senior Director of Special Education Programming lead discussion and feedback of the SSIP implementation and activities as a regular item in the quarterly AC meetings. AC members and other stakeholders in attendance at these meetings provide feedback through participation in roundtable conversations. These are open meetings which are recorded and available on the department's website for public viewing. In January, June, and October of 2021, the Senior Director of Special Education Programming led these sessions with members of the AC to engage in meaningful conversations about the work completed thus far as well as the impending implementation slated for the 2021-22 to 2023-24 school years. AC members confirmed the need for this content, continued expansion into additional districts, and retraining of districts from previous cohorts due to staffing turnover and the effects of the pandemic on access to instruction. Additionally, AC members reiterated the need to continue cohorts until every district is included in this important work and proceed with trainings focused on developing quality IEPs, expressing their excitement about the addition related to math and writing intervention in the 2023-24 school year.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	56.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	72.00%	73.00%	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%
Data	77.27%	31.25%	53.85%	70.59%	66.67%

Targets

FFY	2020 (low)	2020 (high)	2021 (low)	2021 (high)	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	65.00%	75.00%	65.00%	75.00%	65.00%	75.00%	65.00%	75.00%	65.00%	75.00%	65.00%	75.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target (low)	FFY 2020 Target (high)	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
7	2	17	66.67%	65.00%	75.00%	52.94%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Tennessee has seen a 30 to 45 percent decrease in all dispute resolution areas (written signed complaints, mediation requests, and due process complaints) between FFY 2019 and FFY 2020. These lower overall numbers may have led to increased variation in the rates related to these processes, in particular the percentage of mediation agreements. One consideration for the decrease in the number of mediations held may be related to the requirement to request mediations via fax machine. This technological limitation may have made it more difficult for families to submit their requests. The department has already made changes to this process, as families can now submit their completed documentation via email. The department is also working to expand its awareness and guidance around dispute resolution with the creation of a comprehensive "Dispute Resolution Manual" that will accompany the existing "Quick Guide to Special Education Dispute Resolution Processes in Tennessee."

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

<u>Baseline Data</u>*:* The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

<u>Targets</u>*:* In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

<u>Updated Data:</u> In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:
- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:
- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:
- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B.   Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

In Phase I, Tennessee identified a SiMR of increasing by one percent annually the percent of students with a specific learning disability (SLD) in grades 3-8 scoring at or above Basic (since renamed "Approaching") on the statewide English/language arts (ELA) assessment. Evaluation activities were developed by the department to track progress toward and achievement of this ambitious but achievable goal.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (*e.g.*, a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

Tennessee uses a cohort model, calculating the SiMR for the group of districts participating in each iteration of the department's State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG). The newest cohort, SSIP 3.0 districts, began in July 2020. For this reason, Tennessee has reset its baseline in FFY 2020 to account for the change to the group of districts included in the SiMR calculation. Further, Tennessee selected FFY 2018 as its SiMR baseline year, as this is last year of assessment data available before SSIP 3.0 districts started participating in the SPDG.

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

Tennessee's detailed theory of action can be found on page 38 of the SSIP Phase III-4 report: https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/special-education/sped_ssip_phase_iii4_201920.pdf. The broad theory of action can be found on page 7 of the same document.

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.

ACCESS to High Quality Core Instruction for All Students was provided to 45 K-12 SSIP school district facilitation teams. Every facilitator agreed or strongly agreed that the training helped them better understand that "literacy has six parts, with three inputs (viewing, listening, reading), and three outputs (showing, speaking, writing)", "learning requires grouping, ordering, connecting, and personal reflection", and "environment is the essence of classrooms that are built for all students."

Facilitators then redelivered the content to their districts throughout the Fall of 2021 through a series of a fall professional development in two full-day trainings and two one-hour fall Communities of Practice (COPs). 93% of participants agreed or strongly agreed with the three primary knowledge gain survey items; with "I understand better that language, both verbal and nonverbal, are powerful tools for student learning" having the highest overall positive sentiment. 94% of participants agreed or strongly agreed with the three primary ability gain survey items; with "My ability to create a classroom climate where language, environment, and instruction empowers students and shows them their value has increased" having the highest overall positive sentiment.

The COPs have been set up to offer fall redelivery participants with the opportunity to apply previously trained content, dig deeper into these concepts, and create collaborative discussion tl strengthen implementation at the school and classroom level. Overall educators have seen great benefit from COPs, agreeing or strongly agreeing that facilitators were knowledgeable and helpful (94%) and that the COP(s) provided them with the opportunity to apply the fall training concepts (93%). More than 92% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that "The CoP(s) improved my ability to utilize my new learning in my role" and "My teaching practices are improving based on my learning during the Fall training and/or Fall CoP(s)".

A core expectation of each participating district was to have approximately half of their teachers who received the fall trainings observed to ascertain that the content and strategies they were trained in are being used with fidelity in their classrooms. Through January 19, 2022, 938 participants from 39 districts have recorded pre-observations. The observations gathered this fall are baseline and reflect teaching between one and five months after the district's fall professional development day. The majority of classrooms have almost installed the Environment and Culture and Collaboration domains, while all of the other domains are in the installing phase at baseline.

The Access for All project has eight Regional Access Coaches under its employ who work with teachers through cognitive coaching cycles; teachers from preschool to grade 12 are eligible for coaching. From August 1, 2021 through January 19, 2022, 278 coaching sessions have occurred, more than with K-12 teachers. A coach may see multiple teachers within a single school or may visit teachers in multiple schools during a coaching day. 92% of coachees felt that the coaching conversation supported their thought process to plan ahead or reflect. The post-coaching participant survey included a space for optional feedback. The responses were overwhelmingly positive and included terms of gratitude, validation, and cooperative activity. In addition to the K-12 SSIP work, the Early Childhood 3.0 cohort targets the need for appropriately less restrictive placements for preschool-age students, as we know that this trajectory begins in preschool and impacts student access to grade level standards and, ultimately, academic proficiency.

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	31.47%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>=	33.47%	38.24%	39.24%	40.24%	41.24%	42.24%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of students with a specific learning disability (SLD) in grades 3-8 in SSIP 3.0 districts scoring at or above Approaching on the statewide English language arts (ELA) assessment	Number of students with a specific learning disability (SLD) in grades 3-8 in SSIP 3.0 districts who received a valid score on the statewide English language arts (ELA) assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
674	1,810		33.47%	37.24%	Met target	N/A

Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.

The student level statewide assessment file used to populate EDFacts files FS185 and FS188 is the source of TNReady English Language Arts performance levels for students in grades 3-8. This file is merged with the student level End-of-Year Frequency file retrieved from the EasyIEP data system annually on June 30 to identify all students with SLD served by one of the SSIP 3.0 districts at any point during the relevant school year.

The instructional environment data comes from the federal Table 1 and 3 Report formatted to populate EDFacts FS002. It is pulled from the EasyIEP data system with a census date of May 1 in the relevant year.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

The 2018-19 assessment results, compiled in the fall of 2019-20, were the baseline SiMR data for the SSIP 3.0 districts. While state testing was suspended for the 2019-20 school year due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the department evaluated the assessment data for the 3.0 districts again in the 2020-21 school year, compiled in the fall of 2021-22. In assessments conducted in the 2018-19 school year, 31.47 percent of students with an SLD in grades 3-8 scored at or above Approaching on the statewide ELA assessment with a participation rate of 99.4 percent. For the 2020-21 school year, 37.24 percent of students with an SLD in grades 3-8 scored at or above Approaching on the statewide ELA assessment with a participation rate of 96.18 percent. This was an increase of 5.77 percent.

Collection of baseline data regarding the percent of students with an SLD who have access to core instruction for 80 percent or more of the day for SSIP 3.0 districts came from a census report pulled on May 1, 2019. As a baseline for this measure, 73.95 percent of the students with an SLD were in the general education setting 80 percent or more of the day. A comparison pull was completed on May 1, 2021 to assess change from the baseline data pull to the spring after trainings on access were completed. This data pull indicated that 84.12 percent of students with an SLD were served in the general education setting 80 percent or more of the day, an increase of 10.17 percent.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data *(i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey)* that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

YES

Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

The department's State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) concluded it's no-cost extension during the current SSIP phase. The work continues through the department's full funding commitment, though the work is being rebranded as the Access For All initiative. Cohort 3 has drawn on the learnings of the SPDG and has become a four-year commitment (increased from the previous two-year commitment). Participants will focus on access to high-quality tier 1 instruction for all students, intensive reading intervention, and intensive math and writing intervention. It was important to increase the number of years that a district/school commits to the work, allowing more time to work with staff, allowing for gradual release of support duties to internal district personnel. The Communities of Practice approach has continued to increase application/practice/processing of new information and strategies. A commitment to measuring classroom-level implementation (teacher behavioral change) continues, as each district has committed to observe at least 50% of their trained teachers in a pre- and post-observation each year to analyze growth throughout the training process. The evaluation practices from the SPDG also remain in place.

Data were collected throughout the time period of the Spring of the 2020-21 and Fall of the 2021-22 school years through a series of surveys, classroom fidelity observations, coaching records, and a baseline Individualized Education Program (IEP) file review. This data collection was focused specifically on strategies one, two, and three.

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.

In January 2021, the Tennessee General Assembly passed the Accountability Hold Harmless Law (SB7001/HB7003) in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, which allowed districts certain flexibilities regarding school and district accountability if they administered assessments to at least 80% of students: https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/2020-21-leg-session/Accountability%20District%20&%20School%20Board%20Summary%20of%20Legislation%20-%20508%20(1).pdf. This action, which modified expectations and set a lower target for districts, may have affected the participation rate in some districts. In addition, the disruption caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, including but not limited to short-term school closures, shifts to virtual instruction, and student and staff absences due to mandatory isolation and quarantine periods may have contributed to slightly lower overall participation.

In order to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection/analysis, the department compared the participation rates from the baseline year in FFY 2018 (pre-COVID) to the participation rates in FFY 2020 (COVID-19) to ensure the two groups had similar rates and confirm the general validity of the data.

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

Tennessee's evaluation plan can be found on pages 62 to 108 of the SSIP Phase II report: https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/special-education/sped_ssip_phase_ii.pdf. Although some information such as dates and staffing may have changed, the core components of the plan (including the evaluation questions) remain intact.

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

Infrastructure Changes

The department has continued the installation and implementation efforts of several large-scale infrastructure changes previously undertaken to support the State's strategic plan, Best for All (https://bestforall.tnedu.gov/).

June 2021 --The 50 districts previously served in cohorts 1.0 and 2.0 of the SSIP continue to support their previous implementing schools and many have continued to scale-up the trainings with additional buildings/grade levels. Some districts applied for and received a sustainability grant to fund their expansion efforts, and others needing more intense sustainability supports (often due to high levels of turnover in leadership), were chosen to reengage by participating in tandem during Cohort 3's initial training through No-Cost Extension dollars. These 17 reengaging districts voluntarily follow the same evaluation plan.

Fall 2021 -- The SSIP Evaluators in conjunction with the Access For All higher education partner (The University of Tennessee, UT CLEE) expanded on the initiative's data collection monitoring plan and redesigned the data dashboard infrastructure available to all stakeholders. Survey demographic items have been added to increase the filtering ability with the dashboards according to years of experience, grade level, level of efficacy, etc. Data measures are now uploaded daily and are shared throughout the data communication systems (these were previously updated weekly or monthly). The UT CLEE partners and the regional district support personnel (CORE interventionists) review participation rate metrics weekly to ensure districts meet their implementation timelines. Initiative leaders, including key stakeholders, Regional Access Coached (RACs), CORE interventionists, district facilitators, and district leaders, now have their own unique webpage to access all data dashboards. These newly redesigned dashboards offer the ability to filter through a greater number of instrument items and participant comments within 24-hours of an activity.

Implementation Activities

Strategy One and Two: Access to Core Instruction and Providing Increasingly Intensive Intervention (formerly called Special Education within a Continuum of Service)

June 2021—The Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE), along with the University of Tennessee at Knoxville's Center for Literacy, Education and Employment (CLEE) conducted an intensive training, ACCESS to High Quality Core Instruction for All Students for 45 K-12 school district facilitation teams from across the state of Tennessee (Cohort 3.0 and Cohort 1.0 and 2.0 re-engaging districts).

Fall 2021 – Facilitators redelivered the content to their districts through a series of a fall professional development in one full-day training and two one-hour fall Communities of Practice (COPs). Through January 19. 2021, 2,114 educators from 38 districts have completed the professional development participant survey and 2,898 participants from 38 districts have completed one or both fall COP surveys.

Fall 2021 – The Access for All project has eight Regional Access Coaches under its employ who work with teachers through cognitive coaching cycles; teachers from preschool to grade 12 are eligible for coaching. From August 1, 2021 through January 19, 2022, 278 coaching sessions have occurred, more than with K-12 teachers. A coach may see multiple teachers within a single school or may visit teachers in multiple schools during a coaching day.

Fall 2021 – A core expectation of each participating district was to have approximately half of their teachers who received the fall trainings observed to form a baseline in order to ascertain that the content and strategies they were trained in are being implemented at the school and classroom level. Through December 2021, 938 participants from 39 districts had baseline observations recorded.

Strategy Three: Addressing Skill Deficits through IAIEP Development

May-September 2021 – A random sample of IEPs collected and analyzed to establish the Cohort 3.0 baseline measure of quality using a normed quality rubric across eight areas of the IEP.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

Infrastructure Changes

Reengaging districts – 17 previous cohort 1.0/2.0 districts created implementation action plans and began fall redelivery training activities. This outcome is related to the governance, professional development, and technical assistance components of the systems framework. This strategy supports system change through strengthening EBP fidelity within previous districts and is necessary to both the sustainability of systems improvement efforts and scale-up.

Data Sharing (expansion of the data collection monitoring plan and redesign of the data dashboard infrastructure available to all stakeholders) – Data measures are now uploaded/updated daily and shared throughout the data communication systems. All data dashboards were redesigned to give expanded insights, be more accessible, and to increase access to data for regional support personnel, educator coaches, and district/school leaders. These outcomes are related to the data and accountability/monitoring components of the systems framework. This strategy supports system change through its support of continuous improvement cycles and is necessary to both the achievement of the SiMR and the sustainability of systems improvement efforts.

Implementation Activities

Strategy One and Two: Access to Core Instruction and Providing Increasingly Intensive Intervention:

Facilitator Training (June 2021) -- ACCESS to High Quality Core Instruction for All Students was provided to 45 K-12 school district facilitation teams. This outcome is related to the governance, professional development, and technical assistance components of the systems framework. This strategy supports system change through the installation of EBPs and is necessary to the achievement of the SiMR, the sustainability of systems improvement efforts, and scale-up.

District Redelivery by Facilitators, Year One (Jan-May 2021) -- Facilitators redelivered year one content (pre-Strand 1 content adjusted for COVID and access to virtual instruction for students with disabilities) within their districts throughout the spring of 2021. 3,476 surveys were completed by the trainees of this virtual delivery, with 92% agreeing/strongly agreeing with all survey items regarding both increased knowledge and ability to implement.

District Redelivery by Facilitators, Year Two, Fall (July-Dec 2021) As of January 19, 2022, Through January 19. 2021, 2,114 educators from 38 districts have completed the professional development participant survey and 2,898 participants from 38 districts have completed one or both fall COP surveys for fall content in year two (Strand 1). In addition, redelivery participants also complete survey questions designed to measure that the training was redelivered with integrity, with all required activities averaging at 91% or better. These outcomes are related to the governance, professional development, and technical assistance components of the systems framework. This strategy supports system change through the installation of EBPs and is necessary to the achievement of the SiMR, the sustainability of systems improvement efforts, and scale-up.

Cognitive Coaching -- In the fall of 2021, 278 coaching seesions have occurred, over half with K-12 teachers. A coach may see multiple teachers within a single school or may visit teachers in multiple schools during a coaching day. This outcome is related to the data, quality standards, and accountability/monitoring components of the systems framework. This strategy supports system change through its support of continuous improvement cycles and is necessary to both the achievement of the SiMR and the sustainability of systems improvement efforts.

Fidelity Measurement -- Through January 2022, 938 participants from 39 districts had pre-observations recorded. This baseline, compared to the post-observation in late spring 2022, will provide clear data on classroom implementation of the training (teacher behavioral change). This outcome is related to the data, quality standards, and accountability/monitoring components of the systems framework. This strategy supports system change through its support of continuous improvement cycles and is necessary to both the achievement of the SiMR and the sustainability of systems improvement efforts.

Strategy Three: Addressing Skill Deficits through IAIEP Development:

IEP sampling – Baseline collected and analyzed for trend analysis. This outcome is related to the data, quality standards, and accountability/monitoring components of the systems framework. This strategy supports system change through its support of continuous improvement cycles and is necessary to both the achievement of the SiMR and the sustainability of systems improvement efforts.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)
NO

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

All districts' facilitators will continue through this year's training progression (Year Two: Strand 1 content) which includes a winter professional development day and two one-hour winter Communities of Practice (COPs). These facilitators and their district leadership teams will continue to receive technical assistance from SSIP leadership as needed; there will also be a Spring webinar to remind participants of SSIP timelines and deliverables. Baseline teacher fidelity observations were collected through Phase III:6 (for 50% of all teachers) and a follow up implementation observation will be made for each of these teachers in the first 6 months of Phase III:7. Teachers will continue to receive cognitive coaching sessions though the next SSIP reporting period.

Stand 2, year three content will be presented to facilitators who will then facilitate with districts participants between June 2022 – May 2023 and will be primarily focused on their provision of increasingly intensive interventions for all students, including those with disabilities. Districts will select their facilitators to be trained and begin drafting their district implementation plan which will also include district identified outcomes to be achieved with the assistance of implementation mini grants provided by the TDOE to Cohort 3.0. These facilitators will begin receiving timelines and pre-training content in Spring 2022 and will participate in a weeklong intensive training during Summer 2022. The redelivery activities for the 2022-23 school year will follow the same progression as this school year; fall and winter professional development days, four one-hour Communities of Practice (COPs), fall and spring

teacher observations for implementation fidelity measurement, and ongoing cognitive coaching. At this time, all current Cohort 3.0 districts and schools are scheduled to participate in this third year of support.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

• Inclusive Culture and Environment (schoolwide and in every classroom)
• Flexible Access to Instruction (The State's version of Universal Design for Learning and Differentiation of Instruction)
• Multi-Sensory Approach and Data-Based Decision-Making
• Writing of Instructionally Appropriate IEPs (IAIEPs)
• Self-directed One-on-one Educator Coaching

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

Evidence-Based Practice: Environment - For a student to truly have access to core instruction, there must be an inclusive culture and environment established to effectively support students and research contends that both emotional support and classroom climate – which the department groups under the umbrella of "culture and environment" – have the capacity to yield improved student outcomes.

Evidence-Based Practices: Flexible Access to Instruction (Universal Design for Learning and Differentiation of Instruction) - This was one of the initial EBPs employed to address the SSIP's first improvement strategy. Work with this EBP has continued, in conjunction with additional training on the EBP of environment, as a positive environment is essential for UDL strategies to be successful. Trainings around this EPB have focused on ensuring students have the appropriate scaffolds and infrastructure in place to succeed in the classroom. Flexible access (UDL) centers on the principles of effective learning through flexibility in engagement, representation, and expression. When learning environments are universally designed, "fairness" is defined as "every student getting what they need", rather than "every student gets the same." Flexible access (UDL) and scaffolding of instruction serve as effective complements. Flexible access encourages educators to respond to the beneficial, and inevitable, variance among students in the classroom to ensure access to instruction and accurate assessment of knowledge/skills. The use of accommodations and modifications for SWDs was one of the major focal points of the revisions to trainings on access and scaffolding. This was done to ensure districts adequately understand that fair does not necessarily mean equal as (1) SWDs may require additional supports and services to best access core instruction and (2) greater flexible access for all students lessens the need for individual student accommodations. This contention lies at the very heart of this EBP – it prioritizes that instruction must be accessible to every student in the classroom and that this is the responsibility of the educator.

Evidence-Based Practices: Multi-Sensory Approach and Data-Based Decision-Making -These EBPs have been grouped together, as they are innately intertwined. As shared in Phase III – 2, both inform one another, as do their sub practices. The materials developed for SSIP strategy two were focused heavily on utilizing a multi-sensory approach to educate and support SWDs, partially informed by the research findings on the integration of multiple senses to enhance and strengthen learning pathways.

Evidence-Based Practice: Writing of Instructionally Appropriate IEPs (IAIEPs) - This EBP has been implemented in several waves over the last several phases. To assess the quality of the IEPs being developed in the SSIP districts, the department created a rubric that continues to measure the quality of IEPs for specific sections of the document, and the annual review allows the department to identify concerning trends in writing IEPs, particularly regarding both the data collection and writing of present levels of performance and measurable annual goals. To address these prominently weak areas of the IEPs sampled throughout the SSIP's previous phases, these sections of the IEP became a major focus of continuing SSIP work.

Evidence-Based Practice: Cognitive Coaching-This EBP is a process that truly embodies what it means to "coach," contrasting with what "coaches" often provide in education which is actually "consulting." Cognition drives behavior, so in Cognitive Coaching, specific paraphrasing and mediative questions asked by the coach aim to draw out the educator's resourcefulness and create more self-directed professionals who can change their own behavior. So, to see an even greater behavioral change in educators, leading to greater outcomes for students, the department created eight new positions fully dedicated to Cognitive Coaching during Phase III:5. These regional access coaches (RACs) have been added to the team to specifically provide coaching cycles at the individual teacher level. These coaches engage in a planning conversation, then collect data in the classroom that the teacher requests, then engage in reflecting and/or problem resolving conversations using training in Cognitive Coaching.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.

Inclusive Culture and Environment -- For the SWDs particularly addressed in Tennessee's SiMR – students with an SLD – core instruction should be a part of a student's least restrictive environment given that appropriate interventions and supports should make access to core instruction in the general education setting a viable option for 80% or more of a student's day. Access for All training and coaching activities focused on this EBP lead to district's prioritizing access to core instruction through both general and special education change in practice, inclusive teaching mindsets paired with greater educator efficacy, as a result, improved student outcomes.

Flexible Access to Instruction (The State's version of Universal Design for Learning and Differentiation of Instruction) – For the SWDs particularly addressed in Tennessee's SiMR – students with an SLD – core instruction should focus on ensuring students have the appropriate access and scaffolds in place to succeed in the classroom. Access for All training and coaching activities focused on this EBP lead to teachers' greater use of a larger and more flexible "toolbox" of engagement, representation, and expression, reducing the need for accommodations and modifications for SWDs. Greater access, through flexibility for all students, leads to better student outcomes, especially for SWDs.

Multi-Sensory Approach and Data-Based Decision-Making – For the SWDs particularly addressed in Tennessee's SiMR – students with an SLD – core instruction should focus on ensuring students have learning activities that are strengths-based and naturally engaging. Access for All training and coaching activities focused on this EBP lead to teachers' greater use of practices that are tailored to every child's learning needs which leads to better student outcomes, especially for SWDs who rely on this approach to learn, remember, and use new knowledge and skills.

Writing of Instructionally Appropriate IEPs (IAIEPs) – For the SWDs particularly addressed in Tennessee's SiMR – students with an SLD – IEPs must capture thorough and accurate present levels of educational performance and reasonably calculated and individualized measurable annual goals. Access for All training and coaching activities focused on this EBP lead to teachers' greater use of practices that are aligned to each child's learning needs which leads to improved student outcomes.

Cognitive Coaching – The eight regional access coaches (RACs) provide coaching cycles at the individual teacher level. These coaches engage in a planning conversation, then collect data in the classroom that the teacher requests, then engage in reflecting and/or problem resolving conversations

using training in Cognitive Coaching. This activity supports the greater understanding of and implementation of the other EBPs which increases a student with an SLD's access to high quality instruction which leads to better student outcomes.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

The instructional fidelity observations gathered this fall are baseline and reflect teaching between one and five months after the district's professional development day. While observation scores are low in relation to the total score achievable under the instrument, they are very encouraging for initial implementation (especially in the context of previous and current pandemic barriers). The majority of classrooms have almost installed the Environment and Culture and Collaboration domains, while all of the other domains are in the installing phase. The four measures with the highest percentage of classrooms scoring installing or greater this fall included teacher and student learning partnership (84%), collective growth mindset (79%), lesson preparation for engagement and success (78%), and what students should know/be able to do is clearly defined (77%). In addition, redelivery participants also complete survey questions designed to measure that the training was redelivered with integrity, with all required activities averaging at 91% or better.

The Access for All project has eight Regional Access Coaches under its employ who work with teachers through cognitive coaching cycles; teachers from preschool to grade 12 are eligible for coaching. In the fall of 2021, 278 coaching sessions occurred, over half with K-12 teachers. A coach may see multiple teachers within a single school or may visit teachers in multiple schools during a coaching day.

The most frequent coaching cycle components engaged during these coaching sessions were reflecting conversations (47%), data collection (49%), and planning conversations (40%). Coaches have felt the most successful in implementing the active listening, building rapport, and clarifying goals/next steps components of the cognitive coaching framework. The two components most chosen by coaches as a continuous improvement skill for their coaching were mediative questioning and clarifying evidence/data needed to support the coachee. Coaches have learned conversation "maps" to assist them in Cognitive Coaching with fidelity so that they are authentically coaching the person, not the process. Coaches' internalization (automaticity) of these maps has grown significantly over the past five months; when comparing the first two and the last two months, the Planning Map confidence grew from 3.0 to 3.8 and the Reflecting Map confidence grew from 2.7 to 3.3 on a five-point Likert scale.

A random sample of IEPs from high-incidence disability categories in every Access For All Cohort 3.0 K-12 district this year was collected and reviewed for quality using a revised rubric (developed under previous SSIP phases) between May 1 – September 30, 2021. During the same data window, a random sample of IEPs from common disability categories in every Early Childhood Access For All district were also analyzed. This data will serve as the cohort 3.0 baseline (the pandemic prevented earlier baselining) and will be compared to annual reviews to be conducted in future SSIP years. The department is developing a one-pager on observed IEP trends found in the data to be disseminated in Spring 2022.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

As a closing to Phase III:5 activities, a few facilitators redelivered critical content within their districts through late-Spring 2021 on strategies one and three. 141 educators from six districts completed the post training survey for content focused on access to virtual instruction for students with disabilities (SWDs). 80% of all district trainees agreed/strongly agreed with all statements regarding their knowledge, skills, and ability to provide access to instruction for SWDs during the pandemic.

In June 2021, the Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE), along with the University of Tennessee at Knoxville's Center for Literacy, Education and Employment (CLEE) conducted an intensive training, ACCESS to High Quality Core Instruction for All Students for 45 K-12 school district facilitation teams from across the state of Tennessee (Cohort 3.0 and redelivery). Participants in the training completed 141 surveys (92% response rate). About half the 153 participants (48.1%) worked primarily in special education, nearly a third (32.6%) worked primarily in general education, and 94% primarily work with K-8 students. Based on districts' implementation plans for the academic year, more than 3,400 educators at 173 schools were to receive redelivery.

Every facilitator agreed or strongly agreed that the training helped them better understand that "literacy has six parts, with three inputs (viewing, listening, reading), and three outputs (showing, speaking, writing)", "learning requires grouping, ordering, connecting, and personal reflection", and "environment is the essence of classrooms that are built for all students." For example, over 99% of facilitators agreed or strongly agreed that the training increased their ability to train educators on providing access to instruction and tasks by assessing and aligning to students' literacy strengths and needs.

Facilitators then redelivered the content to their districts throughout the Fall of 2021 through a series of a fall professional development day and two one-hour fall Communities of Practice (COPs). Through December 2021, 2,122 educators from 38 districts had completed the professional development participant survey (86% response rate) and 2,913 participants from 37 Districts completed one or both fall COP surveys (84% response rate).

For the full day fall redelivery training, six main topics were taught through a combination of traditional instruction and adult learning strategies. These learning activities and tasks included a Mindset sort, group-based modeling, the levels of the memory triangle, Daniel Pink's 3 Keys to Motivation, Maslow's Hierarchy, and graphing classroom climate examples. Over two-thirds of the trained educators this fall primarily serve students in general education settings; 90% teach K-8 students. 94% of participants agreed or strongly agreed with the three primary knowledge gain survey items; with "I understand better that language, both verbal and nonverbal, are powerful tools for student learning" having the highest overall positive sentiment. 94% of participants agreed or strongly agreed with the three primary ability gain survey items; with "My ability to create a classroom climate where language, environment, and instruction empowers students and shows them their value has increased" having the highest overall positive sentiment.

The COPs have been set up to offer fall redelivery participants with the opportunity to get a refresher on previously trained content, to dig deeper into these concepts, and to get technical assistance that will aid their continued implementation. Each school has the flexibility to conduct the two fall COPs to their own scheduling needs; either hosting two 1-hour sessions or have one larger 2-hour session. Overall educators have seen great benefit from COPs, agreeing or strongly agreeing that facilitators were knowledgeable and helpful (94%) and that the COP(s) provided them with the opportunity to apply the fall training concepts (94%). More than 90% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that "The CoP(s) improved my ability to utilize my new learning in my role" and "My teaching practices are improving based on my learning during the Fall training and/or Fall CoP(s)".

A core expectation of each participating district was to have approximately half of their teachers who received the fall trainings observed to ascertain that the content and strategies they were trained in are being used with fidelity in their classrooms. Through December 2021, 932 participants from 32 districts were observed. The observation instrument includes 25 items across six domains (environment, lesson preparation, assessment, instruction utilizing high quality instructional materials (HQIM), classroom leadership and management, and culture and collaboration) and is completed by a trained district facilitation team member. The observer scores every item on a scale of not evident, not adopted, installing, installed, refining, or full implementation.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Access For All will continue to employ a train-the-trainer model of redelivery focused on all three strategies. The high-quality professional development produced by the department ensures that the activities outlined in trainings do not dissipate when trainers return to their schools. Consistent reinforcement of the work through follow-up workshops, communities of practice, fidelity measurement, classroom observations, cognitive coaching, and refined materials/resources ensure the continued integration of the strategies and EBPs into the classroom.

Year three's Strand 2 content will include review and reinforcement of Inclusive Culture and Environment, Flexible Access to Instruction, Multi-Sensory Approach, and Data-Based Decision-Making that provides teachers with greater knowledge and ability to implement new learning within an effective environment and in addition to accessible Tier 1 general education instruction. Cognitive Coaching will be used by regional access coaches to continue to impact strong educator behavioral change through educator resourcefulness and self-directedness. IAIEP baseline data will be presented to districts to inform their district professional development activities and teachers will review and revise their IEP writing practices. The department will collect a new sample of IEPs for quality measurement between May-September of 2022.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

In developing the SPP/APR, the department solicits input from the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities (AC) through quarterly meetings, presentations of data, and guided question and answer sessions. Stakeholders represented via the AC include individuals with disabilities; parents of children with disabilities; representatives of LEAs; and representatives of institutes of higher education, correctional facilities, charter schools, and private agencies. In addition to Council members, there are several advocacy agencies that attend the meetings and provide input and feedback. The department routinely presents at quarterly AC meetings on the APR and local determinations processes. Such presentations offer stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the data collected in the APR, its relevance to the performance of SWDs, and how the information in the APR is disseminated to LEAs. Additionally, there is an opportunity for feedback on how the data is shared and communicated.

Additional stakeholders are routinely engaged as well for input on the SPP/APR. Special education supervisors from LEAs across the state are asked for input and contributions at regional special education supervisor study council meetings. At these meetings, data from the APR and how local determinations are made are shared and input is solicited. Based on recommendations, changes might be made to the way in which "n" sizes are determined for particular indicators, the way local determinations are made, the weighting and prioritization of indicators, and the targets set for the SPP/APR. At the study council meetings, which typically occur monthly, supervisors are delivered important updates around special education activities and can ask questions or provide feedback on issues they are encountering in their district. Additionally, the department regularly engages representatives of agencies serving individuals with disabilities and their families, such as legal and advocacy groups like Disability Rights Tennessee (DRT), parent training and information centers like Support and Training for Exceptional Parents (TN STEP), and parent advocacy groups such as The ARC Tennessee.

The department has made concerted efforts to engage the AC, district special education supervisors, other agencies supporting individuals with disabilities, and parents of SWDs in the target setting process for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package to satisfy the new stakeholder involvement requirements. Understanding the value and power of these groups' and other stakeholders' input, the department used short presentations with accompanying feedback surveys to both disseminate information to and collect feedback from a wide range of respondents. These presentations and links to surveys are available under the "SPP/APR Target Setting Feedback" tab here: https://www.tn.gov/education/student-support/special-education/special-education-data-services-reports.html. Once survey results were collected, the data were analyzed and adjustments were made to proposed targets based on stakeholders' feedback around whether targets were "too challenging," "not challenging enough," or "just right." The department also considered any specific feedback in response to the following prompt: "Please provide any specific feedback you have regarding the proposed targets." Further, the department collected feedback on whether the data and analyses presented to stakeholders were "too complex," "not complex enough," and "appropriate," as well as "any specific feedback" stakeholders have "regarding the improvement strategies or activities needed to reach the proposed targets." This information will be taken into consideration for future efforts to collect stakeholder feedback. More information about target setting presentation content, methods for soliciting public feedback, and timelines related to the target setting process are included in the "Soliciting Public Input" section of this report.

In addition, the department has continued to engage and solicit feedback from stakeholders during implementation of the SSIP in three cohorts. Various stakeholders have received information on the work, including: special education supervisors, educators, administrators, service providers, advocacy groups, other SEA divisions, the Dyslexia Advisory Council, and the AC. Information has been shared publicly through a variety of modes. Written communications and briefs are posted to state websites and communicated through various internal and external newsletters. In addition, partners have made content of the plan available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work. For the newest cohort of districts (3.0), participating superintendents and special education supervisors were provided with district-specific data infographics summarizing the work and subsequent data from the first year of implementation during the 2019-20 school year. Statewide data was also communicated within the SEA, via social media, and on the project's website. Success of the SSIP is contingent upon not just the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. In addition, the department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees and district facilitators who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content. The Senior Director of Data Analysis for Special Populations and the Senior Director of Special Education Programming lead discussion and feedback of the SSIP implementation and activities as a regular item in the quarterly AC meetings. AC members and other stakeholders in attendance at these meetings provide feedback through participation in roundtable conversations. These are open meetings which are recorded and available on the department's website for public viewing. In January, June, and October of 2021, the Senior Director of Special Education Programming led these sessions with members of the AC to engage in meaningful conversations about the work completed thus far as well as the impending implementation slated for the 2021-22 to 2023-24 school years. AC members confirmed the need for this content, continued expansion into additional districts, and retraining of districts from previous cohorts due to staffing turnover and the effects of the pandemic on access to instruction. Additionally, AC members reiterated the need to continue cohorts until every district is included in this important work and proceed with trainings focused on developing quality IEPs, expressing their excitement about the addition related to math and writing intervention in the 2023-24 school year.

The Access for All project collects participant feedback at every stage of the content delivery process through surveys that collect facilitators' knowledge and ability gains, their district's educators' knowledge and ability gains through district facilitation, the implementation of activities according to expected training fidelity, and a series of open-ended feedback questions. These surveys are tailored to each training event and are annually reviewed and content and surveys are modified at least annually by SSIP leadership based on participant feedback. Surveys collected during this Phase have included post-training for all content on virtual instruction, facilitator training, fall professional development redelivery days within districts, COPs, and coaching sessions (both coach and coachee).

The full day redelivery Fall Participant Survey asks for how the training could be improved and 800 responses were provided this fall. 55% of respondents shared that they liked the training and that no changes were needed. Of the improvements requested, pacing was the most frequent theme (18%) with a desire for the training to be shorter and have more breaks. 11% of responses requested more attention to participant comfort – less crowded spaces, more comfortable chairs, better sound, and access to materials in print and/or on personal devices since the screens weren't always easy to read. Some teachers requested that the content presented be more interactive, with 4% asking for more discussion time, more hands-on activities, or more movement time.

The COP Participant Survey asks for how future CoPs could be improved and 1,000 responses were provided this fall. 65% of respondents shared that they liked the training and that no changes were needed. Of the improvements requested, scheduling was the most frequent theme (12%) with a desire for COPs to be held at different times, different locations whether in-person or virtually, or to be paced differently. 8% of responses requested more activities, more discussion, more videos, or more information about a specific topic; "I am always interested in behavior strategies and classroom organizational strategies" and "Have people share their personal experiences that are positive". Some teachers requested deeper understanding of the content presented, with 4% asking for more information, direct examples, and more practical strategies concerning implementation. 2% of responses focused on the desire for more hands-on learning and another 2% wanted food at the COPs.

Teachers are asked to take the post-coaching participant survey after each coaching session. The survey is aimed at providing key feedback to coaches and SSIP leadership for continuous improvement; it is anonymous and does not ask for any district, school, or classroom identifiers. 278 coaching sessions ended this fall with a completed survey. 92% of coachees felt that the coaching conversation supported their thought process to plan ahead or reflect, and 6% selected "maybe", which is common as teachers get acclimated to cognitive coaching as it is very different than a consultative model. Teachers primarily spent their coaching session reflecting on something that happened or planning ahead (47% each).

The post-coaching participant survey included a space for optional feedback. The responses were overwhelmingly positive and included terms of gratitude, validation, and cooperative activity; "I felt heard" and "sometimes I need the accountability and planning process in place to facilitate change." There were five teachers at first who were confused by the cognitive coaching model ("I really was lost") but most teachers mentioned that the process was very affirming and supportive. One teacher saw the coaching sessions as "framing a workable solution to the implementation of new classroom strategies", while another said their coach "really paid attention to my lesson and helped to guide my thoughts about what I did, why I did it, and how to plan using that information going forward". The specific coaching topics, goals, and next steps written about were all varied and evidence that coaches tailored the experience to each teacher's needs and self-directed goals. The majority of participants cited professional growth examples and a few also said they had seen student gains.

Eighty-six K-12 classroom teachers from 20 districts concluded their first full coaching cycle through December 2021. The average coaching sessions per cycle was four visits. Less than 5% of these cycles concluded prematurely due to coaching barriers (teacher leave, scheduling conflicts, teacher fatigue, etc.). When appropriate, the coach and teacher can mutually select to begin a second coaching cycle. Seventeen teachers started a new coaching cycle. Seven chose to begin a new/refined goal and the others continued with their existing goal. The most popular skills refined by the coach during the coaching cycle were active listening (48%), paraphrasing (40%), and data collection (26%).

After a coaching cycle concludes, coaches also reflect on their hunches about the coachee's states of mind throughout the coaching cycle. The coaches focus their reflection in five areas: efficacy, craftsmanship, consciousness, interdependence, and flexibility. Some teachers initially resisted coaching because of time constraints (loss of planning period time), because they were unsure that they needed to grow, or because cognitive coaching was outside of their comfort zone and they needed more time to "buy-in". One reflection read, "The coachee simply wanted to be told what he needed to do to be "done" with coaching cycles because he had other things he liked to do during his planning period. As the weeks carried on, I slowly saw an increase in efficacy as the coachee began to say things like "I see that I am making (the students) think more".

The majority of coaches collected data while observing the teacher's instruction so that the teacher could use the data to guide/inform their growth: One reflection read, "She became more and more aware of the impact of her feedback on her students' emotional well-being and their motivation. She asked me to collect data that reflected her impact, and it was powerful to see her cognitive shift as she reflected on the data." And another teacher "by reviewing the data, was able to see how her language was hindering her class and try new strategies for reinforcing appropriate behavior". The coaching cycles helped the majority of teachers achieve very positive outcomes; one teacher decided to stay in the field ("I was ready to quit. I didn't think I was made for this. Now I know that I am. It was the best experience"), another teacher "came to the realization that she had some control over how the scripted ELA curriculum is delivered to their students and was able to shift their thinking to finding new ways to use the same material", and a third teacher "immediately put her plan into action and saw progress in student performance over a 6 week period".

In addition, the Access for All project's university partner (University of Tennessee) facilitates weekly meetings with all Regional Access Coaches and CORE Interventionists where real-time implementation feedback is provided and shared with the department's SSIP leaders. The department also hosts a monthly project Leadership Meeting where coaches, key stakeholders, and SSIP evaluators share participant and stakeholder input.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

The department has continued to engage and solicit feedback from stakeholders during implementation of the SSIP in three cohorts. Various stakeholders have received information on the work, including special education supervisors, educators, administrators, service providers, advocacy groups, other SEA divisions, and the Governor's Advisory Council for the Education of Students with Disabilities on a quarterly basis (AC). Information has been shared publicly through a variety of modes, including council/task force meetings and newsletters. In addition, partners have made content available to families and provided resources about the progress implementing the work through the initiative's website. For the current cohort of districts (3.0), participating superintendents and special education supervisors were provided with district-specific data infographics summarizing the work and subsequent data from the first year of implementation during the pandemic (spring 2021). Statewide data was also communicated within the SEA, via social media, and on the project's website.

Additional sessions were held across the year for LEA implementers and decision-makers, as well as internal regional support staff, on the observation tool and requirements, year 2 and year 3 planning, one-on-one educator coaching, and data collection/communication. SEA special populations' staff met to better understand the connections across the work and specifically connected to this SPDG/SSIP at a summer retreat, and members of the team presented at various conferences on addressing learning loss as a result of COVID-19.

Success of the SSIP is contingent upon not just the communication methods outlined above, but also on the availability of feedback loops. At presentations, feedback is gathered verbally from attendees/participants and recorded. In addition, the department analyzes qualitative data and feedback from training attendees and district facilitators who may see challenges or opportunities for improvement relative to the content. The director of data services and the senior director of special education lead discussion and feedback of the SSIP implementation and activities as a regular item in the quarterly AC meetings. AC members (comprised of parents of SWDs, individuals with disabilities, educators, and student and parent advocates) and other stakeholders in attendance at these meeting provide feedback through participation in roundtable conversations. These are open meetings which

are recorded and available on the department's website for public viewing. In July and October 2021, the senior director of special education led these sessions with members of the Advisory Council to engage in meaningful conversations about the work completed thus far, as well as the impending implementation slated for the 2021-24 school years. Council members confirmed the need for this content, continued expansion into additional districts, and retraining of districts from previous cohorts due to staffing turnover. As a direct result of this feedback, during the 2021 summer 5-day facilitator training, 22 districts from previous cohorts (1.0/2.0) sent 51 facilitators for training/retraining alongside their 3.0 peers.

To ensure that training is resulting in implementation, various data is collected on the quality of IEPs, the fidelity of training, observations focused on training concept implementation, and training and classroom visits by the senior director of special education.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

The State uses the data dashboards and quarterly reports to consistently monitor stakeholder concerns. In addition, stakeholders have been provided with a "who to contact" document so they know who to contact for questions/concerns in specific areas, as well as a single email address that any question or concern can be sent to that is checked daily and assigned to the best person to address. Districts have milestone meetings with regional support staff (CORE special education interventionists) and can contact their assigned coach(es), the general email address, the project manager, or the CORE interventionist directly with concerns or requests at any time, and they do. The applicable team members follow up with stakeholders through email, phone/zoom calls, and/or in-person. Technical assistance has been provided, data reviewed, dashboard features redesigned or added, and data cleaned when concerns were related to data collection, data dashboard functionality, or data accuracy. CORE interventionists, coaches, and other initiative leaders have reviewed feedback data with district facilitators and observers through continuous improvement cycles to improve action planning for future training and classroom observations. Technical assistance and cognitive coaching sessions have been provided to the districts and teachers to strengthen implementation and problem-solve in a truly collaborative manner. The project manager meets weekly with the coaches and CLEE staff, biweekly with the CORE intervention team/lead, and monthly with the full project team, and the CLEE logistics teams meets with the UK evaluation team weekly to raise and solve data issues/needs that may arise.

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

There were no newly identified barriers.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

Some districts are no longer participating in the SPDG initiative because of COVID-19's impact on their LEA's operations (staff shortages, inability to prioritize professional learning time).

Tennessee has reset its baseline in FFY 2020 to account for the change to the group of districts included in the SiMR calculation. Further, Tennessee selected FFY 2018 as its baseline year, as this is last year of assessment data available before SSIP 3.0 districts started participating in the SPDG.

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

17 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:

Zachary Stone

Title:

Senior Director of Data Analysis for Special Populations

Email:

Zachary.Stone@tn.gov

Phone:

(615) 532-9702

Submitted on:

04/28/22 12:46:43 PM