

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2021**

Texas



PART B DUE February 1, 2023

**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 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 2004 requires each state to develop a six-year performance plan. The extension of the IDEA continues to require a State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) to evaluate the State of Texas' (State) efforts to implement the requirements and purposes of IDEA and illustrate how the State will continuously improve upon its implementation. The State is required to submit an updated SPP/APR to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on February 1 each year.

The Introduction to the SPP/APR provides an overview of the State's systems that are in place to ensure IDEA requirements and the provision of services to improve results for students with disabilities are met. These are outlined through the following introduction sections which include: General Supervision, Technical Assistance, Professional Development, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

The SPP/APR includes 17 indicators that represent five monitoring priorities; Free and Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), Disproportionate Representation, Child Find, Effective Transition, and General Supervision. Each indicator includes historical and current data, targets, improvement strategies and stakeholder involvement, and progress monitoring.

The SPP/APR is presented publicly on the Texas Education Agency (TEA) website following submission and OSEP approval each spring.
<https://tea.texas.gov/reports-and-data/data-submission/state-performance-plan>

Additionally, TEA reports annually to the public on the performance of each local education agency (LEA) on each of the indicators through a district profile on its website <https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/idea/index.html>.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

1,210

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 State incorporates the SPP in the blueprint for the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP). The State's general supervision system mirrors the requirements of IDEA outlined in the SPP/APR. The State's data-driven, evidence-based improvement activities, inclusive of stakeholder needs and input, guides its efforts to improve results for students with disabilities.

Texas has a balanced system of compliance and performance-based accountability that is included in the monitoring and intervention practices in the State. Special education monitoring and intervention activities rely on rich data sources by which student-level information is analyzed to determine compliance and results of effective programs for students with disabilities. The State's monitoring activities include targeted and cyclical monitoring of public school districts and public charter schools; approval and reapproval of nonpublic day and residential schools; cyclical monitoring of other entities that provide services to students with disabilities; residential facility educational program monitoring; dispute resolution tracking through the Correspondence and Dispute Resolution Management System (CDRMS); and noncompliance tracking and monitoring through the ASCEND secure linked platform.

Each year, TEA evaluates every local educational agency (LEA) through an analysis of district data against the standards of a Results Driven Accountability (RDA) framework (formerly the Performance Based Monitoring and Analysis System) and is aligned across different RDA special population program areas that includes special education. The RDA framework uses reliable and comprehensive LEA data, indicating patterns of past performance along with other federally required indicators, as part of the State's mechanism to inform monitoring determinations and interventions. The RDA framework has transformed its early historical program monitoring from a stand-alone, cyclical and compliance-driven on-site monitoring system to a data-informed, results-driven system of coordinated and aligned monitoring activities inclusive of targeted and cyclical review processes. The system includes alignment in structure within the system reports and captures the included indicators under 3 domains similar in structure to the State's A-F Accountability system and reports. This diagnostic framework supports the Agency and LEAs in developing differentiated support activities. All LEAs in the State with RDA determination levels of 2, 3 or 4 develop or update a strategic support plan aligned to data outputs to promote compliance and continuous improvement of outcomes for students with disabilities.

The RDA framework includes an intervention component with specific processes and activities that are implemented after the initial RDA determinations occur. This component, the Differentiated Monitoring and Support (DMS) system, is similar to OSEP's monitoring system to achieve continuous improvement goals. DMS provides monitoring and support activities that are customized based on the need of an LEA and concentrates on three programmatic pillars: Implementation, Student Outcomes, and Family Engagement. These pillars are integral to the analysis of the seven critical areas of compliance within the monitoring framework. The Self-Assessment support activity, which is required of every LEA, is designed to assist LEA leadership teams in evaluating and improving their special education program, and it engages leadership teams through a proactive approach by addressing special education compliance and improving student performance.

LEA monitoring activities are targeted to address unique special population program needs and to meet state and federal statutory requirements for performance interventions and compliance reviews specific to each program area. All cyclical and targeted LEAs are required to develop local improvement plans addressing areas of concern. TEA requires LEAs to address findings of noncompliance in a corrective action plan (CAP). All LEAs must correct noncompliance as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from identification. Additional information about DMS and special education monitoring activities can be found on TEA's Special Education Review and Support website.

<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support>

TEA monitoring and contract approval processes for LEAs who place students in Nonpublic Schools or state-defined Off-Campus Programs are designed to ensure that any placement by an LEA of a student into a private setting meets FAPE requirements when the special education and related services cannot be implemented by the LEA. More information about TEA's Special Education in Nonpublic and Off-Campus Programs can be found on the following website.

<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/special-education-in-nonpublic-and-off-campus-programs>

TEA also monitors four state agencies that provide educational services to students with disabilities: Texas School for the Deaf, Texas School for the Blind and Visually Impaired, Texas Juvenile Justice Department, and the Windham Prison System. These entities are monitored on a four-year cycle.

Under the authority of 19 Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §97.1072, TEA monitors LEAs that serve students with disabilities who reside in residential facilities (RF) to ensure FAPE. Additionally, RF monitoring has become a part of the integrated intervention process if LEAs are staged in more than one program area.

The CDRMS provides integrated tracking and management of correspondence and dispute resolution processes at TEA. CDRMS is divided into modules as follows:

- Correspondence – maintains basic correspondence data as well as student, complainant, and LEA information for items flagged as potential complaints.
- Closure Letters – maintains all closure letter data including student, complainant, and LEA information as well as workflow and related dispute tracking.
- Complaints – maintains all relevant complaint data including student, complainant, LEA information, related dispute events for the same student, and workflow, as well as links to copies of initial correspondence and response.
- Due Process Hearings – includes electronic docketing functionality as well as maintenance of petitioners, respondents, related dispute events for the same student, issues in dispute, links to the initial request and final hearing orders, and appeals for all hearing requests received by TEA.
- Mediations – includes electronic docketing functionality as well as tracking of related disputes events for the same student; and
- Facilitations - organizes information related to state-sponsored facilitations managed by the Division of Complaints, Dispute Resolution, and Intensive Monitoring (Division) as well as tracking of related activities for the same student.

Additionally, the CDRMS tracks progress on pending and completed corrective actions. The Division, in collaboration with the Division of Review and Support, is responsible for monitoring any required corrective actions resulting from complaints and due process hearings.

In tandem with CDRMS, TEA monitors the finding of noncompliance through the ASCEND platform. Cited noncompliance is recorded in the LEA's account. ASCEND documents the date that the LEA was notified of the finding, the due date for correction, and the date the LEA was cleared of noncompliance. Monitoring occurs through correspondence; uploading and tracking such things as the LEA CAP, interventions, and results for correction of the noncompliance; and documentation of these results. LEAs who do not correct any instance of noncompliance within a year are identified as in escalated oversight within the ASCEND system, where additional interventions and/or sanctions are tracked.

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.

The State provides leadership in implementing the requirements of IDEA 2004 and has mechanisms in place that address state and federally identified monitoring priorities to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced-based technical assistance (TA); and to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

Twenty regional education service centers (ESCs) play an important role in implementing the State's TA processes. ESCs support the State in implementing the requirements of IDEA 2004, meeting the targets of the SPP, and carrying out other results-driven measures identified in the State. Each ESC develops an annual regional special education continuous improvement plan describing locally developed improvement activities based on regional data as compared to state targets, and each ESC engages with state agency staff to identify successes that might be scaled statewide and/or opportunities for state agency support to enhance efforts.

As part of the dissemination of discretionary funds that TEA receives under IDEA-B, TEA provides grants for TA networks, and at least one agency special education program staff member is assigned to oversee the work of each network. Each of the 20 regions in Texas assigns ESC staff to each network to disseminate training, coaching, and static resources across the State. Networks address topics identified as critical and support needs for the State as identified by internal and external stakeholders. TA, resources, and trainings from networks are available to any local educational agency (LEA) in the state and are intended to support compliance and best practices.

Current TA initiatives include, but are not limited to:

The Texas Legal Framework for the Child-Centered Special Education Process

The Legal Framework is a comprehensive web-based platform to inform and educate all stakeholders on the federal and state law and regulations related to special education. In addition to providing dynamic and rich resources regarding the obligations and rights for the provision of a free appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE) for students with disabilities, the user can access the unique operating procedures and additional local regulations of each LEA. <https://fw.escapps.net/>

Child Find, Evaluation, and ARD Supports Network

The Child Find, Evaluation and ARD Supports Network assists LEAs by providing resources and training that are aligned with implementing effective Child Find practices, conducting comprehensive evaluations, and practicing collaborative admission, review and dismissal (ARD) committee processes that lead to a free appropriate public education (FAPE) for students with disabilities <https://childfindtx.tea.texas.gov/>

Inclusion in Texas Network

The Inclusion in Texas network promotes a statewide culture of high expectations for students with disabilities to significantly improve academic and functional outcomes for students served by special education. The network assists LEAs to build capacity and to develop and appropriately implement instructional programs that provide meaningful access to inclusive environments and grade-level standards.

<https://www.inclusionintexas.org/>

Texas Statewide Leadership for Autism Training (TSLAT) Network

The TSLAT network increases LEAs' knowledge, understanding, and implementation of evidence-based practices that ensure the academic, functional, and behavioral needs of students with autism are met. TSLAT provides access to training, technical assistance, support, and resources for educators who serve students with autism. The TSLAT website includes online courses (some in Spanish), webinars, information about opportunities for deeper learning, a video library, and more.

<https://www.txautism.net/>

Tiered Interventions using Evidence-based Research (TIER) Network

TIER provides educators, caregivers, and other educational stakeholders with the knowledge and materials to ensure appropriate implementation of a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) in the areas of academics, behavior, and mental health in every school across Texas.

<https://tier.tea.texas.gov/>

Texas Complex Access Network (TxCAN)

The TxCAN network provides statewide leadership and support to increase the capacity of LEAs and families to meet the needs of students with significant cognitive disabilities. The network provides resources and professional development related to the complex and intensive educational and functional needs of students with complex access needs.

<https://txcan.tea.texas.gov/>

Texas Sensory Support Network (TxSSN)

The TxSSN ensures the provision of support to infants, toddlers, children, and youth with sensory impairments, their families, and the professionals who serve them. This network provides information and strategies for development of communication, mobility, tactile skills, and environmental adaptations. Additionally, TxSSN addresses diagnosis, evaluation, and educational programs for services to students in their home communities in support of the comprehensive statewide education plan for this student population.

<https://www.txssn.org/>

Small and Rural Schools Network (SRSN)

This network strives to build capacity of small and rural LEAs to provide a more equitable level of access for students with disabilities in these communities. The network has developed state-level infrastructures and resources to support LEAs who face unique challenges, such as resource limitations and geographic remoteness.

<https://www.smallandruralschools.org/>

Student-Centered Transitions Network (SCTN)

The SCTN makes available resources and professional development and builds collaborative infrastructures among students, families, schools, LEAs, and communities. The SCTN aims for all students with disabilities to be actively involved in planning, communicating, and evaluating progress in meeting their transition goals from early childhood through high school graduation and post-secondary readiness.

<https://www.texastransition.org/>

School, Family, and Community Engagement (SFCE) Network

The SFCE network provides resources and professional development to build the capacity of educators to work collaboratively with families and community members in supporting positive outcomes for students with disabilities. As part of SFCE, SPEDTEX (the Texas Special Education Information Center) optimizes information and responds with technical assistance in a succinct and useful format that is user friendly, culturally responsive, and accessible to all individuals. SPEDTEX in particular focuses its TA on parents and family members of students with disabilities, as they are able to create individual accounts and access a multitude of resources to navigate the special education process.

<https://www.SPEDTEX.org/>

ESC Dyslexia Network

The dyslexia TA grant provides assistance, including a Dyslexia Helpline, and professional development to a variety of stakeholders across Texas related to compliance and innovative approaches for providing education and related services to students with dyslexia and related disorders.

<https://www.region10.org/programs/dyslexia-regional/overview/>

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.

Providing a robust education for all Texas children requires partnerships among TEA, families, educator preparation programs, public and private schools, institutions of higher education, education service centers, and the broader community. The state is committed to ensuring that educator preparation programs produce qualified educators who are equipped to meet the needs of all learners and that those educators have the ongoing professional development and support necessary to improve results for students with disabilities.

State law requires every teacher candidate to demonstrate knowledge of each disability category under IDEA and how each category can affect student learning and development, as well as conditions that may be considered a disability under Section 504. Each candidate must demonstrate competence in the use of proactive instructional planning strategies that provide flexibility in the ways information is presented, students respond or demonstrate mastery, and students are engaged; reduce barriers in instruction; provide appropriate accommodations, supports, and challenges; and maintain high

achievement expectations for all students, including students with disabilities. They also must demonstrate competence in the use of evidence-based inclusive instructional practices, including general and special education collaborative and co-teaching models, MTSS processes, classroom management techniques; and appropriate adaptation strategies, including accommodations, modifications, and instruction in the use of assistive technology for instruction. [TEC 21.044] All staff development provided at the LEA level must be designed, to the greatest extent possible, to ensure that the training also complies with these standards. [TEC 21.451]

Before becoming certified as a teacher in any grade level or content, a candidate must receive instruction in detection and education of students with dyslexia. [TEC 21.044]

Educators with standard teaching certificates are required to receive a minimum number of continuing professional education (CPE) hours every five years. Part of the CPE for all educators must include training regarding educating students with disabilities. Additionally, any educator who teaches students with dyslexia must receive CPE regarding new research and practices in educating students with dyslexia. [TEC 21.054]

To ensure that service providers have and maintain the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities, including providing assistance to meet the above requirements, TEA provides a multitude of resources and other types of technical assistance, such as:

- Approving CPE providers to ensure they meet qualifications,
- Leveraging regional Education Service Center personnel to communicate, train, and coach on TEA-approved topics and courses,
- Implementing Literacy and Math Achievement Academies, which provide consistent statewide expectations and content,
- Continuously adding courses to TEA's learning management system, called TEA Learn, that is accessible to all educators,
- Working with technical assistance partners to produce courses, lead professional learning cohorts, develop implementation tools, and materials; and
- Actively engaging with experts and various stakeholders in the development and revisions to courses and content developed by the state.

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).

Historically, Texas has solicited broad stakeholder input using the TCIP model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, public hearings, and stakeholder meetings. A systematic approach for obtaining stakeholder participation is used to ensure feedback that is truly representative of the state's geographic and ethnic diversity. This systematic approach includes a recruitment plan designed to ensure that stakeholders from diverse roles provide input representative to the state. The diverse roles included in all advisory or informal stakeholder groups are typically parents, teachers, campus and school district administrators, parent-support and advocacy groups, higher education institutions, Education Service Centers (ESCs), related service and support staff, and other state agencies.

The technical assistance networks and initiatives also support stakeholder involvement as part of their included project metrics to continuously inform and drive technical assistance needs in the State.

All 20 regions are represented within the various advisory and workgroups that constitute broad stakeholder input. TEA routinely reviews group memberships to keep current and contacts various internal and external entities seeking recommendations to fill vacancies.

TEA continues to employ the TCIP model and expand opportunities for stakeholder engagement based on the priorities and the needs of the State.

Specific to target setting, continued review and evaluation against targets, and the development of the SPP, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as general supervision, monitoring, infrastructure, intervention, and improvement activities relating to the improvement plan. This group includes approximately 30 members representing key perspectives or roles. Members represent parents, teachers, related service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple meetings to provide thoughtful input to the important work that has focused on improving results for children and youth with disabilities and their families.

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) consists of 17 governor-appointed members from around the state representing parents, general and special educators, consumers, and other special education liaisons. The majority of members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the Texas Education Agency (TEA) of unmet needs within the state in the education of children with disabilities; comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by the state regarding the education of children with disabilities; advise TEA in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary of Education under Section 1418 of IDEA 20 U.S.C. §1418; advise TEA in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in federal monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA; and advise TEA in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.

The CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.

The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes>. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year. A comprehensive description of revisions that the State has made to targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17 are included in the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The SSIP is linked on the State's Indicator 17 webpage <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/state-systemic-improvement-plan>.

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

YES

Number of Parent Members:

20

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.

In Texas, the State Advisory Panel required under 20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(21) is called the Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC). State law (Texas Education Code 29.006) requires the appointment by the Governor of 17 members, to include those that are required by the federal statute. In addition to the requirements for the panel as prescribed under 20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(21)(D), state law requires the CAC to submit a report to the state legislature by January 1 of each odd-numbered year with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education. The CAC is also charged

by state law to hold their meetings publicly in accordance with the state's Open Meetings Act, provide a procedure for members of the public to speak at committee meetings, and encourage public participation.

For more information on the CAC, its mandate, membership, and meeting schedule or minutes, go to: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education>.

The Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as an external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as general supervision, monitoring, infrastructure, intervention, and improvement activities relating to the improvement plan. This group includes members representing key perspectives or roles, including parents, teachers, related service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institution representatives, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups.

Parents in these groups are encouraged to engage both as members of their respective committees and as private citizens. Additionally, all members of the public have access to a general special education inbox, and suggestions and comments are sent to appropriate agency staff to review.

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.

Regional ESCs play an important role in the special education TA infrastructure by providing training and TA for parents, LEAs, and other community stakeholders to help meet requirements, including SPP targets, and purposes of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Each ESC develops an annual regional special education continuous improvement plan (SECIP). This plan describes regionally developed improvement activities based on SPP progress or slippage. Moreover, ESCs support the dissemination of statewide information to LEAs and throughout Texas.

The State recognizes that families play an integral role in the education of their children and is committed to providing parents with understandable information to help them to engage meaningfully with their schools. The State's website SPED Family Resources, (<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/sped-family-resources-0>), provides information concerning resources and training for families of students with disabilities, general resources for families and SPEDTEX, a one stop shop for all the information and supports for families of students with disabilities.

The Texas Special Education Information Center, which is referred to as SPEDTEX, works with stakeholders to provide resources and facilitate collaboration that supports the development and delivery of services to children with disabilities in our State with a focus on school, family, and community engagement. SPEDTEX provides resources and interactive features for increasing family awareness of disabilities and special education processes, with the goal of improving partnerships between schools and families. A link to the SPEDTEX website is required on every LEA website across Texas. There are opportunities for stakeholders, including families, to opt in to multiple engagements throughout the year with SPEDTEX, including a series of family-centered webinars and focus groups, presented in English and Spanish, and the My SPEDTEX portal, which includes a unique feature for families that provides timely information to them based on the date entered for their child's most recent annual ARD meeting and their most recent evaluation or reevaluation meeting. Stakeholders also can join a mailing list to receive the monthly SPEDTEX newsletter, featuring topics identified through recent SPEDTEX inquiry trends and other data gathered by state, regional, and national organizations that may benefit families. There are over 7,000 recipients of the SPEDTEX newsletter.

The website (<https://www.SPEDTEX.org/>) is a mobile friendly resource for parents and stakeholders. It provides information regarding Special Education Supplemental Services, a Resource Locator, Parent Involvement Survey results, and information on conferences and events. The website and parent accounts can be viewed both in English and Spanish.

The State uses information from the SPEDTEX Data Dashboard to determine the focus of webinars each year. The State intends to increase capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities by providing resources such as:

- Statewide webinars, (including but not limited to: Families New to Special Education, Requesting an Initial Evaluation for Special Education, Admission Review and Dismissal Committee Meeting Process, My First ARD Meeting, and the Special Education Complaints Process located at <https://www.SPEDTEX.org/families/overview-special-education-process-essentials-parents>).
- Information about the special education process, including the laws associated with special education, the evaluation process, and dispute resolution systems;
- Description of the thirteen qualifying disabilities under special education;
- Frequently asked questions, which are adjusted periodically based on the common questions received; and
- Specific information for families who are new to special education.

Additionally the website provides downloadable links to the State's Procedural Safeguards and the Parent's Guide to the ARD Process, which are accessible in 27 languages.

Also included in the State's efforts to increase capacity, all LEAs receive a comprehensive special education program review within a six-year cycle. As part of that process, electronic surveys are provided to various stakeholders, which include parents and other family members. The parent and other family member electronic surveys are available in English, Spanish, Arabic, Chinese, Filipino, Vietnamese and Burmese. LEAs are provided with the number of responses from parents and family members throughout their program review so they may reach out to parents and other family members reminding and encouraging them to provide feedback. LEAs are also encouraged to allow parents and other family members to utilize school computers in computer labs or libraries to complete the surveys.

In certain cases, additional interviews are conducted with stakeholders, including parents and other family members. Translators are utilized for interviews where necessary.

Soliciting Public Input:

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

Specific to target setting, continued review and evaluation against targets, and the development of the SPP, are the responsibility of the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC). The TCISC serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as general supervision, monitoring, infrastructure, intervention, and improvement activities relating to the improvement plan. TCISC meets a minimum of three times a year, State agency staff presents data, reviews targets, describes the data gathering system or any other agenda items the TCISC requests. This group includes members representing key perspectives or roles, including parents, teachers, related service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC members provide thoughtful input to the important work that has focused on improving results for children and youth with disabilities and their families. The agency

is currently exploring ways to make the work of the TCISC more readily available to the public so that more community members can provide input on areas that the TCISC is taking under advisement.

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) consists of 17 governor-appointed members from around the state representing parents, general and special educators, consumers, and other special education liaisons. The majority of members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year. This group specifically advises TEA of unmet needs; comments publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by the state; advises TEA in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary of Education under IDEA 20 U.S.C. §1418; advises TEA in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in federal monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA and advises TEA in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities. The meetings, agendas, and minutes of the CAC are accessible on the agency's website.

All members of the public have access to a general special education inbox, and suggestions and comments are sent to appropriate agency staff to review.

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.

The State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) contains a comprehensive review of target setting, an overview of evaluation activities, measures, and student outcomes. Additionally, improvement strategies, evidenced-based practices, infrastructure improvement strategies, and changes to implementation and improvement strategies are updated and reported annually. Progress in implementing the SSIP, data on implementation and outcomes, data quality issues, progress toward achieving intended improvements and plans for the future are all included in the SSIP. The SSIP is publicly available on the TEA website at: <https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/2020-ssip-submission-feb1-2022.pdf>.

The State leverages several opportunities to gather feedback from stakeholders. This feedback is utilized to inform processes and identify needed TA across the State.

For example, additional questions are included in the SPPI 8 Parent Involvement survey to inform needs across the state. The SPPI 8 comprehensive report is published annually on the Parent Involvement Survey webpage located on the SPEDTX platform: <https://www.spedtx.org/parent-involvement-survey>

Additionally, when LEAs participate in the cyclical desk review process, the TEA provides a survey of stakeholders which includes parents/families, general educators, special educators, assessment staff and administrators in order to gather additional information regarding the implementation of programs and services. At the conclusion of cyclical monitoring, individual LEA reports are available on the Cyclical Monitoring Reports webpage within 30 calendar days of the conclusion of the LEA's monitoring. <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/cyclical-monitoring-reports>

The State also contracted with a 3rd party to conduct a special education performance alignment study based on a comprehensive external stakeholder data collection effort and an internal scan of TEA policies and procedures. The evaluation team collected data related to the alignment of special education initiatives and policies, communications, and collaboration across system stakeholders (e.g., TEA, regional ESCs, Technical Assistance Networks (Networks), and local education agencies (LEAs) – both central office and campus leaders). This report is available on the State's Special Education Third Party Audit webpage: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/special-education-third-party-audit>

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2020 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 2020 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 2020 APR in 2022, is available.

A complete copy of the most recently submitted and accepted SPP and APR is available on the TEA State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report webpage (<https://tea.texas.gov/reports-and-data/data-submission/state-performance-plan>). TEA publicly reports district performance against state targets in the SPP for Indicators 1-14 for a given year on its District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report webpage (<https://rptsrv1.tea.texas.gov/idea/index.html>). Each spring, no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its APR, TEA produces a District Profile of SPP Indicators Report for each district in the State as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A). This system is evolving through ongoing projects resulting in a new platform for LEA public reporting that will include interactive and dynamic dashboards in the next SPP cycle.

The TEA Federal and State Reporting webpage provides the most up to date data related to special education performance and compliance in Texas public schools (<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports>).

The Texas Student Data System (TSDS) is a statewide system that has modernized and improved the quality of data collection, management, and reporting in Texas education. TSDS replaces and expands on the existing Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS), which is one of the largest education databases in the world. Local education agencies (LEAs) load data to the TSDS PEIMS repository from their local systems. This data is moved to other reporting systems used to create reports that provide information about a variety of topics, such as assessment results, prekindergarten and kindergarten readiness skills, college admissions and graduation, and spending and implementation of legislation.

The Results Driven Accountability (RDA) reporting system is the public report used to evaluate LEAs in special population program performance areas. District, regional and state, RDA data and reports are available on the Results Driven Accountability Data and Reports webpage (<https://tea.texas.gov/student-assessment/monitoring-and-interventions/rda/results-driven-accountability-data-and-reports>). This data-driven-monitoring report is a coordinated function of TEA's Department of Review and Support, Department of Performance Reporting, and the Division of Special Education Program Reporting. The data system generates annual publicly facing reports used to evaluate the annual performance of LEA special population program areas. The RDA manual, a Texas statutory requirement, is used as a comprehensive technical resource designed to explain indicators and reports. The current and previous years manuals are available on the RDA and PBMAS Manuals webpage (<https://tea.texas.gov/student-assessment/monitoring-and-interventions/rda/rda-and-pbmas-manuals>).

At the conclusion of cyclical monitoring, individual LEA reports are available on the Cyclical Monitoring Reports webpage within 30 calendar days of the conclusion of the LEA's monitoring. These reports remain available for six years and are updated when LEAs participate in their next cyclical monitoring.

<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/cyclical-monitoring-reports>

The SPPI 8 Parent Involvement reports are published annually going back to 2015-2016 the Parent Involvement Survey webpage located on the SPEDTX platform: <https://www.spedtx.org/parent-involvement-survey>

The results of SPPI 14 report for the last four years are available on the Texas Transition webpage: https://www.texastransition.org/apps/pages/index.jsp?uREC_ID=2148707&type=d&pREC_ID=2182542

The report from the Third Party Audit is available on the State's Special Education Third Party Audit webpage: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/special-education-third-party-audit>

Additionally, all 20 ESCs maintain websites to provide regional as well as statewide information and data. The links to these can be found on the TEA Education Service Centers Map webpage (<https://tea.texas.gov/about-tea/other-services/education-service-centers/education-service-centers-map>).

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2022 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, 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 2020 SPP/APR

Four members of the Texas Education Agency attended the Interactive Institute in June of 2022.

Six members of the Texas Education Agency (including 3 three in senior leadership positions) attended the NASDE 54th Annual Conference and Business Meeting in September 2022.

Three members of the Texas Education Agency directly involved in the SPP/APR data gathering and submission attended the SPP/APR Summit in November 2022.

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) has been meeting with Texas monthly and provided feedback which has been incorporated into the Dyslexia Handbook and implementation work.

Additionally, the Texas SPP Data Manager and Coordinator are part of the IDC Data Manager support group.

Texas has also utilized their state liaison to assist with SPP/APR submission and IDC reviewed and offered suggestions.

Information from these conferences and conversations assisted the agency regarding target setting, explaining the purpose and impact of the SPP indicators, and improving communication across the Texas Education Agency, local education agencies, and families.

Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2021 and 2022 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2022 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, 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. The State provided the required information.

Intro - Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2022 and 2023 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2023 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 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, 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.

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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), 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 Data¹

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	44.77%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	88.00%	88.50%	88.50%	90.00%	44.77%
Data	77.87%	77.41%	77.86%	77.9%. ²	44.77%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	45.00%	46.00%	47.00%	48.00%	50.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Historically, Texas has solicited broad stakeholder input using the TCIP model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, public hearings, and stakeholder meetings. A systematic approach for obtaining stakeholder participation is used to ensure feedback that is truly representative of the state's geographic and ethnic diversity. This systematic approach includes a recruitment plan designed to ensure that stakeholders from diverse roles provide input representative to the state. The diverse roles included in all advisory or informal stakeholder groups are typically parents, teachers, campus and school district administrators, parent-support and advocacy groups, higher education institutions, Education Service Centers (ESCs), related service and support staff, and other state agencies.

The technical assistance networks and initiatives also support stakeholder involvement as part of their included project metrics to continuously inform and drive technical assistance needs in the State.

All 20 regions are represented within the various advisory and workgroups that constitute broad stakeholder input. TEA routinely reviews group memberships to keep current and contacts various internal and external entities seeking recommendations to fill vacancies.

TEA continues to employ the TCIP model and expand opportunities for stakeholder engagement based on the priorities and the needs of the State.

Specific to target setting, continued review and evaluation against targets, and the development of the SPP, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as general supervision, monitoring, infrastructure, intervention, and improvement activities relating to the improvement plan. This group includes approximately 30 members representing key perspectives or roles. Members represent parents, teachers, related service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple meetings to provide thoughtful input to the important work that has focused on improving results for children and youth with disabilities and their families.

¹ Prior to the FFY 2020 submission, the State used a different data source to report data under this indicator.

² Percentage blurred due to privacy protection.

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) consists of 17 governor-appointed members from around the state representing parents, general and special educators, consumers, and other special education liaisons. The majority of members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the Texas Education Agency (TEA) of unmet needs within the state in the education of children with disabilities; comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by the state regarding the education of children with disabilities; advise TEA in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary of Education under Section 1418 of IDEA 20 U.S.C. §1418; advise TEA in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in federal monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA; and advise TEA in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.

The CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.

The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes>. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year. A comprehensive description of revisions that the State has made to targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17 are included in the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The SSIP is linked on the State's Indicator 17 webpage <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/state-systemic-improvement-plan>.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	17,057
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	13,766
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	129
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	5,910

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
17,057	36,862	44.77%	45.00%	46.27%	Met target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

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

The conditions for earning a high school diploma for youth are provided in Title 19 of the Texas Administrative Code (TAC) Chapter 74 Curriculum Requirements, Subchapter B Graduation Requirements

[https://texreg.sos.state.tx.us/public/readtac\\$ext.ViewTAC?tac_view=5&ti=19&pt=2&ch=74&sch=B&rl=Y](https://texreg.sos.state.tx.us/public/readtac$ext.ViewTAC?tac_view=5&ti=19&pt=2&ch=74&sch=B&rl=Y)

To receive a high school diploma in the State, a student must meet the requirements of the foundation high school program. A student must also complete the state testing requirements. Additionally, a student must demonstrate proficiency, determined by each individual LEA, in certain communication skills.

Beginning with students in grade 12 in the 2021-2022 school year, graduation eligibility also requires, with certain exceptions, the student's completion of the free application for federal student aid (FAFSA) or a Texas application for state financial aid (TASFA).

The foundation high school program consists of four main pieces: the minimum requirements to complete the foundation high school program (22 credits), the requirements to earn an endorsement, the requirements to earn a distinguished level of achievement, and the requirements to earn performance acknowledgments. Students entering high school are required to begin pursuit of a diploma with an endorsement, which requires completion of 26 credits, and can only opt-out of an endorsement when certain conditions apply. Endorsements available to students include science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM); business and industry; public services; arts and humanities; and multidisciplinary studies. The distinguished level of achievement includes the earning of an endorsement and completion of four credits in science and four in math. Finally, a student can earn performance acknowledgments for performance in dual credit courses, bilingualism and biliteracy, on advanced placement or international

baccalaureate tests, on college preparation tests, or in earning a business or industry certification,

19 TAC Chapter 89 Adaptations for Special Populations, Subchapter AA, Commissioner's Rules Concerning Special Education Services, Division 2 Clarification of Provisions in Federal Regulations, Rule 89.1070 Graduation Requirements provides additional clarification for students receiving special education services.

[https://texreg.sos.state.tx.us/public/readtac\\$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=19&pt=2&ch=89&rl=1070](https://texreg.sos.state.tx.us/public/readtac$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=19&pt=2&ch=89&rl=1070).

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)

Additional information and resources may be found on the State's SPPI 1 Graduation Rate website <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/graduation-information/state-graduation-requirements>

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

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

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.

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

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.

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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target.

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.

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.

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.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data³

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	13.41%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	2.00%	1.90%	1.80%	1.80%	13.41%
Data	1.96%	1.82%	1.93%	1.85%	13.41%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	13.00%	12.00%	11.00%	10.00%	9.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Historically, Texas has solicited broad stakeholder input using the TCIP model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, public hearings, and stakeholder meetings. A systematic approach for obtaining stakeholder participation is used to ensure feedback that is truly representative of the state's geographic and ethnic diversity. This systematic approach includes a recruitment plan designed to ensure that stakeholders from diverse roles provide input representative to the state. The diverse roles included in all advisory or informal stakeholder groups are typically parents, teachers, campus and school district administrators, parent-support and advocacy groups, higher education institutions, Education Service Centers (ESCs), related service and support staff, and other state agencies.

The technical assistance networks and initiatives also support stakeholder involvement as part of their included project metrics to continuously inform and drive technical assistance needs in the State.

All 20 regions are represented within the various advisory and workgroups that constitute broad stakeholder input. TEA routinely reviews group memberships to keep current and contacts various internal and external entities seeking recommendations to fill vacancies.

TEA continues to employ the TCIP model and expand opportunities for stakeholder engagement based on the priorities and the needs of the State.

Specific to target setting, continued review and evaluation against targets, and the development of the SPP, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as general supervision, monitoring, infrastructure, intervention, and improvement activities relating to the improvement plan. This group includes approximately 30 members representing key perspectives or roles. Members represent parents, teachers, related service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple meetings to provide thoughtful input to the important work that has focused on improving results for children and youth with disabilities and their families.

³ Prior to the FFY 2020 submission, the State used a different data source to report data under this indicator.

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) consists of 17 governor-appointed members from around the state representing parents, general and special educators, consumers, and other special education liaisons. The majority of members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the Texas Education Agency (TEA) of unmet needs within the state in the education of children with disabilities; comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by the state regarding the education of children with disabilities; advise TEA in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary of Education under Section 1418 of IDEA 20 U.S.C. §1418; advise TEA in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in federal monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA; and advise TEA in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.

The CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.

The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes>. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year. A comprehensive description of revisions that the State has made to targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17 are included in the State Systemic Improvement Plan(SSIP). The SSIP is linked on the State's Indicator 17 webpage <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/state-systemic-improvement-plan>.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	17,057
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	13,766
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	129
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	5,910

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
5,910	36,862	13.41%	13.00%	16.03%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

As the State transitioned back to in-school instruction during the 2020-2021 school year, schools in various parts of the state struggled to locate previous students. As documented throughout the country, students with disabilities experienced significant health, safety, and academic impacts from the COVID-19 pandemic. The state overall experienced a slightly higher dropout rate for the 2020-2021 school year as compared to the previous school year. Similarly, the dropout rate for students with disabilities increased. Schools continue to utilize federal, state, and local funding to locate students who did not return to ensure they are aware of their right to continue their education.

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

A dropout is a student aged 14-21 who is enrolled in public school, does not return to public school the following fall, and did not exit special education through any of the other means.

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)

Additional information and resources may be found on the State's SPPI 2 Dropout Rate website: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/dropout-rate>

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

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	87.82%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	80.65%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	74.25%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	88.21%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	81.85%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	85.18%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Historically, Texas has solicited broad stakeholder input using the TCIP model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, public hearings, and stakeholder meetings. A systematic approach for obtaining stakeholder participation is used to ensure feedback that is truly representative of the state's geographic and ethnic diversity. This systematic approach includes a recruitment plan designed to ensure that stakeholders from diverse roles provide input representative to the state. The diverse roles included in all advisory or informal stakeholder groups are typically parents, teachers, campus and school district administrators, parent-support and advocacy groups, higher education institutions, Education Service Centers (ESCs), related service and support staff, and other state agencies.

The technical assistance networks and initiatives also support stakeholder involvement as part of their included project metrics to continuously inform and drive technical assistance needs in the State.

All 20 regions are represented within the various advisory and workgroups that constitute broad stakeholder input. TEA routinely reviews group

memberships to keep current and contacts various internal and external entities seeking recommendations to fill vacancies.

TEA continues to employ the TCIP model and expand opportunities for stakeholder engagement based on the priorities and the needs of the State.

Specific to target setting, continued review and evaluation against targets, and the development of the SPP, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as general supervision, monitoring, infrastructure, intervention, and improvement activities relating to the improvement plan. This group includes approximately 30 members representing key perspectives or roles. Members represent parents, teachers, related service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple meetings to provide thoughtful input to the important work that has focused on improving results for children and youth with disabilities and their families.

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) consists of 17 governor-appointed members from around the state representing parents, general and special educators, consumers, and other special education liaisons. The majority of members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the Texas Education Agency (TEA) of unmet needs within the state in the education of children with disabilities; comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by the state regarding the education of children with disabilities; advise TEA in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary of Education under Section 1418 of IDEA 20 U.S.C. §1418; advise TEA in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in federal monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA; and advise TEA in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.

The CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.

The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes>. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year. A comprehensive description of revisions that the State has made to targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17 are included in the State Systemic Improvement Plan(SSIP). The SSIP is linked on the State's Indicator 17 webpage <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/state-systemic-improvement-plan>.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

04/05/2023

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	56,830	48,494	78,805
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	6,855	3,555	4,866
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	43,001	38,226	58,683
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	6,404	5,794	6,006

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

04/05/2023

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	56,772	50,524	65,013
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	6,645	4,148	5,081
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	43,213	39,753	51,357

d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	6,408	5,803	5,993
---	-------	-------	-------

*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 pre-filled data in this indicator.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	56,260	56,830	87.84%	95.00%	99.00%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	47,575	48,494	80.66%	95.00%	98.10%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	69,555	78,805	74.28%	95.00%	88.26%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	56,266	56,772	88.21%	95.00%	99.11%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	49,704	50,524	81.85%	95.00%	98.38%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	62,431	65,013	85.18%	95.00%	96.03%	Met target	No Slippage

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.

The State makes available to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children with regard to participation in regular assessments and alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards. Because the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR®) revisions have provided accommodations for all students, with or without an IEP, based on expanded embedded and allowable accommodations, and is not reported publicly for nondisabled children, the state only tracks and reports on the number of students with disabilities provided accommodations in its federal reports ED Facts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589, and ED Facts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588, and provides secure detailed data files to the LEAs which includes participation and performance results and data including accommodations provided. For more information of what the secure student files reported to LEAs include see <https://www.texasassessment.gov/-/media/project/client-portals/texas/pdf/assessment-data-file-formats/taar-3-8-reporting-student-data-file-format.pdf>

Additional information regarding the expanded embedded and allowable accommodations for all students can be seen at:

<https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/combined-accommodation-policy-docs.pdf>

Inclusive public reporting:

https://rptsrv1.tea.texas.gov/cgi/sas/broker?_service=marykay&_program=perf rept.perfmast.sas&_debug=0&lev=S&prgopt=reports/tapr/performance.sas

Campus, district, region, and state level reporting:

https://rptsrv1.tea.texas.gov/cgi/sas/broker?_service=marykay&_program=perf rept.perfmast.sas&_debug=0&lev=S&prgopt=reports/tapr/performance.sas

The webpage, STAAR Statewide Summary Reports, (<https://tea.texas.gov/student-assessment/testing/taar/taar-statewide-summary-reports>), contains a link to the STAAR Statewide Summary Reports 2021-2022, (<https://tea.texas.gov/student-assessment/testing/taar/taar-statewide-summary-reports-2021-2022>), webpage. This webpage has links to the reports below. Each report includes the number of students receiving special education services participating in the STAAR and the results.

Summer 2022 end-of-course reports.

- English I and English II

- Algebra I

- Biology

- U.S. History

Spring 2022 end-of-course reports.

- English I and English II

- Algebra I

- Biology
 - U.S. History
- Spring 2022 3–8 reports.
- Grade 3, Grade 3 - Spanish, Grade 3 - Combined
 - Grade 4, Grade 4 – Spanish, Grade 4 - Combined
 - Grade 5, Grade 5 – Spanish, Grade 5 - Combined
 - Grade 6, Grade 7, Grade 8
- Fall 2021 end-of-course reports.
- English I, English II
 - Algebra I
 - Biology
 - U.S. History

The number of children participating in regular assessments, who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) can be found on the State Performance Plan Indicator 3 webpage, (<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/participation-and-performance-rates-on-state-assessments>).

2022 STAAR Assessments with Accommodations, (<https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/2022-staar-assessments-with-accommodations.pdf>). State, district, and campus level STAAR Alt 2 participation number and results can be found Group Summary Performance Levels, (<https://txreports.emetric.net/>). The assessment type state, district or LEA name or campus name must be selected to run each individual LEA STAAR Alt 2 results.

STAAR 3-8 Alternate 2, State, 2022
 STAAR EOC Alternate 2, State, 2022, Biology
 STAAR EOC Alternate 2, State, 2022, Algebra I
 STAAR EOC Alternate 2, State, 2022, English I
 STAAR EOC Alternate 2, State, 2022, English II
 STAAR EOC Alternate 2, State, 202, U.S. History

The state level STAAR Alt 2 Statewide Summary Reports 2021-2022, (<https://tea.texas.gov/student-assessment/testing/staar-alternate/staar-alternate-2-statewide-summary-reports-2021-2022>), webpage has the below reports posted.

STAAR Alt 2 Reading and Math 3rd grade
 STAAR Alt 2 Reading, Math and Writing 4th grade
 STAAR Alt 2 Reading, Math and Science 5th grade
 STAAR Alt 2 Reading and Math 6th grade
 STAAR Alt 2 Reading, Math and Writing 7th grade
 STAAR Alt 2 Reading and Math 8th grade
 STAAR Alt 2 English 1 and English 2 End of Course
 STAAR Alt 2 Algebra 1, Biology and U.S. History

Additionally, District level STAAR Alt 2 participation rates may be found in each districts' Results Driven Accountability report. Reports for each LEA are available on the RDA-District Reports webpage, <https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/pbm/distrpts.html>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Additional information and resources may be found on the State's SPPI 3 Participation and Performance Rates on State Assessments webpage: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/participation-and-performance-rates-on-state-assessments>

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2022 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2020, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

A comprehensive list of webpages with links was provided to OSEP showing where statewide assessments for children with disabilities can be found including instructions on how to find specific information and run any of the publicly available reports in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f).

Weblinks for FFY 2021 are included which provides instructions on how to run different reports and descriptions of the assessments listed on each page are included.

3A - OSEP Response

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	11.83%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	10.04%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	10.49%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	13.25%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	10.96%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	10.28%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	14.00%	20.00%	25.00%	30.00%	40.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	12.00%	18.00%	25.00%	30.00%	40.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	12.00%	18.00%	25.00%	30.00%	40.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	19.00%	23.00%	25.00%	30.00%	40.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	20.00%	23.00%	25.00%	30.00%	40.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	17.00%	23.00%	25.00%	30.00%	40.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Historically, Texas has solicited broad stakeholder input using the TCIP model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, public hearings, and stakeholder meetings. A systematic approach for obtaining stakeholder participation is used to ensure feedback that is truly representative of the state's geographic and ethnic diversity. This systematic approach includes a recruitment plan designed to ensure that stakeholders from diverse roles provide input representative to the state. The diverse roles included in all advisory or informal stakeholder groups are typically parents, teachers, campus and school district administrators, parent-support and advocacy groups, higher education institutions, Education Service Centers (ESCs), related service and support staff, and other state agencies.

The technical assistance networks and initiatives also support stakeholder involvement as part of their included project metrics to continuously inform and drive technical assistance needs in the State.

All 20 regions are represented within the various advisory and workgroups that constitute broad stakeholder input. TEA routinely reviews group memberships to keep current and contacts various internal and external entities seeking recommendations to fill vacancies.

TEA continues to employ the TCIP model and expand opportunities for stakeholder engagement based on the priorities and the needs of the State.

Specific to target setting, continued review and evaluation against targets, and the development of the SPP, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as general supervision, monitoring, infrastructure, intervention, and improvement activities relating to the improvement plan. This group includes approximately 30 members representing key perspectives or roles. Members represent parents, teachers, related service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple meetings to provide thoughtful input to the important work that has focused on improving results for children and youth with disabilities and their families.

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) consists of 17 governor-appointed members from around the state representing parents, general and special educators, consumers, and other special education liaisons. The majority of members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the Texas Education Agency (TEA) of unmet needs within the state in the education of children with disabilities; comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by the state regarding the education of children with disabilities; advise TEA in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary of Education under Section 1418 of IDEA 20 U.S.C. §1418; advise TEA in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in federal monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA; and advise TEA in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.

The CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.

The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes>. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year. A comprehensive description of revisions that the State has made to targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17 are included in the State Systemic Improvement Plan(SSIP). The SSIP is linked on the State's Indicator 17 webpage <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/state-systemic-improvement-plan>.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

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	49,856	41,781	63,549
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4,391	1,788	1,479
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	6,366	4,826	4,769

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

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	49,858	43,901	56,438
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no	3,604	1,751	1,085

accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4,229	3,576	4,832

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	10,757	49,856	11.83%	14.00%	21.58%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	6,614	41,781	10.04%	12.00%	15.83%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	6,248	63,549	10.49%	12.00%	9.83%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

As schools readjusted to full-time in-person instruction in the 2021-2022 school year, the state focused on closing the learning loss experienced by students caused by the pandemic. The State has invested significant resources into closing those achievement gaps. Additionally, state law was revised in 2021 to put a significant emphasis on students who do not meet proficiency on state assessments by prescribing elements of accelerated instruction. As those resources will take time to determine whether they were successful, the State did see a decline in the proficiency percentage for students with disabilities in high school reading for the 2021-2022 school year. The state as a whole experienced a decline in proficiency as well. In recent years, state law has been amended to require new elements in the state assessments; this includes embedding writing elements into reading assessments and transitioning to online testing. Those changes have been occurring incrementally, with full implementation of online testing in the 2022-2023 school year.

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	7,833	49,858	13.25%	19.00%	15.71%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	5,327	43,901	10.96%	20.00%	12.13%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	5,917	56,438	10.28%	17.00%	10.48%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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.

The State Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR®) revisions have provided accommodations for all students, with or without an IEP, based on expanded embedded and allowable accommodations, and is not reported publicly for nondisabled children, the state only tracks and reports on the number of students with disabilities provided accommodations in its federal reports EDfacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589, and EDfacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588, and provides secure detailed data files to the LEAs which includes participation and performance results and data including accommodations provided. For more information of what the secure student files reported to LEAs include see <https://www.texasassessment.gov/-/media/project/client-portals/texas/pdf/assessment-data-file-formats/staar-3-8-reporting-student-data-file-format.pdf>

Additional information regarding the expanded embedded and allowable accommodations for all students can be seen at:

<https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/combined-accommodation-policy-docs.pdf>

Inclusive public reporting:

https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/cgi/sas/broker?_service=marykay&_program=perf rept.perfmast.sas&_debug=0&lev=S&prgopt=reports/tapr/performance.sas

Campus, district, region, and state level reporting:

https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/cgi/sas/broker?_service=marykay&_program=perf rept.perfmast.sas&_debug=0&lev=S&prgopt=reports/tapr/performance.sas

The webpage, STAAR Statewide Summary Reports, (<https://tea.texas.gov/student-assessment/testing/taar/taar-statewide-summary-reports>), contains a link to the STAAR Statewide Summary Reports 2021-2022, (<https://tea.texas.gov/student-assessment/testing/taar/taar-statewide-summary-reports-2021-2022>), webpage. This webpage has links to the reports below. Each report includes the number of students receiving special education services participating in the STAAR and the results.

Summer 2022 end-of-course reports.

- English I and English II

- Algebra I

- Biology

- U.S. History

Spring 2022 end-of-course reports.

- English I and English II

- Algebra I

- Biology

- U.S. History

Spring 2022 3–8 reports.

- Grade 3, Grade 3 - Spanish, Grade 3 - Combined

- Grade 4, Grade 4 – Spanish, Grade 4 - Combined

- Grade 5, Grade 5 – Spanish, Grade 5 - Combined

- Grade 6, Grade 7, Grade 8

Fall 2021 end-of-course reports.

- English I, English II

- Algebra I

- Biology

- U.S. History

The number of children participating in regular assessments, who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) can be found on the State Performance Plan Indicator 3 webpage, (<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/participation-and-performance-rates-on-state-assessments>).

2022 STAAR Assessments with Accommodations, (<https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/2022-staar-assessments-with-accommodations.pdf>).

State, district, and campus level STAAR Alt 2 participation number and results can be found Group Summary Performance Levels,

(<https://txreports.emetric.net/>). The assessment type state, district or LEA name or campus name must be selected to run each individual LEA STAAR Alt 2 results.

STAAR 3-8 Alternate 2, State, 2022

STAAR EOC Alternate 2, State, 2022, Biology

STAAR EOC Alternate 2, State, 2022, Algebra I

STAAR EOC Alternate 2, State, 2022, English I

STAAR EOC Alternate 2, State, 2022, English II

STAAR EOC Alternate 2, State, 202, U.S. History

The state level STAAR Alt 2 Statewide Summary Reports 2021-2022, (<https://tea.texas.gov/student-assessment/testing/taar-alternate/taar-alternate-2-statewide-summary-reports-2021-2022>), webpage has the below reports posted.

STAAR Alt 2 Reading and Math 3rd grade

STAAR Alt 2 Reading, Math and Writing 4th grade

STAAR Alt 2 Reading, Math and Science 5th grade

STAAR Alt 2 Reading and Math 6th grade

STAAR Alt 2 Reading, Math and Writing 7th grade

STAAR Alt 2 Reading and Math 8th grade

STAAR Alt 2 English 1 and English 2 End of Course

STAAR Alt 2 Algebra 1, Biology and U.S. History

Additionally, District level STAAR Alt 2 participation rates may be found in each districts' Results Driven Accountability report. Reports for each LEA are available on the RDA-District Reports webpage, (<https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/pbm/distrpts.html>), in section five of the report SPED STAAR Alternate 2 Participation Rate.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Additional information and resources may be found on the State's SPPI 3 Participation and Performance Rates on State Assessments webpage:

<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/participation-and-performance-rates-on-state-assessments>

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

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	85.35%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	94.81%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	94.47%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	92.62%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	95.25%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	91.16%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	91.00%	92.00%	92.00%	93.00%	93.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	93.00%	93.00%	94.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	94.00%	94.00%	95.00%	95.00%	96.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	94.00%	94.00%	95.00%	95.00%	96.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	96.00%	96.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	93.00%	93.00%	94.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Historically, Texas has solicited broad stakeholder input using the TCIP model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, public hearings, and stakeholder meetings. A systematic approach for obtaining stakeholder participation is used to ensure feedback that is truly representative of the state's geographic and ethnic diversity. This systematic approach includes a recruitment plan designed to ensure that stakeholders from diverse roles provide input representative to the state. The diverse roles included in all advisory or informal stakeholder groups are typically parents, teachers, campus and school district administrators, parent-support and advocacy groups, higher education institutions, Education Service Centers (ESCs), related service and support staff, and other state agencies.

The technical assistance networks and initiatives also support stakeholder involvement as part of their included project metrics to continuously inform and drive technical assistance needs in the State.

All 20 regions are represented within the various advisory and workgroups that constitute broad stakeholder input. TEA routinely reviews group memberships to keep current and contacts various internal and external entities seeking recommendations to fill vacancies.

TEA continues to employ the TCIP model and expand opportunities for stakeholder engagement based on the priorities and the needs of the State.

Specific to target setting, continued review and evaluation against targets, and the development of the SPP, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as general supervision, monitoring, infrastructure, intervention, and improvement activities relating to the improvement plan. This group includes approximately 30 members representing key perspectives or roles. Members represent parents, teachers, related service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple meetings to provide thoughtful input to the important work that has focused on improving results for children and youth with disabilities and their families.

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) consists of 17 governor-appointed members from around the state representing parents, general and special educators, consumers, and other special education liaisons. The majority of members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the Texas Education Agency (TEA) of unmet needs within the state in the education of children with disabilities; comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by the state regarding the education of children with disabilities; advise TEA in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary of Education under Section 1418 of IDEA 20 U.S.C. §1418; advise TEA in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in federal monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA; and advise TEA in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.

The CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.

The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes>. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year. A comprehensive description of revisions that the State has made to targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17 are included in the State Systemic Improvement Plan(SSIP). The SSIP is linked on the State's Indicator 17 webpage <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/state-systemic-improvement-plan>.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

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	6,404	5,794	6,006
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	5,618	5,387	5,449

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

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	6,408	5,803	5,993
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate	6,078	5,532	5,596

standards scored at or above proficient			
---	--	--	--

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	5,618	6,404	85.35%	91.00%	87.73%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	5,387	5,794	94.81%	93.00%	92.98%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	5,449	6,006	94.47%	94.00%	90.73%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Students with disabilities were significantly impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic, particularly those with significant cognitive disabilities. As schools readjusted to full-time in-person instruction, schools needed to focus on this transition, including needed mental and emotional health supports and special education and related services that may have been missed during the pandemic. While academics always remains a focus, the State did see some slippage in the proficiency percentages in the alternate assessment for grade 8. IEP teams will continue to discuss accelerated instruction plans for students who did not meet proficiency on the alternate assessment.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

Students with disabilities were significantly impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic, particularly those with significant cognitive disabilities. As schools readjusted to full-time in-person instruction, schools needed to focus on this transition, including needed mental and emotional health supports and special education and related services that may have been missed during the pandemic. While academics always remains a focus, the State did see some slippage in the proficiency percentages in the alternate assessment in high school. IEP teams will continue to discuss accelerated instruction plans for students who did not meet proficiency on the alternate assessment.

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	6,078	6,408	92.62%	94.00%	94.85%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	5,532	5,803	95.25%	95.00%	95.33%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	5,596	5,993	91.16%	93.00%	93.38%	Met target	No Slippage

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.

Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR®) revisions have provided accommodations for all students, with or without an IEP, based on expanded embedded and allowable accommodations, and is not reported publicly for nondisabled children, the state only tracks and reports on the number of students with disabilities provided accommodations in its federal reports ED Facts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589, and ED Facts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588, and provides secure detailed data files to the LEAs which includes participation and performance results and data including

accommodations provided. For more information of what the secure student files reported to districts include see <https://www.texasassessment.gov/-/media/project/client-portals/texas/pdf/assessment-data-file-formats/taar-3-8-reporting-student-data-file-format.pdf>

Additional information regarding the expanded embedded and allowable accommodations for all students can be seen at: <https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/combined-accommodation-policy-docs.pdf>

Inclusive public reporting:

https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/cgi/sas/broker?_service=marykay&_program=perfrep.perfmast.sas&_debug=0&lev=S&prgopt=reports/tapr/performance.sas

Campus, district, region, and state level reporting:

https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/cgi/sas/broker?_service=marykay&_program=perfrep.perfmast.sas&_debug=0&lev=S&prgopt=reports/tapr/performance.sas

The webpage, STAAR Statewide Summary Reports, (<https://tea.texas.gov/student-assessment/testing/taar/taar-statewide-summary-reports>), contains a link to the STAAR Statewide Summary Reports 2021-2022, (<https://tea.texas.gov/student-assessment/testing/taar/taar-statewide-summary-reports-2021-2022>), webpage. This webpage has links to the reports below. Each report includes the number of students receiving special education services participating in the STAAR and the results.

Summer 2022 end-of-course reports.

- English I and English II
- Algebra I
- Biology
- U.S. History

Spring 2022 end-of-course reports.

- English I and English II
- Algebra I
- Biology
- U.S. History

Spring 2022 3–8 reports.

- Grade 3, Grade 3 - Spanish, Grade 3 - Combined
- Grade 4, Grade 4 – Spanish, Grade 4 - Combined
- Grade 5, Grade 5 – Spanish, Grade 5 - Combined
- Grade 6, Grade 7, Grade 8

Fall 2021 end-of-course reports.

- English I, English II
- Algebra I
- Biology
- U.S. History

The number of children participating in regular assessments, who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) can be found on the State Performance Plan Indicator 3 webpage, (<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/participation-and-performance-rates-on-state-assessments>).

2022 STAAR Assessments with Accommodations, (<https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/2022-staar-assessments-with-accommodations.pdf>).

State, district, and campus level STAAR Alt 2 participation number and results can be found Group Summary Performance Levels, (<https://txreports.emetric.net/>). The assessment type state, district or LEA name or campus name must be selected to run each individual LEA STAAR Alt 2 results.

STAAR 3-8 Alternate 2, State, 2022

STAAR EOC Alternate 2, State, 2022, Biology

STAAR EOC Alternate 2, State, 2022, Algebra I

STAAR EOC Alternate 2, State, 2022, English I

STAAR EOC Alternate 2, State, 2022, English II

STAAR EOC Alternate 2, State, 202, U.S. History

The state level STAAR Alt 2 Statewide Summary Reports 2021-2022, (<https://tea.texas.gov/student-assessment/testing/taar-alternate/taar-alternate-2-statewide-summary-reports-2021-2022>), webpage has the below reports posted.

STAAR Alt 2 Reading and Math 3rd grade

STAAR Alt 2 Reading, Math and Writing 4th grade

STAAR Alt 2 Reading, Math and Science 5th grade

STAAR Alt 2 Reading and Math 6th grade

STAAR Alt 2 Reading, Math and Writing 7th grade

STAAR Alt 2 Reading and Math 8th grade

STAAR Alt 2 English 1 and English 2 End of Course

STAAR Alt 2 Algebra 1, Biology and U.S. History

Additionally, District level STAAR Alt participation rates may be found in each districts' Results Driven Accountability report. Reports for each LEA are available on the RDA-District Reports webpage, (<https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/pbm/distrpts.html>), in section five of the report SPED STAAR Alternate 2 Participation Rate.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Additional information and resources may be found on the State's SPPI 3 Participation and Performance Rates on State Assessments webpage: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/participation-and-performance-rates-on-state-assessments>

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2022 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2020, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP

reminds the State that in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

A comprehensive list of webpages with links was provided to OSEP showing where statewide assessments for children with disabilities can be found including instructions on how to find specific information and run any of the publicly available reports in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f).

Weblinks for FFY 2021 are included which provides instructions on how to run different reports and descriptions of the assessments listed on each page are included.

3C - OSEP Response

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 2021-2022 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 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 2021-2022 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 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	23.38
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	35.25
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	37.91
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	20.90
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	32.72
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	26.66

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	23.00	23.00	22.00	21.00	20.00
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	36.00	35.00	34.00	32.00	30.00
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	38.00	37.00	35.00	32.00	30.00
Math	A <=	Grade 4	20.00	20.00	19.00	19.00	18.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	32.00	31.00	30.00	29.00	28.00
Math	C <=	Grade HS	26.00	26.00	25.00	25.00	24.00

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Historically, Texas has solicited broad stakeholder input using the TCIP model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, public hearings, and stakeholder meetings. A systematic approach for obtaining stakeholder participation is used to ensure feedback that is truly representative of the state's geographic and ethnic diversity. This systematic approach includes a recruitment plan designed to ensure that stakeholders from diverse roles provide input representative to the state. The diverse roles included in all advisory or informal stakeholder groups are typically parents, teachers, campus and school district administrators, parent-support and advocacy groups, higher education institutions, Education Service Centers (ESCs), related service and support staff, and other state agencies.

The technical assistance networks and initiatives also support stakeholder involvement as part of their included project metrics to continuously inform and drive technical assistance needs in the State.

All 20 regions are represented within the various advisory and workgroups that constitute broad stakeholder input. TEA routinely reviews group memberships to keep current and contacts various internal and external entities seeking recommendations to fill vacancies.

TEA continues to employ the TCIP model and expand opportunities for stakeholder engagement based on the priorities and the needs of the State.

Specific to target setting, continued review and evaluation against targets, and the development of the SPP, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as general supervision, monitoring, infrastructure, intervention, and improvement activities relating to the improvement plan. This group includes approximately 30 members representing key perspectives or roles. Members represent parents, teachers, related service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple meetings to provide thoughtful input to the important work that has focused on improving results for children and youth with disabilities and their families.

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) consists of 17 governor-appointed members from around the state representing parents, general and special educators, consumers, and other special education liaisons. The majority of members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the Texas Education Agency (TEA) of unmet needs within the state in the education of children with disabilities; comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by the state regarding the education of children with disabilities; advise TEA in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary of Education under Section 1418 of IDEA 20 U.S.C. §1418; advise TEA in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in federal monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA; and advise TEA in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.

The CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.

The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes>. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year. A comprehensive description of revisions that the State has made to targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17 are included in the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The SSIP is linked on the State's Indicator 17 webpage <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/state-systemic-improvement-plan>.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

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	381,532	416,728	570,240
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	49,856	41,781	63,549
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	164,577	212,228	230,635
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	35,620	24,003	26,067
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4,391	1,788	1,479
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	6,366	4,826	4,769

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

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	381,165	481,125	506,414
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	49,858	43,901	56,438
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	128,447	210,158	157,942
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	26,901	21,364	23,156
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3,604	1,751	1,085
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4,229	3,576	4,832

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	21.58%	52.47%	23.38	23.00	30.90	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	15.83%	56.69%	35.25	36.00	40.86	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	9.83%	45.02%	37.91	38.00	35.18	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

The state overall experienced a slight increase in proficiency rates for reading in all grade levels, but only as compared to the large decline in proficiency rates during the 2020-2021 school year. This is likely due to the continued effects of learning loss experienced during the pandemic. The population of Texas students has also seen an increase in mobility since the pandemic, resulting in fewer tests taken in 2022. Further, the 2021-2022 test administration was the first year in which the reading assessment tested all of the revised essential knowledge and skills that were adopted by the State Board of Education in 2017. The state is also transitioning to online assessments and has changed the way it embeds writing skills into the state assessment. While students with disabilities in all grade levels improved their proficiency rates as compared to the 2020-2021 school year, the state did experience slippage in the comparison of proficiency rates in grade 4 reading. The state has recently invested significant resources in tutoring supports for students, including those with disabilities, who do not perform satisfactorily on the state assessments.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

The state overall experienced a slight increase in proficiency rates for reading in all grade levels, but only as compared to the large decline in proficiency rates during the 2020-2021 school year. This is likely due to the continued effects of learning loss experienced during the pandemic. The population of Texas students has also seen an increase in mobility since the pandemic, resulting in fewer tests taken in 2022. Further, the 2021-2022 test administration was the first year in which the reading assessment tested all of the revised essential knowledge and skills that were adopted by the State Board of Education in 2017. The state is also transitioning to online assessments and has changed the way it embeds writing skills into the state assessment. While students with disabilities in all grade levels improved their proficiency rates as compared to the 2020-2021 school year, the state did experience slippage in the comparison of proficiency rates in grade 8 reading. The state has recently invested significant resources in tutoring supports for students, including those with disabilities, who do not perform satisfactorily on the state assessments.

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	15.71%	40.76%	20.90	20.00	25.05	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	12.13%	48.12%	32.72	32.00	35.99	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	10.48%	35.76%	26.66	26.00	25.28	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

The state overall experienced a slight increase in proficiency rates for math in all grade levels, but only as compared to the large decline in proficiency rates during the 2020-2021 school year. This is likely due to the continued effects of learning loss experienced during the pandemic. The population of Texas students has also seen an increase in mobility since the pandemic, resulting in fewer tests taken in 2022. While students with disabilities in all grade levels improved their proficiency rates as compared to the 2020-2021 school year, the state did experience slippage in the comparison of proficiency rates in grade 4 math. The state has recently invested significant resources in tutoring supports for students, including those with disabilities, who do not perform satisfactorily on the state assessments.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

The state overall experienced a slight increase in proficiency rates for math in all grade levels, but only as compared to the large decline in proficiency rates during the 2020-2021 school year. This is likely due to the continued effects of learning loss experienced during the pandemic. The population of Texas students has also seen an increase in mobility since the pandemic, resulting in fewer tests taken in 2022. While students with disabilities in all grade levels improved their proficiency rates as compared to the 2020-2021 school year, the state did experience slippage in the comparison of proficiency rates in grade 8 math. The state has recently invested significant resources in tutoring supports for students, including those with disabilities, who do not perform satisfactorily on the state assessments.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Additional information and resources may be found on the State's SPPI 3 Participation and Performance Rates on State Assessments webpage: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/participation-and-performance-rates-on-state-assessments>

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), 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 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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
2020	28.57%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%
Data	2.29%	1.89%	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	24.00%	23.00%	22.00%	21.00%	20.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Historically, Texas has solicited broad stakeholder input using the TCIP model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, public hearings, and stakeholder meetings. A systematic approach for obtaining stakeholder participation is used to ensure feedback that is truly representative of the state’s geographic and ethnic diversity. This systematic approach includes a recruitment plan designed to ensure that stakeholders from diverse roles provide input representative to the state. The diverse roles included in all advisory or informal stakeholder groups are typically parents, teachers, campus and school district administrators, parent-support and advocacy groups, higher education institutions, Education Service Centers (ESCs), related service and support staff, and other state agencies.

The technical assistance networks and initiatives also support stakeholder involvement as part of their included project metrics to continuously inform and drive technical assistance needs in the State.

All 20 regions are represented within the various advisory and workgroups that constitute broad stakeholder input. TEA routinely reviews group memberships to keep current and contacts various internal and external entities seeking recommendations to fill vacancies.

TEA continues to employ the TCIP model and expand opportunities for stakeholder engagement based on the priorities and the needs of the State.

Specific to target setting, continued review and evaluation against targets, and the development of the SPP, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as general supervision, monitoring, infrastructure, intervention, and improvement activities relating to the improvement plan. This group includes approximately 30 members representing key perspectives or roles. Members represent parents, teachers, related service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple meetings to provide thoughtful input to the important work that has focused on improving results for children and youth with disabilities and their families.

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) consists of 17 governor-appointed members from around the state representing parents, general and special educators, consumers, and other special education liaisons. The majority of members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the Texas Education Agency (TEA) of unmet needs within the state in the education of children with disabilities; comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by the state regarding the education of children with disabilities; advise TEA in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary of Education under Section 1418 of IDEA 20 U.S.C. §1418; advise TEA in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in federal monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA; and advise TEA in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.

The CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.

The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes>. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year. A comprehensive description of revisions that the State has made to targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17 are included in the State Systemic Improvement Plan(SSIP). The SSIP is linked on the State’s Indicator 17 webpage <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/state-systemic-improvement-plan>.

FFY 2021 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.

1,185

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
3	25	28.57%	24.00%	NVR	Met target	No Slippage

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

The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology

The State’s definition of "significant discrepancy" provides that any local education agency (LEA) meeting the State’s established minimum size requirement (MSR) and exceeding the established rate ratio threshold of greater than 3.0 (3 times the rate of non-disabled students) for out of school suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a single school year for children with IEPs would be identified as such. To meet the MSR and be included in this measurement, an LEA must have at least 30 total students served in special education during the school year measured on applicable

attendance reported AND have at least 10 students ages 3-21 served in special education with applicable action codes for out of school suspensions and expulsions that equal more than 10 cumulative school days. If the LEA meets MSR, the rate of students ages 3-21 served in special education with out of school suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days is divided by the rate of all nondisabled students in the same LEA with out of school suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days to determine the rate ratio.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The number of LEAs excluded from the calculation has been corrected. The total number of LEAs used to calculate SPPI 4a was incorrect. TEA will build in a verification process between the data team and the reporting team prior to SPP/APR submission.

Additional information and resources may be found on the State's SPPI 4 Suspension and Expulsion Rates webpage: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/suspension-and-expulsion-rates>

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 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.

All local educational agencies (LEAs) are required to submit their local policies and operating procedures through the state's Legal Framework. Additionally, each LEA is required to complete a self-assessment annually, which includes a review of policies and operating procedures to confirm alignment with law. When significant discrepancy is identified, TEA requires identified LEAs to review policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of individualized education programs (IEPs), to review its use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and to review its procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170. Annually, the agency engages in Results Driven Accountability (RDA), which analyzes district compliance and performance indicators resulting in determination levels. Based on the determination levels, a district may also be required to engage in monitoring activities, including desk reviews and possible onsite reviews as determined by LEA improvement needs. To help support LEAs in the development and implementation of positive behavioral interventions and supports, TEA Special Education technical assistance released the Behavioral Supports and Guidance for Students with Disabilities in October of 2022.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

OSEP cannot determine whether the data are valid and reliable. The State reported that 25 districts met the minimum n size requirement, and 1,185 districts did not meet the minimum n size requirement and were excluded from the calculation. The number of districts excluded from the calculation because they do not meet the minimum "n" size, plus the number of districts that met the State-established minimum "n" size, do not equal the total number of districts the State reported in the FFY 2020 Introduction (which was 1,208). Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

4A - Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2021. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2022 in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), 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 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2020-2021 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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
2020	28.57%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 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.

1,195

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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
8	0	15	0.00%	0%	NVR	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The State's definition of "significant discrepancy" provides that any LEA meeting the State's established minimum size requirement (MSR), including a minimum cell size (10) and a minimum n-size (30), and exceeding the established rate ratio threshold of greater than 3.0 (3 times the rate of non-disabled students) for out of school suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a single school year for children with IEPs in a particular racial/ethnic group would be identified as such. To meet the MSE and be included in this measurement, an LEA must have at least 30 total students in a particular racial/ethnic group served in special education during the school year measured on applicable attendance reported AND have at least 10 students ages 3-21 in the same racial/ethnic group served in special education with applicable action codes for out of school suspensions and expulsions that equal more than 10 cumulative school days. If the LEA meets MSR, the rate of students ages 3-21 in a particular racial/ethnic group served in special education with out of school suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days is divided by the rate of nondisabled students in all racial/ethnic groups in the same LEA with out of school suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days to determine the rate ratio.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The number of LEAs excluded from the calculation has been corrected. The total number of LEAs used to calculate SPPI 4b was incorrect. TEA will build in a verification process between the data team and the reporting team prior to SPP/APR submission.

The data was calculated correctly but the description in the State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology was not described accurately. The description has been corrected.

Additional information and resources may be found on the State's SPPI 4 Suspension and Expulsion Rates webpage: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/suspension-and-expulsion-rates>

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 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.

All local educational agencies (LEAs) are required to submit their local policies and operating procedures through the state's Legal Framework. Additionally, each LEA is required to complete a self-assessment annually, which includes a review of policies and operating procedures to confirm alignment with law. When significant discrepancy is identified, TEA requires identified LEAs to review policies, procedures, and practices related to the

development and implementation of individualized education programs (IEPs), to review its use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and to review its procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170. Annually, the agency engages in Results Driven Accountability (RDA), which analyzes district compliance and performance indicators resulting in determination levels. Based on the determination levels, a district may also be required to engage in monitoring activities, including desk reviews and possible onsite reviews as determined by LEA improvement needs. To support LEAs in their development and implementation of positive behavioral interventions and supports, TEA Special Education technical assistance released the Behavioral Supports and Guidance for Students with Disabilities in October of 2022.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

In reporting its FFY 2021 data in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report the number of districts that were excluded from the calculation because they did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

The number of local education agencies that were excluded from the calculation in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR because they did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement is 1,186 and is included above.

4B - OSEP Response

OSEP cannot determine whether the data are valid and reliable. The State reported that 15 districts met the minimum n size requirement, and 1,195 districts did not meet the minimum n size requirement and were excluded from the calculation. The number of districts excluded from the calculation because they do not meet the minimum “n” size, plus the number of districts that met the State- established minimum “n” size, do not equal the total number of districts the State reported in the FFY 2020 Introduction (which was 1,208). Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

4B- Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2021. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2022 in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	2020	Target >=	67.50%	68.00%	68.00%		71.84%
A	71.84%	Data	68.42%	68.75%	69.45%	71.04%	71.84%
B	2020	Target <=	13.00%	12.50%	12.00%		14.07%
B	14.07%	Data	14.79%	14.94%	14.88%	14.42%	14.07%
C	2020	Target <=	1.30%	1.30%	1.29%		0.80%
C	0.80%	Data	1.15%	1.11%	0.91%	0.84%	0.80%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	73.00%	73.00%	74.00%	74.00%	75.00%
Target B <=	14.00%	13.00%	12.00%	11.00%	10.00%
Target C <=	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	0.79%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Historically, Texas has solicited broad stakeholder input using the TCIP model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, public hearings, and stakeholder meetings. A systematic approach for obtaining stakeholder participation is used to ensure feedback that is truly representative of the state's geographic and ethnic diversity. This systematic approach includes a recruitment plan designed to ensure that stakeholders from diverse roles provide input representative to the state. The diverse roles included in all advisory or informal stakeholder groups are typically parents, teachers, campus and school district administrators, parent-support and advocacy groups, higher education institutions, Education Service Centers (ESCs), related service and support staff, and other state agencies.

The technical assistance networks and initiatives also support stakeholder involvement as part of their included project metrics to continuously inform and drive technical assistance needs in the State.

All 20 regions are represented within the various advisory and workgroups that constitute broad stakeholder input. TEA routinely reviews group memberships to keep current and contacts various internal and external entities seeking recommendations to fill vacancies.

TEA continues to employ the TCIP model and expand opportunities for stakeholder engagement based on the priorities and the needs of the State.

Specific to target setting, continued review and evaluation against targets, and the development of the SPP, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as general supervision, monitoring, infrastructure,

intervention, and improvement activities relating to the improvement plan. This group includes approximately 30 members representing key perspectives or roles. Members represent parents, teachers, related service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple meetings to provide thoughtful input to the important work that has focused on improving results for children and youth with disabilities and their families.

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) consists of 17 governor-appointed members from around the state representing parents, general and special educators, consumers, and other special education liaisons. The majority of members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the Texas Education Agency (TEA) of unmet needs within the state in the education of children with disabilities; comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by the state regarding the education of children with disabilities; advise TEA in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary of Education under Section 1418 of IDEA 20 U.S.C. §1418; advise TEA in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in federal monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA; and advise TEA in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.

The CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.

The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes>. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year. A comprehensive description of revisions that the State has made to targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17 are included in the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The SSIP is linked on the State's Indicator 17 webpage <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/state-systemic-improvement-plan>.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	605,365
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	439,290
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	81,959
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	2,177
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	85
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	3,510

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 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	439,290	605,365	71.84%	73.00%	72.57%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	81,959	605,365	14.07%	14.00%	13.54%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	5,772	605,365	0.80%	1.00%	0.95%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Additional information and resources may be found on the State's SPPI 5 Education Environments (School Age) webpage:
<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/education-environments-school-age>

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

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 = $[(\# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs})] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs})] \times 100$.
- C. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs})] \times 100$.

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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	Target >=	32.50%	33.00%	33.00%		27.05%
A	Data	32.87%	31.79%	32.03%	26.75%	27.05%
B	Target <=	16.00%	15.50%	15.00%		25.70%
B	Data	16.99%	16.88%	17.59%	26.58%	25.70%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Historically, Texas has solicited broad stakeholder input using the TCIP model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, public hearings, and stakeholder meetings. A systematic approach for obtaining stakeholder participation is used to ensure feedback that is truly representative of the state's geographic and ethnic diversity. This systematic approach includes a recruitment plan designed to ensure that stakeholders from diverse roles provide input representative to the state. The diverse roles included in all advisory or informal stakeholder groups are typically parents, teachers, campus and school district administrators, parent-support and advocacy groups, higher education institutions, Education Service Centers (ESCs), related service and support staff, and other state agencies.

The technical assistance networks and initiatives also support stakeholder involvement as part of their included project metrics to continuously inform and drive technical assistance needs in the State.

All 20 regions are represented within the various advisory and workgroups that constitute broad stakeholder input. TEA routinely reviews group memberships to keep current and contacts various internal and external entities seeking recommendations to fill vacancies.

TEA continues to employ the TCIP model and expand opportunities for stakeholder engagement based on the priorities and the needs of the State.

Specific to target setting, continued review and evaluation against targets, and the development of the SPP, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as general supervision, monitoring, infrastructure,

intervention, and improvement activities relating to the improvement plan. This group includes approximately 30 members representing key perspectives or roles. Members represent parents, teachers, related service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple meetings to provide thoughtful input to the important work that has focused on improving results for children and youth with disabilities and their families.

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) consists of 17 governor-appointed members from around the state representing parents, general and special educators, consumers, and other special education liaisons. The majority of members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the Texas Education Agency (TEA) of unmet needs within the state in the education of children with disabilities; comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by the state regarding the education of children with disabilities; advise TEA in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary of Education under Section 1418 of IDEA 20 U.S.C. §1418; advise TEA in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in federal monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA; and advise TEA in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.

The CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.

The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes>. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year. A comprehensive description of revisions that the State has made to targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17 are included in the State Systemic Improvement Plan(SSIP). The SSIP is linked on the State's Indicator 17 webpage <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/state-systemic-improvement-plan>.

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 not used

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

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2020	27.05%
B	2020	25.70%
C	2020	0.85%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	27.00%	27.00%	28.00%	29.00%	30.00%
Target B <=	26.00%	25.00%	24.00%	24.00%	23.00%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	0.85%	0.85%	0.85%	0.85%	0.84%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/06/2022

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	9,562	16,455	3,958	29,975
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the	1,732	4,820	1,292	7,844

majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program				
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	3,755	3,507	714	7,976
b2. Number of children attending separate school	5	9	3	17
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	108	139	32	279

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 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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	7,844	29,975	27.05%	27.00%	26.17%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	7,993	29,975	25.70%	26.00%	26.67%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Home	279	29,975	0.85%	0.85%	0.93%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Additional information and resources may be found on the State's SPPI 6 Preschool Environments webpage: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/preschool-environments>

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A1	2008	Target >=	84.00%	84.00%	85.00%	86.00%	85.00%
A1	73.40%	Data	84.26%	84.81%	84.36%	85.03%	83.77%

A2	2008	Target >=	62.00%	63.00%	63.00%	63.00%	63.00%
A2	62.20%	Data	60.74%	61.04%	59.65%	60.07%	59.21%
B1	2008	Target >=	84.00%	84.00%	85.00%	86.00%	84.00%
B1	67.00%	Data	83.56%	84.41%	84.25%	84.41%	83.37%
B2	2008	Target >=	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	56.00%
B2	52.00%	Data	57.61%	58.51%	56.95%	57.49%	56.21%
C1	2008	Target >=	84.00%	84.00%	85.00%	86.00%	84.00%
C1	72.50%	Data	84.73%	84.86%	84.71%	84.62%	84.02%
C2	2008	Target >=	73.00%	74.00%	74.00%	74.00%	71.00%
C2	73.60%	Data	72.32%	71.65%	71.29%	72.15%	71.10%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	85.00%	86.00%	86.00%	87.00%	87.00%
Target A2 >=	63.00%	63.00%	63.00%	63.00%	64.00%
Target B1 >=	84.00%	85.00%	85.00%	86.00%	86.00%
Target B2 >=	57.00%	57.00%	58.00%	59.00%	60.00%
Target C1 >=	85.00%	85.00%	86.00%	86.00%	87.00%
Target C2 >=	72.00%	72.00%	73.00%	74.00%	75.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Historically, Texas has solicited broad stakeholder input using the TCIP model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, public hearings, and stakeholder meetings. A systematic approach for obtaining stakeholder participation is used to ensure feedback that is truly representative of the state’s geographic and ethnic diversity. This systematic approach includes a recruitment plan designed to ensure that stakeholders from diverse roles provide input representative to the state. The diverse roles included in all advisory or informal stakeholder groups are typically parents, teachers, campus and school district administrators, parent-support and advocacy groups, higher education institutions, Education Service Centers (ESCs), related service and support staff, and other state agencies.

The technical assistance networks and initiatives also support stakeholder involvement as part of their included project metrics to continuously inform and drive technical assistance needs in the State.

All 20 regions are represented within the various advisory and workgroups that constitute broad stakeholder input. TEA routinely reviews group memberships to keep current and contacts various internal and external entities seeking recommendations to fill vacancies.

TEA continues to employ the TCIP model and expand opportunities for stakeholder engagement based on the priorities and the needs of the State.

Specific to target setting, continued review and evaluation against targets, and the development of the SPP, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as general supervision, monitoring, infrastructure, intervention, and improvement activities relating to the improvement plan. This group includes approximately 30 members representing key perspectives or roles. Members represent parents, teachers, related service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple meetings to provide thoughtful input to the important work that has focused on improving results for children and youth with disabilities and their families.

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) consists of 17 governor-appointed members from around the state representing parents, general and special educators, consumers, and other special education liaisons. The majority of members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the Texas Education Agency (TEA) of unmet needs within the state in the education of children with disabilities; comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by the state regarding the education of children with disabilities; advise TEA in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary of Education under Section 1418 of IDEA 20 U.S.C. §1418; advise TEA in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in federal monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA; and advise TEA in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.

The CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.

The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes>. Members of the

committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year. A comprehensive description of revisions that the State has made to targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17 are included in the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The SSIP is linked on the State's Indicator 17 webpage <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/state-systemic-improvement-plan>.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

24,215

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	150	0.62%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	2,864	11.83%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	7,080	29.24%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	8,985	37.11%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	5,136	21.21%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	16,065	19,079	83.77%	85.00%	84.20%	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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	14,121	24,215	59.21%	63.00%	58.32%	Did not meet target	No 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	147	0.61%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	3,115	12.87%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	7,310	30.20%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	9,540	39.42%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	4,091	16.90%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased	16,850	20,112	83.37%	84.00%	83.78%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$							
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. <i>Calculation:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	13,631	24,203	56.21%	57.00%	56.32%	Did not meet target	No 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	166	0.69%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	2,461	10.17%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	4,686	19.36%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	8,922	36.85%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	7,974	32.94%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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. <i>Calculation:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	13,608	16,235	84.02%	85.00%	83.82%	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. <i>Calculation:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	16,896	24,209	71.10%	72.00%	69.79%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
C2	Early education programs continue to experience impacts of COVID-19. Slippage in C2 can at least partially be attributed to the pandemic since many of the students had delayed entries into programs due to the pandemic. Additionally, the need of school systems to provide behavioral supports to students at all grade levels has significantly increased post-pandemic, including those in early education programs. The slippage is reflective of readjustment after experiencing delays in access to programs and to consistent in person instruction.

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.

Based upon the specifics designated within indicator 7 and the requirements to report data for all local education agencies (LEAs), the State uses the Early Childhood Outcome Center's (ECO) Childhood Outcomes Summary (COS) Form to document children's functioning in three outcome areas. The COS form is a template which allows LEA staff to record multiple sources of assessment information regarding a student's level of functioning in each of the prescribed outcome areas. The form also serves as a template for converting individualized assessment data into a consistent system for statewide reporting.

With the COS process, a team of people and parents that are familiar with a child can consider multiple sources of information about his/her functioning, including parent/provider observation and results from any valid, appropriate, and direct assessment. Additionally, the COS process allows early intervention and early childhood special education programs to combine information about children across different assessment tools to produce data that can be summarized across programs in the state.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Additional information and resources may be found on the State's SPPI 7 Preschool Outcomes webpage:
<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/preschool-outcomes>

Upon further investigation some LEAs did not enter data for all three measurements. We determined that the data submitted is accurate. There was a problem with the data entry program. We have worked with the program developers and as of now LEAs will not be able to submit their data if any elements are missing.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

In reporting the percent of preschoolers aged 3 through 5 who were functioning within age expectations in each outcome area by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program, the State reported 24,215 as the denominator in outcome A, 24,203 as the denominator in outcome B, and 24,209 as the denominator in outcome C. Additionally, the State reported 24,215 preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs were assessed. The State explained this discrepancy.

7 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, the State must explain any discrepancies between the FFY 2022 total number assessed and the FFY 2022 denominator in its calculation of the percent of preschoolers aged 3 through 5 who were functioning within age expectations in each outcome area by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

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 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, 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 must consider race/ethnicity. 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 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.

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

Historically, Texas has solicited broad stakeholder input using the TCIP model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, public hearings, and stakeholder meetings. A systematic approach for obtaining stakeholder participation is used to ensure feedback that is truly representative of the state's geographic and ethnic diversity. This systematic approach includes a recruitment plan designed to ensure that stakeholders from diverse roles provide input representative to the state. The diverse roles included in all advisory or informal stakeholder groups are typically parents, teachers, campus and school district administrators, parent-support and advocacy groups, higher education institutions, Education Service Centers (ESCs), related service and support staff, and other state agencies.

The technical assistance networks and initiatives also support stakeholder involvement as part of their included project metrics to continuously inform and drive technical assistance needs in the State.

All 20 regions are represented within the various advisory and workgroups that constitute broad stakeholder input. TEA routinely reviews group memberships to keep current and contacts various internal and external entities seeking recommendations to fill vacancies.

TEA continues to employ the TCIP model and expand opportunities for stakeholder engagement based on the priorities and the needs of the State.

Specific to target setting, continued review and evaluation against targets, and the development of the SPP, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as general supervision, monitoring, infrastructure, intervention, and improvement activities relating to the improvement plan. This group includes approximately 30 members representing key perspectives or roles. Members represent parents, teachers, related service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple meetings to provide thoughtful input to the important work that has focused on improving results for children and youth with disabilities and their families.

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) consists of 17 governor-appointed members from around the state representing parents, general and special educators, consumers, and other special education liaisons. The majority of members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the Texas Education Agency (TEA) of unmet needs within the state in the education of children with disabilities; comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by the state regarding

the education of children with disabilities; advise TEA in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary of Education under Section 1418 of IDEA 20 U.S.C. §1418; advise TEA in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in federal monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA; and advise TEA in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.

The CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.

The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes>. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year. A comprehensive description of revisions that the State has made to targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17 are included in the State Systemic Improvement Plan(SSIP). The SSIP is linked on the State's Indicator 17 webpage <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/state-systemic-improvement-plan>.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	73.04%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	80.00%	80.00%	81.00%	81.00%	73.04%
Data	77.99%	76.40%	76.70%	80.80%	73.04%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	81.00%	81.00%	81.00%	82.00%	82.00%

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
12,909	18,597	73.04%	81.00%	69.41%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The 2021-2022 parent survey represents only the second year of a new sampling approach, shorter survey, and analysis from prior surveys. One possible factor for the decrease is that different districts participate each year in the survey. Additionally, more responses were received this year, which affects the overall mean score. While over 80 percent of parents surveyed reported that they were satisfied with their child's IEP progress and believed that their child is receiving the special education services they need, there is a need for the State and local school systems to analyze the percentages on the other survey questions that lowered the overall mean score. The State will explore ways to coordinate the survey questions with initiatives that school systems can implement in order to ensure parent involvement and satisfaction at each level.

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 State included school age and preschool survey results jointly in the statewide survey results. The survey pulled from a representative database sample including preschool and school aged children. The survey results demonstrate representation across grade levels including preschool. Additional information concerning the survey results across grade levels can be found in the Results of the 2021-2022 Texas Parent Involvement Survey: <https://www.spedtex.org/sites/spedtex.tea.texas.gov/files/2022-10/2021-2022%20Survey%20Results.pdf>

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

90,119

Percentage of respondent parents

20.64%

Response Rate

FFY	2020	2021
Response Rate	18.48%	20.64%

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

To help engage districts and facilitate survey administration, working closely with a district liaison throughout the survey fielding process will be continued. An instructional webinar in advance of the survey launch, which was recorded and hosted by SPEDTex, the Special Education Information Center for Texas has been and will continue to be offered. Engaging in extensive follow-up activities with liaisons at the included districts throughout the survey fielding window, encouraging them to use the response rate dashboard to inform continued outreach. Throughout the survey window direct contact with all included districts, through both phone and email, offering support, highlighting their real-time response rate (in the event that they were not using the dashboard), inquiring about how to help, and continuing to offer to send the invitations directly. Additionally, the ESC Special Education Directors will be encouraged to support the included districts in their regions. Phone calls directly to families for districts asking for survey fielding support will be offered.

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.

Research shows that Hispanics are more likely to refuse to participate in surveys, or having agreed to take a survey, more likely to refuse to answer individual questions under some circumstances. This disproportionate refusal is complicated for many reasons, including language barriers and cultural differences. Additionally, it may be driven by a general suspicion of government, and associating all state agencies with the same suspicion. Hispanics are underrepresented in LEA leadership and the Texas Legislature. Underrepresentation of minorities leads to an underrepresentation of a minority group's priorities and thus impacts participation in state sponsored activities.

The State worked with its contracted vendor to take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote survey response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities. Extensive support was offered to districts in the dissemination of materials. A support line was created that families could use to answer survey questions over the phone in both English and Spanish. Invitations (whether distributed as email, text, or through a flyer) directed families to an online survey which was available in English, Spanish, Vietnamese, French, and Chinese.

The vendor tracked survey responses during the survey period and used a variety of data analysis and tools to detect anomalies to the collection with regard to nonresponse bias, artificial result inflations, and other data patterns that might suggest barriers to parent groups in the state. Where adjustments could be made with respect to outreach to parents, reminders, marketing strategy updates, the contracted vendor committed to reducing any potential bias.

Nonresponse bias was not identified in these results, however, the State recognized that 14 districts had a 0% response rate (an improvement from last year of 26) and continues to identify this as an area targeted with follow-up monitoring efforts via the tie to cyclical reviews post parent survey years.

Include 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. 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.

Comparison of race/ethnicity of students in the responding sample showed that no disproportionality according to the State's definition.

The responding sample was somewhat over-representative of White students (+2.8 percentage points) and under-representative of Hispanic students (-3.0 percentage points). All other racial/ethnic subgroups were represented within two percentage points of their size in the population.

Comparison of primary disability of families of the students in the responding sample did not indicate disproportionality according to the State's definition.

The sample was somewhat over-representative of students with Autism (+3.5 percentage points) and under-representative of students with Learning Disabilities (-3.2 percentage points) — all other differences by subgroup were within two percentage points.

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

YES

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

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

The State considered anything + or - 5% as not representative. Survey results that fell within the +/- 5% are considered representative with regard to race/ethnicity, gender, and disability category. Additional information can be found in the publicly posted 2020-21 Texas Parent Involvement Survey Report located at <https://www.spedtex.org/index.cfm/parent-involvement-survey-results/>.

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.

Districts included in this year's survey were those that were scheduled for Continuous Monitoring and Support site visits in 2019-20 – one year after results from this survey become available – and those that were reviewed in 2020-21. Any district serving over 50,000 students, were added if not already in the list of included districts, for a total of 411 participating districts. From those districts, a stratified random sample of students receiving special education services was utilized, with the aim of sending their parents an invitation to complete a survey. In crafting the student sample, there were two objectives:

1. obtain a representative Indicator 8 result statewide, and
2. collect five or more surveys from each included district to maximize the likelihood that districts would receive results reports.

These two objectives can compete with each other, as increasing the sample in Texas' many small districts can shift the demographics of the statewide sample to be non-representative of statewide population parameters. To offset that disproportionality, we included a higher proportion of students in larger districts. Using this sampling strategy, 90,119 students from 3,209 campuses for the 2021-22 school year were selected. Over 46% of these students were enrolled in 20 of the state's largest districts (and from 1,232 campuses), while 53.7% were enrolled in 391 of the state's smaller districts (and from 1,977 campuses).

To maximize the likelihood that small districts get feedback (five or more parents must respond) more parents in small districts must be included than would otherwise be needed for the statewide sample. If many parents respond in all of Texas' numerous small districts, the statewide sample will demographically become unrepresentative at the statewide level since the demographics of small, often rural, districts are quite different from the demographics of large, often urban, districts in Texas. The research team chose to prioritize the importance of providing feedback to as many districts as possible and therefore sampled more students than otherwise necessary in small districts. To offset the resulting disproportionality, higher proportions of students in larger districts were sampled. Below is the complete set of sampling rules used to create the 2021-22 student sample:

1. Campus inclusion rules: Campuses from included districts were sampled by grade span category (e.g., Elementary, Middle, High, or other grade span groups). Sixty percent of campuses were included, over a one campus minimum, for each grade span category in a district.
2. Student inclusion rules: Students within the campuses sampled were randomly selected. A minimum of 25 percent of students from each included campus were selected.
3. To ensure that each district had at least 100 students selected (to maximize the potential for at least five responses), the following rules were used.

- If a district had 100 or fewer students receiving special education services, all students were included.
- If a district had more than 100 students receiving special education services but 100 or fewer students sampled, additional campuses were sampled, one at a time, until 100 students were included, or all campuses were included.
- If a district had more than 100 students receiving special education services and all campuses were included but 100 or fewer students were included, additional students were sampled from the included campuses until 100 students were included.

To adjust the minimum number of students selected from small districts (again to increase the likelihood that small districts would have a sufficient number of responses to generate a results report), a higher proportion of students at each campus were sampled depending on the total number of students receiving services in each district.

An additional five percent of students receiving services in districts serving between 2,001 and 5,000 students were sampled. An additional 10 percent of students receiving services in districts serving between 5,001 and 10,000 students were sampled and an additional 15 percent of students receiving services in districts serving more than 10,000 students were sampled.

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)

The description of strategies that were implemented to increase response rate year over, for groups that are underrepresented has been edited to accurately and correctly reflect strategies the State took to increase response rates for underrepresented groups.

Working with our TA representative, the Texas Education Agency will examine and update the SPPI 8 sampling methodology. TEA will take the updated methodology to stakeholders for input, update targets if necessary, and resubmit the plan.

Additional information and resources may be found on the State's SPPI 8 Parent Involvement webpage:
<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/parent-involvement>

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8 - OSEP Response

8 - Required Actions

OSEP's response to the State's initial FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission required the State to submit a revised sampling plan for this indicator by June 1, 2023. The State has responded, requesting additional time to submit its revised plan. The State must submit by September 1, 2023 its revised sampling plan that the State plans to use for its FFY 2022 – FFY2025 data collection and indicate how the revised plan addresses the concerns identified in OSEP's evaluation.

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 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 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.

88

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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
17	0	1,122	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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).

The State defines that a local education agency exceeding the State established threshold of 2.5, in a single data year, would be identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups for measurement in SPPI 9. The State applies a risk ratio methodology in calculating an LEA risk for disproportionate representation.

LEAs meeting the minimum size requirements for analysis must have at least thirty (30) students in a particular group denominator, and ten (10) students with disabilities served under IDEA in a particular group numerator to be evaluated. The comparison group rate is comprised of students with disabilities served under IDEA in all other racial or ethnic groups (numerator) divided by the total number of students with disabilities served under IDEA in all other racial or ethnic groups within an LEA (denominator), when calculating the risk ratio.

An alternate risk ratio is applied when the particular target group meets MSR, but the comparison group in the LEA does not meet the MSR requirements. The calculation is performed by dividing the risk of a particular outcome for children with disabilities in one racial or ethnic group within an LEA by the risk of that outcome for children with disabilities in all other racial or ethnic groups in the State. No risk ratio or alternate risk ratio is calculated in a particular category for an LEA if the particular racial or ethnic group being analyzed does not meet the minimum cell size (10) or minimum n-size (30).

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.

Local educational agencies (LEAs) are required to upload their local policies and operating procedures to the state’s Legal Framework. A self-assessment is required annually, which prompts an LEA to confirm their practices are in alignment with law. Additionally, TEA required identified LEAs to review policies, procedures, and practices related to the identification of students with disabilities to ensure compliance with 34 CFR §300.111, 300.201, and §300.301 through §300.311.

Annually, the agency engages in Results Driven Accountability (RDA), which analyzes district compliance and performance indicators resulting in determination levels. Based on the determination levels, a district may also be required to engage in monitoring activities, including desk reviews and possible onsite reviews as determined by LEA improvement needs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The number of LEAs excluded from the calculation has been corrected. The total number of LEAs used to calculate SPPI 9 was incorrect. TEA will build in a verification process between the data team and the reporting team prior to SPP/APR submission.

More information concerning Indicator 9 can be found on the State's Disproportionate Representation in Special Education webpage: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/disproportionate-representation-in-special-education>

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

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 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 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 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	0.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 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.

353

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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
118	0	857	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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).

The State defines that a local education agency exceeding the State established threshold of 2.5, in a single data year, would be identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories for measurement in SPPI 10. The State applies a risk ratio methodology in calculating an LEA risk for disproportionate representation.

LEAs meeting the minimum size requirements (MSR) for analysis must have at least thirty (30) students with disabilities served under IDEA in a particular racial/ethnic group denominator, and ten (10) students with disabilities served under IDEA in a particular racial/ethnic group and specific disability category numerator to be evaluated. The comparison group rate is comprised of students with disabilities served under IDEA in all other racial or ethnic groups in a specific disability category (numerator) divided by the total number of students with disabilities served under IDEA in all other racial or ethnic groups within an LEA (denominator) when calculating the risk ratio.

An alternate risk ratio is applied when the particular target group meets MSR, but the comparison group in the LEA does not meet the MSR requirements. The calculation is performed by dividing the risk of a particular outcome for children with disabilities in one racial or ethnic group in a specific disability category within an LEA by the risk of that outcome for children with disabilities in all other racial or ethnic groups in a specific disability category in the State. No risk ratio or alternate risk ratio is calculated in a particular category for an LEA if the particular racial or ethnic group in a specific disability category being analyzed does not meet the minimum cell size (10) or minimum n-size (30).

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.

Local educational agencies (LEAs) are required to upload their local policies and operating procedures to the state’s Legal Framework. A self-assessment is required annually, which prompts an LEA to confirm their practices are in alignment with law. Additionally, TEA required identified LEAs to review policies, procedures, and practices related to the identification of students with disabilities to ensure compliance with 34 CFR §300.111, 300.201, and §300.301 through §300.311.

Annually, the agency engages in Results Driven Accountability (RDA), which analyzes district compliance and performance indicators resulting in determination levels. Based on the determination levels, a district may also be required to engage in monitoring activities, including desk reviews and possible onsite reviews as determined by LEA improvement needs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The number of LEAs excluded from the calculation has been corrected. The total number of LEAs used to calculate SPPI 10 was incorrect. TEA will build in a verification process between the data team and the reporting team prior to SPP/APR submission.

More information concerning Indicator 10 can be found on the State’s Disproportionate Representation in Disability Categories webpage: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/disproportionate-representation-in-disability-categories>

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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
2007	89.19%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.02%	99.77%	99.05%	98.63%	93.55%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
141,381	135,532	93.55%	100%	95.86%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

5,849

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.

LEAs reported a total of 141,381 initial referrals for children with parental consent to evaluate. Upon review by the State a total of 5849 children's evaluations were not completed within the State-established timeline. Of those children, 1380 were determined to be completed 31+ days beyond the timeline requirement and 3946 were between 1 to 30 days beyond the required evaluation timeline.

Subsequent to data collection, the State conducted a 2 week period of clarification with LEAs similar to that which OSEP allows for States in their SPP data submission. During clarification, LEAs were encouraged, but not required, to submit any clerical error corrections, and evidence of correction at both the student and systemic level for pre-finding corrections consideration by the State, following guidance included in OSEP memo 09-02 dated October 17, 2008 and subsequent resources. To successfully receive a status of "pre-finding corrected" the LEA would have met all correction evidence requirements including (but not limited to depending on an LEA's specific reasons for delay) 1. verifying correction, although late, of each instance of child-specific noncompliance; 2. evidence of LEA examination of where and when the noncompliance occurred, the rate of noncompliance, and root causes; 3. LEA resulting actions such as updated training, revisions of policies, procedures, and practices; and 4. updated program data and information demonstrating 100% compliance with the regulatory requirement.

At conclusion of the clarification period, the State determined that 116 LEAs did not meet "pre-finding corrected" status (a decrease of 46 LEAs from FFY 2020) and were required to submit corrective action plans and entered into corrective action monitoring until which time corrections were demonstrated under OSEP memo 09-02 for correction of noncompliance.

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's timeline for initial evaluations is specified in the Texas Administrative Code (TAC) Title 19 Chapter 89, Adaptations for Special Populations Subchapter AA, Commissioner's Rules Concerning Special Education Services, and specifically in:

19 TAC §89.1011 Full and Individual Initial Evaluation

(a) Referral of students for a full individual and initial evaluation for possible special education services must be a part of the LE's overall, general education referral or screening system. Prior to referral, students experiencing difficulty in the general classroom should be considered for all support services available to all students, such as tutorial; remedial; compensatory; response to evidence-based intervention; and other academic or behavior support services. A student is not required to be provided with interventions for any specific length of time prior to a referral being made or a full individual and initial evaluation being conducted. If the student continues to experience difficulty in the general classroom with the provision of interventions, district personnel must refer the student for a full individual and initial evaluation. A referral for a full individual and initial evaluation may be initiated at any time by school personnel, the student's parents or legal guardian, or another person involved in the education or care of the student.

(b) If a parent submits a written request to a school district's director of special education services or to a district administrative employee for a full individual and initial evaluation of a student, the school district must, not later than the 15th school day after the date the district receives the request:

(1) provide the parent with prior written notice of its proposal to conduct an evaluation consistent with 34 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), §300.503; a copy of the procedural safeguards notice required by 34 CFR, §300.504; and an opportunity to give written consent for the evaluation; or

(2) provide the parent with prior written notice of its refusal to conduct an evaluation consistent with 34 CFR, §300.503, and a copy of the procedural safeguards notice required by 34 CFR, §300.504.

(c) Except as otherwise provided in this section, a written report of a full individual and initial evaluation of a student must be completed as follows:

(1) not later than the 45th school day following the date on which the school district receives written consent for the evaluation from the student's parent, except that if a student has been absent from school during that period on three or more school days, that period must be extended by a number of school days equal to the number of school days during that period on which the student has been absent; or

(2) for students under five years of age by September 1 of the school year and not enrolled in public school and for students enrolled in a private or home school setting, not later than the 45th school day following the date on which the school district receives written consent for the evaluation from the student's parent.

(d) The admission, review, and dismissal (ARD) committee must make its decisions regarding a student's initial eligibility determination and, if appropriate, individualized education program (IEP) and placement within 30 calendar days from the date of the completion of the written full individual and initial evaluation report. If the 30th day falls during the summer and school is not in session, the student's ARD committee has until the first day of classes in the fall to finalize decisions concerning the student's initial eligibility determination, IEP, and placement, unless the full individual and initial evaluation indicates that the student will need extended school year services during that summer.

(e) Notwithstanding the timelines in subsections (c) and (d) of this section, if the school district received the written consent for the evaluation from the student's parent at least 35 but less than 45 school days before the last instructional day of the school year, the written report of a full individual and initial evaluation of a student must be provided to the student's parent not later than June 30 of that year. The student's ARD committee must meet not later than the 15th school day of the following school year to consider the evaluation. If, however, the student was absent from school three or more days between the time that the school district received written consent and the last instructional day of the school year, the timeline in subsection (c)(1) of this section applies to the date the written report of the full individual and initial evaluation is required. If an initial evaluation completed not later than June 30 indicates that the student will need extended school year services during that summer, the ARD committee must meet as expeditiously as possible.

(f) If a student was in the process of being evaluated for special education eligibility by a school district and enrolls in another school district before the previous school district completed the full individual and initial evaluation, the new school district must coordinate with the previous school district as necessary and as expeditiously as possible to ensure a prompt completion of the evaluation in accordance with 34 CFR, §300.301(d)(2) and (e) and §300.304(c)(5). The timelines in subsections (c) and (e) of this section do not apply in such a situation if:

- (1) the new school district is making sufficient progress to ensure a prompt completion of the evaluation; and
- (2) the parent and the new school district agree to a specific time when the evaluation will be completed.

(g) For purposes of subsections (b), (c), and (e) of this section, school day does not include a day that falls after the last instructional day of the spring school term and before the first instructional day of the subsequent fall school term.

(h) For purposes of subsections (c)(1) and (e) of this section, a student is considered absent for the school day if the student is not in attendance at the school's official attendance taking time or at the alternate attendance taking time set for that student. A student is considered in attendance if the student is off campus participating in an activity that is approved by the school board and is under the direction of a professional staff member of the school district, or an adjunct staff member who has a minimum of a bachelor's degree and is eligible for participation in the Teacher Retirement System of Texas.

Statutory Authority: The provisions of this §89.1011 issued under the Texas Education Code, §§29.001, 29.003, 29.004, 29.0041, and 30.002, and 34 Code of Federal Regulations, §§300.101, 300.111, 300.129, 300.131, 300.300, 300.301, 300.302, 300.304, and 300.305.

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 Texas Education Agency (TEA) utilizes a secure, online application for the collection of data related to Indicator 11. Students for whom the evaluation process was completed during the July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022 school year are included in this data collection. This would also include students for whom parental consent was obtained late in the 2020-21 reporting period and the eligibility process was completed between July 1, 2021 and June 30, 2022.

During FFY 2021, all LEAs that evaluated students with disabilities submitted aggregate data on timely initial evaluation. LEAs that did not evaluate any students with disabilities submitted a zero count. The application was designed to validate data and to ensure integrity (for example, certain counts could not exceed the totals entered). Technical assistance and associated documents increased the accuracy of the data for Indicator 11.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Additional information can be found on the State's SPPI 11 Timely Initial Evaluation (Child Find) webpage. <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/timely-initial-evaluation-child-find>

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
162	161	0	1

FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The Texas Education Agency Division of Special Education notified LEAs of noncompliance with FFY 2020 SPP Indicator 11 with due dates for corrective action plans one year after the date noncompliance was found. TEA required LEAs to submit a "Corrective Action Plan (CAP)." Every LEA cited for noncompliance was required to develop and submit a CAP. Staff in the Division of Special Education Monitoring reviewed the CAP, updated data, and documentation to determine whether an LEA was implementing the appropriate regulations associated with the indicator and corrected the noncompliance.

Actions taken by the TEA:

- LEAs policies and procedures were reviewed.
- The correspondence where noncompliance was identified was reviewed.
- The Special Education Correspondence and Dispute Resolution Management System application was reviewed for any substantiated findings in the same regulatory requirement.
- Scheduled phone conferences with the LEA.
- Requested evidence of training by requiring the LEA to submit agendas and sign in sheets for each individual case of noncompliance.
- Completed progress check ins (monthly reviews) held with the LEA to discuss progress towards meeting noncompliance goals and offer assistance where appropriate and available.
- Created a timeline for submissions and planned out the process based on their needs, as well as, meeting the federal one-year timeline.
- Followed up with two modes of communication with the LEA via email summarizing the conversation and provided LEA resources including Steps Required to Correct Noncompliance, the Noncompliance Verification Rubric, and provided an opportunity for questions and support if requested.
- Collected and organized all documentation as evidence.

After receiving all the requested documentation for the citation(s), reviewed and made a determination whether compliance had been met.

The State has verified that each LEA with corrected noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator 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 (Prong 2) consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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

In addition to the required CAP, LEAs were required to submit student-level data specific to each case of noncompliance. TEA staff reviewed the updated data and documentation to determine if each case of noncompliance was corrected and whether systemic corrections were made to ensure LEAs were implementing the appropriate regulations associated with the indicator.

Actions taken by the TEA:

- Reviewed the correspondence where noncompliance was identified.
- Requested student level evidence of correction for each individual case of noncompliance, records showing evidence of IEP correction and compensatory services discussed and/or offered, review documentation to ensure correction at the student level.
- Referred to the Special Education Correspondence and Dispute Resolution Management System application for any substantiated findings that should be considered when reviewing information for the LEA.
- Scheduled phone conferences with the LEA.
- Requested evidence of training by requiring the LEA to submit agendas and sign in sheets for each individual case of noncompliance.
- Completed Progress Check Ins (monthly) with the LEA to discuss progress towards meeting noncompliance goals and offer assistance, where appropriate and available.
- Created a timeline for submissions and plan out the process based on their needs, as well as, meeting the federal one-year timeline.
- Followed up with two modes of communication with the LEA via email summarizing the conversation and provide, LEA Steps Required to Correct Noncompliance, Noncompliance Verification Rubric, and provide an opportunity for questions and support if requested.
- Collected and organized all documentation as evidence.

After receiving all the requested documentation for the citation(s), reviewed and made a determination whether compliance had been met.

The State has verified that each LEA with corrected noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator has completed the required action (e.g., the evaluation, IEP developed and implemented), though late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA (Prong 1), consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

- TEA notified 1 LEA regarding their status of continuing noncompliance for indicator 11 from FFY 2020. Directives were given to update LEA corrective action plans, and participation in additional monitoring requirements. This LEA continues to participate in escalated monitoring activities that include:
- increased direct support from technical assistance providers, specifically addressing internal challenges the LEA is facing due to ongoing evaluation staff shortages
 - increased engagement with TEA designated regional support specialist establishing timelines and next steps
 - tailored support meetings to discuss specific technical assistance to address both internal and external challenges regarding the LEA's compliance through state and national resource use and strategy implementation

Once TEA is assured through data and other monitoring observations this LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, the LEA will be determined as corrected.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2019	1	0	1

FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

- TEA notified 1 LEA regarding their status of continuing noncompliance for indicator 11 from FFY 2019. Directives were given to update LEA corrective action plans, and participation in additional monitoring requirements. This LEA continues to participate in escalated monitoring activities that include:
- increased direct support from technical assistance providers, specifically addressing internal challenges the LEA is facing due to ongoing evaluation staff shortages
 - increased engagement with TEA designated regional support specialist establishing timelines and next steps
 - tailored support meetings to discuss specific technical assistance to address both internal and external challenges regarding the LEA's compliance through state and national resource use and strategy implementation

Once TEA is assured through data and other monitoring observations this LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, the LEA will be determined as corrected.

11 - Prior FFY 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 one 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 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

TEA notified 1 LEA regarding their status of continuing noncompliance for indicator 11 from FFY 2019. Directives were given to update LEA corrective action plans, and participation in additional monitoring requirements. This LEA continues to participate in escalated monitoring activities that include:

- increased direct support from technical assistance providers, specifically addressing internal challenges the LEA is facing due to ongoing evaluation staff shortages
- increased engagement with TEA designated regional support specialist establishing timelines and next steps
- tailored support meetings to discuss specific technical assistance to address both internal and external challenges regarding the LEA's compliance through state and national resource use and strategy implementation

Once TEA is assured through data and other monitoring observations this LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, the LEA will be determined as corrected.

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the remaining one uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 was corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020: (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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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
2007	77.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.50%	99.92%	99.47%	97.26%	92.27%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	7,040
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	644

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	4,683
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.	242
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	1,359
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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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.	4,683	4,795	92.27%	100%	97.66%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

112

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.

LEAs reported a total of 7040 children who were served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination. Upon review by the State a total of 112 included in the total count of children in section (a), but not included in sections (b), (c), (d), (e), or (f). Of those children, 67 were determined to be completed 31+ days beyond the timeline requirement and 45 were between 1 to 30 days beyond the third birthday timeline for IEP development.

Subsequent to data collection, the State conducted a 2 week period of clarification with LEAs similar to that which OSEP allows for States in their SPP data submission. During clarification, LEAs were encouraged, but not required, to submit any clerical error corrections, and evidence of correction at both the student and systemic level for pre-finding corrections consideration by the State, following guidance included in OSEP memo 09-02 dated October 17, 2008 and subsequent resources. To successfully receive a status of "pre-finding corrected" the LEA would have met all correction evidence requirements including (but not limited to depending on an LEA's specific reasons for delay)

1. verifying correction, although late, of each instance of child-specific noncompliance;
2. evidence of LEA examination of where and when the noncompliance occurred, the rate of noncompliance, and root causes;
3. LEA resulting actions such as updated training, revisions of policies, procedures, and practices; and
4. updated program data and information demonstrating 100% compliance with the regulatory requirement.

At conclusion of the clarification period, the State determined that 54 LEAs (increase from 23 LEAs in FFY 2019) were required to submit corrective action plans and entered into corrective action monitoring until which time corrections are demonstrated under OSEP memo 09-02 for correction of noncompliance.

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.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) created a secure, online application for the collection of data related to Indicator 12. Students for whom the IEP is developed and implemented by their third birthday during the July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021 school year are included in this data collection.

During FFY 2020, all LEAs that evaluated students with disabilities submitted aggregate data on the transition of children referred by Part C to Part B. LEAs that did not evaluate any students with disabilities submitted a zero count. The application was designed to validate data and to ensure integrity (for example, certain counts could not exceed the totals entered). Technical assistance and associated documents increased the accuracy of the data for Indicator 12. Additional information about the data collection process for Indicator 12 (instructions, collection instrument, etc.) can be found on the TEA's LEA Reports and Requirements website (<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/early-childhood-transition>).

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Additional information can be found on the State's SPPI 12 Early Childhood Transition webpage: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/early-childhood-transition>

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
54	54	0	0

FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The Texas Education Agency Division of Special Education notified LEAs of noncompliance with FFY 2020 SPP Indicator 12 in October 2021. TEA required LEAs to submit a "Corrective Action Plan (CAP)." Every LEA cited for noncompliance was required to develop and submit a CAP. Staff in the Division of Special Education Monitoring reviewed the CAP, updated data, and documentation to determine whether an LEA was implementing the appropriate regulations associated with the indicator and corrected the noncompliance.

Actions taken by the TEA:

- LEAs policies and procedures were reviewed.
- The correspondence where noncompliance was identified was reviewed.
- The Special Education Correspondence and Dispute Resolution Management System application was reviewed for any substantiated findings in the same regulatory requirement.
- Scheduled phone conferences with the LEA.
- Requested evidence of training by requiring the LEA to submit agendas and sign in sheets for each individual case of noncompliance.
- Completed progress check ins (monthly reviews) held with the LEA to discuss progress towards meeting noncompliance goals and offer assistance where appropriate and available.
- Created a timeline for submissions and planned out the process based on their needs, as well as, meeting the federal one-year timeline.
- Followed up with two modes of communication with the LEA via email summarizing the conversation and provided LEA resources including Steps Required to Correct Noncompliance, the Noncompliance Verification Rubric, and provided an opportunity for questions and support if requested.
- Collected and organized all documentation as evidence.

After receiving all the requested documentation for the citation(s), reviewed and made a determination whether compliance had been met. The State has verified that each LEA with corrected noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator 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 (Prong 2) consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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

In addition to the required CAP, LEAs were required to submit student-level data specific to each individual case of noncompliance. TEA staff reviewed the updated data and documentation to determine if each individual case of noncompliance was corrected and whether systemic corrections were made to ensure LEAs were implementing the appropriate regulations associated with the indicator.

Actions taken by the TEA:

- Reviewed the correspondence where noncompliance was identified.
- Requested student level evidence of correction for each individual case of noncompliance, records showing evidence of IEP correction and compensatory services discussed and/or offered, review documentation to ensure correction at the student level.
- Referred to the Special Education Correspondence and Dispute Resolution Management System application for any substantiated findings that should be considered when reviewing information for the LEA.
- Scheduled phone conferences with the LEA.
- Requested evidence of training by requiring the LEA to submit agendas and sign in sheets for each individual case of noncompliance.
- Completed Progress Check Ins (monthly) with the LEA to discuss progress towards meeting noncompliance goals and offer assistance, where appropriate and available.
- Created a timeline for submissions and plan out the process based on their needs, as well as, meeting the federal one-year timeline.
- Followed up with two modes of communication with the LEA via email summarizing the conversation and provide, LEA Steps Required to Correct Noncompliance, Noncompliance Verification Rubric, and provide an opportunity for questions and support if requested.
- Collected and organized all documentation as evidence.
- After receiving all the requested documentation for the citation(s), reviewed and made a determination whether compliance had been met.

The State has verified that each LEA with corrected noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator has completed the required action (e.g., the evaluation, IEP developed and implemented), though late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA (Prong 1), consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. 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 noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

The Texas Education Agency Division of Special Education notified LEAs of noncompliance with FFY 2020 SPP Indicator 13 in October 2021. TEA required LEAs to submit a "Corrective Action Plan (CAP)." Every LEA cited for noncompliance was required to develop and submit a CAP. Staff in the Division of Special Education Monitoring reviewed the CAP, updated data, and documentation to determine whether an LEA was implementing the appropriate regulations associated with the indicator and corrected the noncompliance.

Actions taken by the TEA:

- LEAs policies and procedures were reviewed.

- The correspondence where noncompliance was identified was reviewed.
 - The Special Education Correspondence and Dispute Resolution Management System application was reviewed for any substantiated findings in the same regulatory requirement.
 - Scheduled phone conferences with the LEA.
 - Requested evidence of training by requiring the LEA to submit agendas and sign in sheets for each individual case of noncompliance.
 - Completed progress check ins (monthly reviews) held with the LEA to discuss progress towards meeting noncompliance goals and offer assistance where appropriate and available.
 - Created a timeline for submissions and planned out the process based on their needs, as well as, meeting the federal one-year timeline.
 - Followed up with two modes of communication with the LEA via email summarizing the conversation and provided LEA resources including Steps Required to Correct Noncompliance, the Noncompliance Verification Rubric, and provided an opportunity for questions and support if requested.
 - Collected and organized all documentation as evidence.
 - After receiving all the requested documentation for the citation(s), reviewed and made a determination whether compliance had been met.
- The State has verified that each LEA with corrected noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator 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 (Prong 2) consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Additionally, in addition to the required CAP, LEAs were required to submit student-level data specific to each individual case of noncompliance. TEA staff reviewed the updated data and documentation to determine if each individual case of noncompliance was corrected and whether systemic corrections were made to ensure LEAs were implementing the appropriate regulations associated with the indicator.

Actions taken by the TEA:

- Reviewed the correspondence where noncompliance was identified.
- Requested student level evidence of correction for each individual case of noncompliance, records showing evidence of IEP correction and compensatory services discussed and/or offered, review documentation to ensure correction at the student level.
- Referred to the Special Education Correspondence and Dispute Resolution Management System application for any substantiated findings that should be considered when reviewing information for the LEA.
- Scheduled phone conferences with the LEA.
- Requested evidence of training by requiring the LEA to submit agendas and sign in sheets for each individual case of noncompliance.
- Completed Progress Check Ins (monthly) with the LEA to discuss progress towards meeting noncompliance goals and offer assistance, where appropriate and available.
- Created a timeline for submissions and plan out the process based on their needs, as well as, meeting the federal one-year timeline.
- Followed up with two modes of communication with the LEA via email summarizing the conversation and provide, LEA Steps Required to Correct Noncompliance, Noncompliance Verification Rubric, and provide an opportunity for questions and support if requested.
- Collected and organized all documentation as evidence.
- After receiving all the requested documentation for the citation(s), reviewed and made a determination whether compliance had been met.

The State has verified that each LEA with corrected noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator has completed the required action (e.g., the evaluation, IEP developed and implemented), though late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA (Prong 1), consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	97.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.79%	99.52%	99.29%	99.73%	99.83%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
25,481	25,623	99.83%	100%	99.45%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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 Texas Education Agency (TEA) utilizes a secure, online application for the collection of data related to Indicator 13. Included in this data collection are students with disabilities who were at least age 16 up through age 21 (age 22 if appropriate) between July 1, 2021 and June 30, 2022 and included students who were age 15 but turned age 16 by June 30, 2022.

During FFY 2021, all districts serving students with disabilities receiving special education services ages 16-21 submitted student level data on compliance aspects of the secondary transition process. Districts that did not serve students with disabilities ages 16-21 were required to submit a zero count. Districts with less than 30 students with disabilities ages 16-21 were required to submit data on all students. Districts with more than 30 students with disabilities ages 16-21 were required to follow a sampling procedure to ensure the submission of data reflective of the district’s student with disabilities ages 16-21 population. A description of the sample procedures can be found on the State’s SPPI 13 Secondary Transition webpage: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/secondary-transition>

Data collection and use of an online SPP 13 application is an integral part of the statewide training process for this indicator. The training includes data collection tools including a Data Collection Checklist for measuring SPP Indicator 13 and the Data Collection Checklist Guidance (Student Folder/IEP Review Chart). Additionally, a Data Integrity Checklist is provided to facilitate the review of students’ folders.

The Data Collection Checklist for measurement of SPP Indicator 13 is aligned with the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC) guidance on data collection. The use of these tools ensures that comparable data is collected throughout the state. The reviewer responds either "yes" or "no" to each of the eight compliance items included in the Data Collection Checklist, which addresses key elements of secondary transition reflected in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

To report an IEP in compliance with Indicator 13, all eight compliance Data Collection Checklist items must have a "yes" response. Therefore, if there was one "no" response, the IEP did not meet the SPP Indicator 13 measurement requirements. The online SPP 13 application automatically calculates compliance based on the response to the Data Collection Checklist items. Data collection resources can be found on the TEA LEA Reports and Requirements website.

Subsequent to data collection, the State conducted a 2 week period of clarification with LEAs similar to that which OSEP allows for States in their SPP data submission. During clarification, LEAs were encouraged, but not required, to submit any clerical error corrections, and evidence of correction at both the student and systemic level for pre-finding corrections consideration by the State, following guidance included in OSEP memo 09-02 dated October 17, 2008 and subsequent resources. To successfully receive a status of "pre-finding corrected" the LEA would have met all correction evidence requirements. 1. verifying correction, of each instance of child-specific noncompliance; 2. evidence of LEA examination of where and when the noncompliance occurred, the rate of noncompliance, and root causes; 3. LEA resulting actions such as updated training, revisions of policies, procedures, and practices; and 4. updated program data and information demonstrating 100% compliance with the regulatory requirement.

At conclusion of the clarification period 14 LEAs were required to submit corrective action plans and entered into corrective action monitoring until which time corrections are demonstrated under OSEP memo 09-02 for correction of noncompliance.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The description for the correction of noncompliance has been edited to accurately and correctly reflect the steps the State requires LEAs to take to correct noncompliance.

Additional information can be found on the State’s SPPI 13 Secondary Transition webpage: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/secondary-transition>

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
14	14	0	0

FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The Texas Education Agency Division of Special Education notified LEAs of noncompliance with FFY 2020 SPP Indicator 13 in October 2021. TEA required LEAs to submit a "Corrective Action Plan (CAP)." Every LEA cited for noncompliance was required to develop and submit a CAP. Staff in the Division of Special Education Monitoring reviewed the CAP, updated data, and documentation to determine whether an LEA was implementing the appropriate regulations associated with the indicator and corrected the noncompliance.

Actions taken by the TEA:

- LEAs policies and procedures were reviewed.
- The correspondence where noncompliance was identified was reviewed.
- The Special Education Correspondence and Dispute Resolution Management System application was reviewed for any substantiated findings in the same regulatory requirement.
- Scheduled phone conferences with the LEA.
- Requested evidence of training by requiring the LEA to submit agendas and sign in sheets for each individual case of noncompliance.
- Completed progress check ins (monthly reviews) held with the LEA to discuss progress towards meeting noncompliance goals and offer assistance where appropriate and available.
- Created a timeline for submissions and planned out the process based on their needs, as well as, meeting the federal one-year timeline.
- Followed up with two modes of communication with the LEA via email summarizing the conversation and provided LEA resources including Steps

Required to Correct Noncompliance, the Noncompliance Verification Rubric, and provided an opportunity for questions and support if requested.

- Collected and organized all documentation as evidence.
- After receiving all the requested documentation for the citation(s), reviewed and made a determination whether compliance had been met.

The State has verified that each LEA with corrected noncompliance reflected in the data are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.

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

In addition to the required CAP, LEAs were required to submit student-level data specific to each individual case of noncompliance. TEA staff reviewed the updated data and documentation to determine if each individual case of noncompliance was corrected and whether systemic corrections were made to ensure LEAs were implementing the appropriate regulations associated with the indicator.

Actions taken by the TEA:

- Reviewed the correspondence where noncompliance was identified.
- Requested student level evidence of correction for each individual case of noncompliance, records showing evidence of IEP correction and compensatory services discussed and/or offered, review documentation to ensure correction at the student level.
- Referred to the Special Education Correspondence and Dispute Resolution Management System application for any substantiated findings that should be considered when reviewing information for the LEA.
- Scheduled phone conferences with the LEA.
- Requested evidence of training by requiring the LEA to submit agendas and sign in sheets for each individual case of noncompliance.
- Completed Progress Check Ins (monthly) with the LEA to discuss progress towards meeting noncompliance goals and offer assistance, where appropriate and available.
- Created a timeline for submissions and plan out the process based on their needs, as well as, meeting the federal one-year timeline.
- Followed up with two modes of communication with the LEA via email summarizing the conversation and provide, LEA Steps Required to Correct Noncompliance, Noncompliance Verification Rubric, and provide an opportunity for questions and support if requested.
- Collected and organized all documentation as evidence.
- After receiving all the requested documentation for the citation(s), reviewed and made a determination whether compliance had been met.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. 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 noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

The Texas Education Agency Division of Special Education notified LEAs of noncompliance with FFY 2020 SPP Indicator 13 in October 2021. TEA required LEAs to submit a "Corrective Action Plan (CAP)." Every LEA cited for noncompliance was required to develop and submit a CAP. Staff in the Division of Special Education Monitoring reviewed the CAP, updated data, and documentation to determine whether an LEA was implementing the appropriate regulations associated with the indicator and corrected the noncompliance.

Actions taken by the TEA:

- LEAs policies and procedures were reviewed.
- The correspondence where noncompliance was identified was reviewed.
- The Special Education Correspondence and Dispute Resolution Management System application was reviewed for any substantiated findings in the same regulatory requirement.
- Scheduled phone conferences with the LEA.
- Requested evidence of training by requiring the LEA to submit agendas and sign in sheets for each individual case of noncompliance.
- Completed progress check ins (monthly reviews) held with the LEA to discuss progress towards meeting noncompliance goals and offer assistance where appropriate and available.
- Created a timeline for submissions and planned out the process based on their needs, as well as, meeting the federal one-year timeline.
- Followed up with two modes of communication with the LEA via email summarizing the conversation and provided LEA resources including Steps Required to Correct Noncompliance, the Noncompliance Verification Rubric, and provided an opportunity for questions and support if requested.
- Collected and organized all documentation as evidence.
- After receiving all the requested documentation for the citation(s), reviewed and made a determination whether compliance had been met.

The State has verified that each LEA with corrected noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator 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 (Prong 2) consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Additionally, in addition to the required CAP, LEAs were required to submit student-level data specific to each individual case of noncompliance. TEA staff reviewed the updated data and documentation to determine if each individual case of noncompliance was corrected and whether systemic corrections were made to ensure LEAs were implementing the appropriate regulations associated with the indicator.

Actions taken by the TEA:

- Reviewed the correspondence where noncompliance was identified.
- Requested student level evidence of correction for each individual case of noncompliance, records showing evidence of IEP correction and compensatory services discussed and/or offered, review documentation to ensure correction at the student level.
- Referred to the Special Education Correspondence and Dispute Resolution Management System application for any substantiated findings that should be considered when reviewing information for the LEA.
- Scheduled phone conferences with the LEA.
- Requested evidence of training by requiring the LEA to submit agendas and sign in sheets for each individual case of noncompliance.
- Completed Progress Check Ins (monthly) with the LEA to discuss progress towards meeting noncompliance goals and offer assistance, where appropriate and available.
- Created a timeline for submissions and plan out the process based on their needs, as well as, meeting the federal one-year timeline.
- Followed up with two modes of communication with the LEA via email summarizing the conversation and provide, LEA Steps Required to Correct Noncompliance, Noncompliance Verification Rubric, and provide an opportunity for questions and support if requested.
- Collected and organized all documentation as evidence.
- After receiving all the requested documentation for the citation(s), reviewed and made a determination whether compliance had been met.

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

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 = $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100$.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100$.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100$.

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 2022 on students who left school during 2020-2021, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2020-2021 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 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 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.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, include the State’s 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. States must include race/ethnicity in their 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. 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.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	2009	Target >=	29.00%	29.00%	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%
A	26.00%	Data	21.41%	18.31%	16.36%	19.55%	23.79%
B	2009	Target >=	62.00%	62.00%	63.00%	63.00%	63.00%
B	59.00%	Data	53.69%	50.88%	51.10%	50.84%	53.43%
C	2009	Target >=	76.00%	78.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
C	72.00%	Data	66.67%	64.78%	93.31%	63.93%	64.59%

FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	31.00%	31.00%	32.00%	32.00%	33.00%
Target B >=	64.00%	64.00%	65.00%	65.00%	66.00%
Target C >=	81.00%	81.00%	82.00%	82.00%	83.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Historically, Texas has solicited broad stakeholder input using the TCIP model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, public hearings, and stakeholder meetings. A systematic approach for obtaining stakeholder participation is used to ensure feedback that is truly representative of the state’s geographic and ethnic diversity. This systematic approach includes a recruitment plan designed to ensure that stakeholders from diverse roles provide input representative to the state. The diverse roles included in all advisory or informal stakeholder groups are typically parents, teachers, campus and school district administrators, parent-support and advocacy groups, higher education institutions, Education Service Centers (ESCs), related service and support staff, and other state agencies.

The technical assistance networks and initiatives also support stakeholder involvement as part of their included project metrics to continuously inform and drive technical assistance needs in the State.

All 20 regions are represented within the various advisory and workgroups that constitute broad stakeholder input. TEA routinely reviews group memberships to keep current and contacts various internal and external entities seeking recommendations to fill vacancies.

TEA continues to employ the TCIP model and expand opportunities for stakeholder engagement based on the priorities and the needs of the State.

Specific to target setting, continued review and evaluation against targets, and the development of the SPP, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as general supervision, monitoring, infrastructure, intervention, and improvement activities relating to the improvement plan. This group includes approximately 30 members representing key perspectives or roles. Members represent parents, teachers, related service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple meetings to provide thoughtful input to the important work that has focused on improving results for children and youth with disabilities and their families.

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) consists of 17 governor-appointed members from around the state representing parents, general and special educators, consumers, and other special education liaisons. The majority of members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the Texas Education Agency (TEA) of unmet needs within the state in the education of children with disabilities; comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by the state regarding the education of children with disabilities; advise TEA in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary of Education under Section 1418 of IDEA 20 U.S.C. §1418; advise TEA in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in federal monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA; and advise TEA in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.

The CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.

The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes>. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year. A comprehensive description of revisions that the State has made to targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17 are included in the State Systemic Improvement Plan(SSIP). The SSIP is linked on the State's Indicator 17 webpage <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/state-systemic-improvement-plan>.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	34,796
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	8,300
Response Rate	23.85%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	2,141
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	2,443
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)	251
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).	629

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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	2,141	8,300	23.79%	31.00%	25.80%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	4,584	8,300	53.43%	64.00%	55.23%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in	5,464	8,300	64.59%	81.00%	65.83%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)							
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). 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.

Response Rate

FFY	2020	2021
Response Rate	21.79%	23.85%

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

To continue improving overall response rates, the State asks LEAs to educate high school special education students and their families about the existence of the survey before they leave school. When high school students and their families are educated about the upcoming survey, how it will be administered, and the importance of the survey, that may make them more likely to participate. The vast majority of student email address were LEA assigned and no longer valid. LEAs are asked to ensure accurate contact information for exiting students.

Strategies to be implemented to provide a representative sample of responses for all students, (focusing on currently underrepresented Hispanic students, and students with Learning Disabilities), are:

- Provide text messages in Spanish
- Utilizing bilingual Spanish speakers for phone interviews
- Gather home language survey information and provide additional translations of the survey in languages other than English and Spanish
- Increase LEA staff involvement in the data collection process
- Increase awareness and importance of the survey at the LEA, parent, and student levels
- Encourage LEAs provide reminders and information concerning the survey in additional languages
- Direct LEAs to update contact information at students’ final IEP meeting requiring students’ personal email address and phone numbers
- Investigate inclusion of data sets such as Postsecondary enrollment, Texas Workforce Commission enrollment, or Employment data to supplement student outcomes information in addition to the SPP Indicator 14 survey data

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.

Research shows that Hispanics are more likely to refuse to participate in surveys, or having agreed to take a survey, more likely to refuse to answer individual questions under some circumstances. This disproportionate refusal is complicated for many reasons, including language barriers and cultural differences. Additionally, it may be driven by a general suspicion of government, and associating all state agencies with the same suspicion. Hispanics are underrepresented in LEA leadership and the Texas Legislature. Underrepresentation of minorities leads to an underrepresentation of a minority group’s priorities and thus impacts participation in state sponsored activities.

Strategies implemented to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth were:

- Provide text messages in Spanish
- Utilize bilingual Spanish speakers for phone interviews
- Gather home language survey information and provide additional translations of the survey in languages other than English and Spanish
- Encourage LEAs provide reminders and information concerning the survey in additional languages

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 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.

The population of exiters in the 2020-21 school year was 64% male and 36% female. The respondent group was proportionate to this composition and mirrored those statistics.

The responding sample was representative of all race/ethnicities with the exception of Hispanic students who were under-represented by 5.2 percentage points and over-representative of White students by 4.2 percentage points. All other race/ethnicities were represented within one percentage point of their prevalence in the population of exiters.

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.

There was an improvement in last year’s under-representative response rate of Hispanic students from 5.6% last year to 5.2% this year. All other race/ethnicities were represented within one percentage point of their prevalence in the population of exiters. Response rates for Hispanic students has improved by providing text messages in Spanish, utilizing bilingual Spanish speakers for phone interviews. In future years, LEAs will be encouraged to

provide reminders and information concerning the survey in additional languages. Gathering home language survey information and providing additional translations of the survey in languages other than English and Spanish currently provided.

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

The State considered anything + or – 5% as not representative. Survey results that fell within the +/- 5% are considered representative with regard to gender, race/ethnicity, and primary exceptionalality.

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.

Through a grant leveraged by TEA, the Student-Centered Transitions Network (SCTN) contracted with a third-party vendor to conduct the statewide survey administered during the summer of 2022.

The State shares contact information with the selected vendor for survey administration purposes. Surveys were sent to 34,796 students across the State. These exited students were distributed across 1,000+ LEAs, with 20 of the state’s largest LEAs accounting for more than one-quarter (28%) of exited students. In contrast, 734 of the state’s smallest LEAs accounted for 13% of exited students.

Texas’ historic Indicator 14 survey, federal requirements, and other states’ survey instruments were reviewed. A few small improvements were made to the questions. These improvements included refining question wording, improving programmable skip logic, deleting some questions and adding some that might benefit LEAs above and beyond Indicator 14. Additionally, a question was added concerning the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on students’ post-secondary or employment opportunities and experiences.

More than 34,000 unique sample records were included to conduct this year’s study.

Several modalities were leveraged to improve participation:

- 15,547 phone calls were made,
- 32,442 text messages,
- 29,310 postcards and,
- 33,302 emails sent.

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	YES
If yes, attach a copy of the survey	Texas Post School Outcomes Survey

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The description of strategies that were implemented to increase response rate year over, for groups that are underrepresented has been edited to accurately and correctly reflect strategies the State took to increase response rates for underrepresented groups.

More information concerning the State Performance Plan Indicator 14 can be found at on the Student-Centered Transitions Network Survey (2020-2021) located on the SCTN website at:

https://www.texastransition.org/apps/pages/index.jsp?uREC_ID=2148707&type=d&pREC_ID=2166907

The SPPI 14 report can be viewed here:

https://www.texastransition.org/apps/pages/index.jsp?uREC_ID=2148707&type=d&pREC_ID=2182542

14 - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State provided above, data concerning the 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 the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State also included an 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.

14 - OSEP Response

14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 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.

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 (EMAPS)).

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 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	116
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	39

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

Historically, Texas has solicited broad stakeholder input using the TCIP model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, public hearings, and stakeholder meetings. A systematic approach for obtaining stakeholder participation is used to ensure feedback that is truly representative of the state's geographic and ethnic diversity. This systematic approach includes a recruitment plan designed to ensure that stakeholders from diverse roles provide input representative to the state. The diverse roles included in all advisory or informal stakeholder groups are typically parents, teachers, campus and school district administrators, parent-support and advocacy groups, higher education institutions, Education Service Centers (ESCs), related service and support staff, and other state agencies.

The technical assistance networks and initiatives also support stakeholder involvement as part of their included project metrics to continuously inform and drive technical assistance needs in the State.

All 20 regions are represented within the various advisory and workgroups that constitute broad stakeholder input. TEA routinely reviews group memberships to keep current and contacts various internal and external entities seeking recommendations to fill vacancies.

TEA continues to employ the TCIP model and expand opportunities for stakeholder engagement based on the priorities and the needs of the State.

Specific to target setting, continued review and evaluation against targets, and the development of the SPP, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as general supervision, monitoring, infrastructure, intervention, and improvement activities relating to the improvement plan. This group includes approximately 30 members representing key perspectives or roles. Members represent parents, teachers, related service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple meetings to provide thoughtful input to the important work that has focused on improving results for children and youth with disabilities and their families.

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) consists of 17 governor-appointed members from around the state representing parents, general and special educators, consumers, and other special education liaisons. The majority of members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the Texas Education Agency (TEA) of unmet needs within the state in the education of children with disabilities; comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by the state regarding the education of children with disabilities; advise TEA in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary of Education under Section 1418 of IDEA 20 U.S.C. §1418; advise TEA in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in federal monitoring reports under Part B of

IDEA; and advise TEA in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.

The CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.

The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes>. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year. A comprehensive description of revisions that the State has made to targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17 are included in the State Systemic Improvement Plan(SSIP). The SSIP is linked on the State's Indicator 17 webpage <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/state-systemic-improvement-plan>.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	43.90%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	25.00%-30.00%	25.00% - 30.00%	25.00% - 30.00%	25.00%-30.00%	43.00%-43.90%
Data	35.63%	31.78%	31.65%	36.28%	43.90%

Targets

FFY	2021 (low)	2021 (high)	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	30.00%	35.00%	30.00%	35.00%	30.00%	35.00%	30.00%	35.00%	30.00%	35.00%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target (low)	FFY 2021 Target (high)	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
39	116	43.90%	30.00%	35.00%	33.62%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Additional information can be found on the State's SPPI 15 Resolution Sessions webpage: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/resolution-sessions>

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

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 ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

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 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1 Mediations held	234
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	94
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	61

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

Historically, Texas has solicited broad stakeholder input using the TCIP model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, public hearings, and stakeholder meetings. A systematic approach for obtaining stakeholder participation is used to ensure feedback that is truly representative of the state's geographic and ethnic diversity. This systematic approach includes a recruitment plan designed to ensure that stakeholders from diverse roles provide input representative to the state. The diverse roles included in all advisory or informal stakeholder groups are typically parents, teachers, campus and school district administrators, parent-support and advocacy groups, higher education institutions, Education Service Centers (ESCs), related service and support staff, and other state agencies.

The technical assistance networks and initiatives also support stakeholder involvement as part of their included project metrics to continuously inform and drive technical assistance needs in the State.

All 20 regions are represented within the various advisory and workgroups that constitute broad stakeholder input. TEA routinely reviews group memberships to keep current and contacts various internal and external entities seeking recommendations to fill vacancies.

TEA continues to employ the TCIP model and expand opportunities for stakeholder engagement based on the priorities and the needs of the State.

Specific to target setting, continued review and evaluation against targets, and the development of the SPP, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as general supervision, monitoring, infrastructure, intervention, and improvement activities relating to the improvement plan. This group includes approximately 30 members representing key perspectives or roles. Members represent parents, teachers, related service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple meetings to provide thoughtful input to the important work that has focused on improving results for children and youth with disabilities and their families.

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) consists of 17 governor-appointed members from around the state representing parents, general and special educators, consumers, and other special education liaisons. The majority of members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the Texas Education Agency (TEA) of unmet needs within the state in the education of children with disabilities; comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by the state regarding

the education of children with disabilities; advise TEA in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary of Education under Section 1418 of IDEA 20 U.S.C. §1418; advise TEA in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in federal monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA; and advise TEA in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.

The CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.

The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes>. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year. A comprehensive description of revisions that the State has made to targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17 are included in the State Systemic Improvement Plan(SSIP). The SSIP is linked on the State's Indicator 17 webpage <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/state-systemic-improvement-plan>.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2015	73.60%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	75.00%-80.00%	75.00% - 80.00%	75.00% - 80.00%	75.00%-80.00%	75.00%-80.00%
Data	76.50%	75.81%	75.78%	70.88%	73.60%

Targets

FFY	2021 (low)	2021 (high)	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	75.00%	80.00%	75.00%	80.00%	75.00%	80.00%	75.00%	80.00%	75.00%	80.00%

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target (low)	FFY 2021 Target (high)	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
94	61	234	73.60%	75.00%	80.00%	66.24%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Because of the inherently voluntary nature of the mediation process, the percentage of mediations that will end in agreement depends on the parties' willingness to come to an agreement. Accordingly, this percentage will vary from year to year. In Texas, however, the percentage of successful mediations has historically remained relatively consistent. During the pandemic, the state continued to require that all special education mediators participate in relevant annual training to hone their skills. The state also ensured that parties had access to mediation via virtual platforms and expressly allowed parties to request mediation electronically. Indeed, the number of mediations increased from 197 in the 2020-2021 school year to 234 in the 2021-2022 school year. Nevertheless, the percentage of successful mediations decreased. While the percentage of successful mediations is party dependent, the decline in successful mediations during 2021-2022 appears to be attributable to the continued effects of the pandemic.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Additional information can be found on the State's SPPI 16 Mediation webpage: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/mediation>

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

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

Baseline Data: 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.

Targets: In its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2021 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 1, 2023, 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 2021 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, 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, 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 2021 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 2022). 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 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023; for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023).

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 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023 for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023)) 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)?

Increase the reading proficiency rate for all children with disabilities in grades 4, 8, and HS (as measured by combining the state assessment results for grades 4, 8, and End of Course exams in Reading Achievement against grade level standards, with or without accommodations).

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)

NO

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.

The State's Theory of Action is linked below:

<https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/texas-ssip-theory-of-action-one-pager.pdf>

It may also be found on the Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan webpage linked below:

<https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/texas-ssip-theory-of-action-one-pager.pdf>

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
2020	10.85%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target> =	12.00%	20.00%	25.00%	30.00%	40.00%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of Children with IEPs in Grades 4, 8, and HS combined Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards with or without accommodations in Reading	Number of Children with IEPs in Grades 4, 8, and HS who Received a Valid Reading Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment in Reading	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
23,619	155,186	10.85%	12.00%	15.22%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584) combined totals.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

Data are collected from the indicated data source(s) and analyzed by Agency staff to assure accuracy and validity in looking at statewide measurements. Impacts from certain influential changes or events within the State are considered, as well as trend data to determine improvement, slippage, or rebaseline or change implications.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

NO

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)

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

Publicly linked at <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/state-systemic-improvement-plan>

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:

Improvement Strategy 1: Allocate resources to support state, regional, and local efforts toward positive student outcomes. - in this strategy activities included leverage of state and federal funds to increase capacity for technical assistance, professional development, resource allotments to expand dyslexia support and reading instruction program expansion, early childhood literacy program adoptions by LEAs, and supports to LEAs via expanded grant for regional liaisons.

Improvement Strategy 2: Expand Initiatives and Opportunities - in this strategy activities included continuation of network supports, resources, and professional development opportunities in a multitude of areas in support of reading instruction and related issues.

Improvement Strategy 3: Communicate Expectations, Standards, and Results - in this strategy activities included continued statewide training through House Bill 3 established Reading Academies, and Reading Excellence and Academies Development (READ) reading academies to communicate expectations, set standards, and achieve results. Additionally, certification requirements and additional school personnel training requirements have been added to expand the reach and standardization of reading instructional strategies.

Improvement Strategy 4: Collaborate with institutes of higher education, other statewide agencies, and organizations to improve teacher quality initiatives, and ensure consistency across programs and policies that affect student outcomes. - in this strategy activities included completion of a revised education diagnostician certification and test framework aligned with updated standards with continued work on approving specific test items for the exam.

A complete list of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period is included in the attached complete SSIP document and located on the TEA website at <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/state-systemic-improvement-plan>

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.

Improvement Strategy 1: Allocate resources to support state, regional, and local efforts toward positive student outcomes communicated by the governing bodies, educational associations, and Texas Education Agency. - relates to governance, and financial frameworks and leverages afforded by discretionary federal, and allocated state funds for the intended activities and outcomes.

Strategy 1 intermediate outcomes included:

1. Hired staff will oversee the development of TA resources, FAQs, webinars, monthly newsletters, and the state website redesign;
2. Funding increases to expand the availability of dyslexia training for teachers, increase dyslexia therapist positions, screening/evaluation tools, progress monitoring tools, and evidence-based early intervention programs, Increase the number of students accessing the general education reading curriculum, and increase progress monitoring and data collection on early warning indicators specific to kindergarten reading readiness;
3. Requiring school boards to create and implement early childhood plans that set annual goals for aggregate student growth on 3rd grade STAAR reading, annual targets for students in each group evaluated under closing the gaps domain, targeted professional development for classroom teachers in K-3rd grade for campuses the board identifies as not meeting the plan's goals—considering the needs of students in bilingual education/special language programs, and annual targets set for students in bilingual/ESL programs;
4. Allocation of funds to grow teachers' knowledge, understanding, and systematic use of effective, research-based, and scientifically validated reading instruction;
5. Continued State funding to support ESCs in their support to LEAs by disseminating information, conducting training, and consultation for federal and state programs, and providing TA and leadership on a variety of projects and functions determined as priorities by the State;
6. Continued and expanded funding to ESC liaison personnel that support LEAs by disseminating information, conducting training, and consultation for both federal and state special education programs, and providing TA and leadership on a variety of projects related to special education; and

7. Leverage and fiscal support of a statewide accessible platform (Amplio) intended to improve students with dyslexia reading outcomes by providing access to high quality dyslexia intervention strategies that are research-based to improve the rate of words correct per minute (wcpm).

Improvement Strategy 2: Expand Initiatives and Opportunities - relates to data, and professional development and/or technical assistance that are measured through technical assistance networks leveraged across the state with delivery of professional development and technical assistance opportunities in a variety of modalities. Each technical assistance network and ESC is required to set approved goals and included activities annually through a review process in order to receive approval for continued grant allocation, and report on the achievements to the TEA in determined formative and summative metric reporting. One hundred percent of ESCs received training and/or directives to establish specific training or resource delivery to the LEAs within their regions. Goals range from 10% to 100% of LEA participation depending on the activity and delivery expectations. As with many states, time is the biggest factor for LEA practitioners in accessing and receiving professional development and technical assistance. The networks have employed a variety of strategies to help support practitioners in the field that are making strides through those efforts to deliver high quality TA and PD where possible and targeted to the specific needs of the LEA/student outcome needs.

Improvement Strategy 3: Communicate Expectations, Standards, and Results - relates to quality standards, professional development, and accountability/monitoring assessed by the coordinating or governing bodies who collect and report on the participation, certification, and hiring requirements. Specifically, beginning January 1, 2021, all intern, probationary, and standard certifications are required to have earned a Science of Teaching Reading certification. By August 2021, all K-5th grade teachers in low-performing schools and schools with high percentages of students qualifying for free and reduced-price lunch have had the opportunity to participate in a teacher literacy achievement or reading-to-learn academy and received access to high-quality content and instructional strategies aligned to the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS); and ESCs and LEAs must hire a full-time literacy coach to provide development sessions, instructional coaching to teachers, as well as training and instructional collaboration to LEA and school leader cohort participants. Literacy coaches support the members of their cohort and training needs.

Improvement Strategy 4: Collaborate with institutes of higher education, other statewide agencies, and organizations to improve teacher quality initiatives, and ensure consistency across programs and policies that affect student outcomes. - relates to governance and quality standards for educators communicated through the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) and other professional associations, groups, and TEA. Short-term outcomes are measured by success of intended improvements such as the January 2020 launch of the education diagnostician certification and test framework aligned with updated standards, and the July 2020 - SBEC adoption of Special Education EC-6, Special Education 6-12, and Deafblind EC-12 educator standards.

A more detailed description of the short-term outcomes within each infrastructure improvement strategy and in particular to systems framework for professional development and technical assistance in the reporting period is included in the attached complete SSIP document and located on the TEA website at <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/state-systemic-improvement-plan>.

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.

The summary of next steps for infrastructure improvement is for continuation of the listed activities/supports in Improvement Strategies 1 - 4 for increase in LEA access to technical assistance, professional development, high quality materials and standardized practices based in research, and monitoring of the leveraged resources and certification and/or participation requirements. The State will continue to leverage resources, employ best practices, gather and report on progress toward achieving the project and the student outcomes in reading achievement expected from the collective efforts of focused activity and work of the included improvement strategy activities.

Additionally the State intends to expand with activities that will include:

The Intensive Supports Project that identifies LEAs that require intensive intervention. LEAs will participate in the intensive support process, which is aimed at improving the implementation of best practices in special education and increasing LEA access to TA.

The Dyslexia Monitoring Project is a monitoring process for dyslexia, as required by TEC §38.003. It is designed to effectively audit, monitor, and periodically conduct onsite visits of LEAs to ensure compliance with TEC §38.003 and the program approved by the State Board of Education. -

A more detailed description of next steps for infrastructure improvement strategy and anticipated outcomes is included in the attached complete SSIP document and located on the TEA website at <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/state-systemic-improvement-plan>.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

Evidence-based practices are included and embedded in identified networks listed in the SSIP document. There are ten Networks Implementing Statewide Improvement Strategies which report quarterly to the Initiatives Lead at TEA. These networks provide targeted evidence-based practices, resources, trainings, and interventions specific to:

Child Find/evaluation and ARD (IEP) supports;
Inclusion Supports;
Autism training;
Tiered interventions;
Increasing capacity of LEAs and families to meet the needs of students with significant cognitive disabilities;
Sensory supports; and
Texas Lesson Study (TXLS) a professional development program.

More information can be found on the webpage at <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/state-systemic-improvement-plan>.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

Child Find/evaluation and ARD (IEP) supports - Provide resources and training aligned with effective Child Find practices, evaluations, and collaborative admission, review, and dismissal (ARD) committee processes that lead to a free appropriate public education (FAPE) for students with disabilities. Also, developed guidance documents and tools on comprehensive evaluation for SLD/dyslexia, dysgraphia, dyscalculia, including data from multiple sources.

Inclusion - Assists LEAs to build capacity and implement instructional programs that provide access to inclusive environments and grade-level standards. Developed and published reading trainer of trainer (ToT) resources for addressing how disabilities affect students' learning of reading, including resources that address dyslexia and related disabilities (e.g., science of reading); and in collaboration with national experts, develop and publish to website resources on inclusion support beyond co-teaching and supporting coteaching partnerships focused on specially designed instruction in reading.

Autism training - Increase LEAs' knowledge, understanding, and implementation of evidence-based practices (e.g., training, TA, and resources) that ensure the academic, functional, and behavioral needs of students with autism are met. Developed a 6-hour online course: Literacy Instruction for Students with Autism Spectrum Disorders; and a 45-minute course - Autism Spectrum Disorder and Assistive Technology: Supporting Literacy in Individuals with Autism through the use of Assistive technology.

Tiered interventions - Develop a comprehensive and coherent training and resources for evidence-based intervention practices across the State. These trainings aim to increase LEA and ESC capacity to develop and implement an effective, integrated, comprehensive framework for intervention that is grounded in differentiated instruction for all students' academic, behavioral, and social achievement. A set of 10 modules were developed (i.e., on-demand and face-to-face training modules) related to best practices for MTSS. There is a module that takes a deep dive into evidence-based reading practices.

Provide statewide leadership and support to increase the capacity of LEAs and families to meet the needs of students with significant cognitive disabilities. Increasing capacity of LEAs and families to meet the needs of students with significant cognitive disabilities - Revised and updated existing Trainer of Trainers into an online format with the addition of engaging user activities, including pre- and post-tests for teaching literacy to students with significant cognitive disability.

Sensory supports, ensures support (e.g., communication, mobility, tactile skills, environmental adaptations, diagnosis, evaluation) to infants, toddlers, children, and youth with sensory impairments, their families, and the professionals who serve them. - Literacy pilots provided training on implementing the Foundations for Literacy to teachers of PreK students who are identified as deaf or hard of hearing (DHH) and speech and language pathologists (SLPs) in participating Regional Day School Programs for the Deaf (RDSPDs). Video coaching provided for follow up support (TSBVI Early Braille Literacy).

Texas Lesson Study is inquiry-based, job-embedded professional development where teachers work collaboratively to develop, teach and access research-based lessons. The teacher-designed lessons, videos of the lessons, and information about the TXLS program are available on the Texas Lesson Study website. <https://texaslessonstudy.org/>

To continue to accelerate student learning in Texas, TEA is launching the Strong Foundations Implementation Supports grant for local education agencies (LEAs) implementing High-Quality Instructional Materials (HQIM). For the 2023–24 school year, LEAs can choose to apply to the following options as a part of the Learning Acceleration Support Opportunities (LASO) Grant (<https://tea.texas.gov/texas-schools/health-safety-discipline/covid/learning-acceleration-support-opportunities-laso>):

The COVID-19 pandemic and shift to at-home learning during 2020 and 2021 helped highlight the importance of high-quality instructional materials (HQIM) and effective pedagogical practices in ensuring all students receive a high-quality education with rigorous expectations for grade-level learning. To support students with disabilities served by special education in reaching high-standards and obtaining equitable benefit from the use of HQIM within Texas LEAs, the TEA has developed and published a series of HQIM field users guides to support the provision of Specially-Designed Instruction (SDI) in inclusive settings. Concepts of SDI have further been integrated into training and coaching provided to LEA educators and leaders around the implementation of HQIM as part of the TEA's COVID Recovery Instructional Materials Initiative (CRIMSI) and Resilient Schools Support Program (RSSP.)

The Intensive Supports project identifies LEAs that require intensive intervention. LEAs participate in the intensive support process, which is aimed at improving the implementation of best practices in special education and increasing LEA access to TA, and The Dyslexia Monitoring project is developing a monitoring process for dyslexia, as required by TEC §38.003.

The Technical Assistance Dashboard (TAD) is a software application developed to strengthen the connections between the Texas Differentiated Monitoring and Support (DMS) system and special education technical assistance to support improved practices and outcomes in Local Education Agencies (LEAs.) The TAD application integrates seamlessly with the Ascend Texas application for DMS activities and allows TEA users to assign technical assistance resources directly to LEAs based upon compliance and/or performance monitoring. The TAD functionality also allows all users, including LEA users, to search, filter, sort, and select TEA special education technical assistance resources based on customizable search criteria, generates reports on the usage of resources, and collects user survey data from LEAs regarding the usefulness and applicability of TEA's special education technical assistance resources in supporting LEA compliance and performance goals.

The Special Education Technical Assistance team is responsible for supporting LEAs in compliance requirements and best practices related to the education of students with disabilities. A single Content Management System (CMS) is being developed that will house all technical assistance resources. The technical assistance team is also in the process of migrating all online coursework to TEA's single comprehensive Learning Management System (LMS).. Moving forward, TEA will be able to collect and analyze user data, including course participation and outcomes when all content is housed in one location overseen by TEA. This single system will also allow TEA to reach more educators with high quality content over t and user accessibility to technical assistance resources and courses, since they will have one landing site as opposed to 10 individual websites to navigate.

Outcomes are tracked on other strategy initiatives for completion of expected activity such as certification changes, leverage of financial resources (e.g. grants allocations); and implementation of legislatively required trainings, staffing, or adoption of materials or procedural requirements. These data are collected by initiative owners and tracked for fidelity of implementation; then obtained through shared information by the Special Education Policy team members for reporting in the SPP.

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.

The TEA's continuing and planned infrastructure changes and the quality of statewide TA and resources are designed to improve the services and supports needed for increasing reading proficiency for grades 4, 8, and HS students with disabilities who receive special education services. The TEA has committed additional resources and expanded its capacity to provide oversight and targeted engagement over special education programs. For example, the Department of Review and Supports new Differentiated Monitoring and Support system aims to be inclusive of all LEAs in Texas, helping to improve compliance and statewide performance. Additionally, TEA has committed additional support by redesigning the TA networks, expanding the number of state TA staff, and by executing on agency wide initiatives related to reading outcomes. Ongoing connections across infrastructures, the inclusion of metrics, measures in network project plans, and expected stakeholder engagements support strategy implementation. Benchmarks regarding progress toward short-term goals include:

- how well resources are being used;
- how well participants are engaged with implementation and fidelity;
- how knowledgeable stakeholders are of expectations, standards, and results;
- how prepared practitioners are upon completion of training.

Metrics have been expanded and are providing more lead measures that are anticipated to be more predictive of student outcomes often based on lag measures for statewide projects.

TEA has taken steps to increase capacity through strategies identified in the Leading by Convening principles. ESC leaders can help to better allocate resources, increase participant engagement in implementing evidenced-based practices with fidelity, and increase knowledge and preparation of stakeholders and practitioners. Two-way active engagement is necessary to achieve short-term and long-term goals of the SSIP. Preliminary results indicate high levels of engagement and positive outcomes regarding implementation activities, short-term goals, and the positive impact on increased reading proficiency and impact to the SiMR.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

Data collected include formative and summative metric data from each of the Ten Networks. Additionally, future infrastructure improvement strategies such as:

The Intensive Supports project identifies LEAs that require intensive intervention. LEAs participate in the intensive support process, which is aimed at improving the implementation of best practices in special education and increasing LEA access to TA, and The Dyslexia Monitoring project is developing a monitoring process for dyslexia, as required by TEC §38.003.

Outcomes are tracked on other strategy initiatives for completion of expected activity such as certification changes, leverage of financial resources (e.g. grants allocations); and implementation of legislatively required trainings, staffing, or adoption of materials or procedural requirements. These data are collected by initiative owners and tracked for fidelity of implementation; then obtained through shared information by the Special Education Policy team members for reporting in the SPP.

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.

Additionally, student results are examined. Baseline reading outcomes for special education students in grades 4, 8, HS were obtained from the Texas Performance Reporting System (TPRS), Statewide, State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR). Baseline Special Education STAAR Reading Results for Grades 4, 8, and High School are included in the SSIP document located on the TEA website at <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/state-systemic-improvement-plan>

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

TEA will engage with literacy topics and activities through monthly TEA/ESC Zoom meeting and other opportunities to increase technical capacity and expand the existing networks of support, especially increasing technical capacity, support, and general supervision of dyslexia to achieve its anticipated positive outcomes to students with disabilities and specifically to improve reading proficiency.

The Amplio Digital Dyslexia Intervention for Texas LEAs launched in February 2021 and ran until August 2022. The goal was to facilitate evidence based, outcomes-focused interventions for students with dyslexia, monitoring their progress and empowering specialists to devote more time to direct instruction. Amplio's digital platform connects students, educators, and administrators with advanced technologies such as artificial intelligence (AI) and natural language processing to students with dyslexia.

General supervision activities are aimed at supporting students with dyslexia by increasing data collection and monitoring capacity. Currently, the State requires all kindergarten and first grade children to be screened for dyslexia and annually submit the screening results to the State's data management system. The data are then used for monitoring and general supervision activities aimed at improving dyslexia programming at LEAs. Going forward, data on the reasons why a child was not screened for dyslexia will be collected statewide and will be used to identify screening barriers, customize general supervision and monitoring activities, and provide TA support.

Further study/opportunities for obtaining interim student level progress through project monitoring of these type platforms, touchpoints to families and practitioners in pursuit of increased reading achievement and building dashboards for tracking improvement strategy progress will be considered.

In a systemic evolutionary process, the challenges inherent to changing practices and achieving long term commitments are typical barriers that affect short term success. Necessary steps to address barriers include meeting challenges as opportunity for growth and further stakeholder engagement, working with partners at federal, state, and local levels to discern emerging issues across literacy and other related topics like dyslexia, response to intervention (RTI), and evidenced-based practices.

More detail on next steps and anticipated outcomes is included in the attached complete SSIP document and located on the TEA website at <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/state-systemic-improvement-plan>

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.

FFY 2020 was the baseline year for this indicator. There is not enough data to support changing or modifying the SSIP at this time. The alignment with the SPP 2020-2025 indicator measurement change was advised by stakeholders in the State and created an opportunity to focus on infrastructure and improvement strategies aligned to results at specific benchmarking grades in reading achievement (i.e., grades 4, 8, and HS).

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

Historically, Texas has solicited broad stakeholder input using the TCIP model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, public hearings, and stakeholder meetings. A systematic approach for obtaining stakeholder participation is used to ensure feedback that is truly representative of the state's geographic and ethnic diversity. This systematic approach includes a recruitment plan designed to ensure that stakeholders from diverse roles provide input representative to the state. The diverse roles included in all advisory or informal stakeholder groups are typically parents, teachers, campus and school district administrators, parent-support and advocacy groups, higher education institutions, Education Service Centers (ESCs), related service and support staff, and other state agencies.

The technical assistance networks and initiatives also support stakeholder involvement as part of their included project metrics to continuously inform and drive technical assistance needs in the State.

All 20 regions are represented within the various advisory and workgroups that constitute broad stakeholder input. TEA routinely reviews group memberships to keep current and contacts various internal and external entities seeking recommendations to fill vacancies.

TEA continues to employ the TCIP model and expand opportunities for stakeholder engagement based on the priorities and the needs of the State.

Specific to target setting, continued review and evaluation against targets, and the development of the SPP, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as general supervision, monitoring, infrastructure, intervention, and improvement activities relating to the improvement plan. This group includes approximately 30 members representing key perspectives or roles. Members represent parents, teachers, related service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple meetings to provide thoughtful input to the important work that has focused on improving results for children and youth with disabilities and their families.

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) consists of 17 governor-appointed members from around the state representing parents, general and special educators, consumers, and other special education liaisons. The majority of members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the Texas Education Agency (TEA) of unmet needs within the state in the education of children with disabilities; comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by the state regarding the education of children with disabilities; advise TEA in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary of Education under Section 1418 of IDEA 20 U.S.C. §1418; advise TEA in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in federal monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA; and advise TEA in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.

The CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.

The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes>. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year. A comprehensive description of revisions that the State has made to targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17 are included in the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The SSIP is linked on the State's Indicator 17 webpage <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/state-systemic-improvement-plan>.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

Stakeholders are key to improvement efforts in each of the included improvement strategies and associated activities. Since launch of the ten networks, and associated projects and network activities, stakeholder input and feedback is measured through project success metrics inclusive of stakeholder participation, feedback, and needs assessments through a variety of assessment measures (i.e. survey, TA ratings, coaching follow-ups, etc.).

Beyond project success metrics there are several other opportunities to gather stakeholder input.

Additional questions are included in the SPPI 8 Parent Involvement survey to inform needs across the state.

When LEAs participate in the cyclical desk review process, the TEA provides a survey of stakeholders which includes parents/families, general educators, special educators, assessment staff and administrators in order to gather additional information regarding the implementation of programs and services. Thousands of responses are gathered through the cyclical monitoring stakeholder surveys.

The State also contracted with a 3rd party to conduct a special education performance alignment study based on a comprehensive external stakeholder data collection effort and an internal scan of TEA policies and procedures. The evaluation team collected data related to the alignment of special education initiatives and policies, communications, and collaboration across system stakeholders (e.g., TEA, regional ESCs, Technical Assistance Networks (Networks), and local education agencies (LEAs) – both central office and campus leaders).

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

NO

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.

Promising Practices is intended to locate, elevate and promote evidence-based practices in LEAs that are successful in moving student achievement in reading addressing the impact of COVID on student learning and achievement disruptions. The State intends to identify certain LEA practices that

achieve a high student performance rate gain, determine its potential impact and scalability that may be leveraged to districts who struggle to improve student achievement in reading.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

FFY 2022 is planned for identification through data collection and study with capture, development of resources, and leverage in FFY 2023 and beyond.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

No newly identified barriers are identified for the SSIP measures.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

Texas students, families, and educators continue to address many of the same unique challenges as all other states across the country post pandemic with regards to disruptions to structured routines and typical learner access. TEA continues to collect and utilize student level data to better understand the total impact of the pandemic on special education services to students with disabilities, and in particular to reading achievement as an area of focus measured in the SSIP. Please see resources which are provided across the state to identify needs specific to COVID-19. Resources for Special Education are available at <https://tea.texas.gov/texas-schools/health-safety-discipline/covid/covid-19-support-special-education>. Additionally, eligible parents/caregivers are afforded access to Supplemental Special Education Services (SSES). These are on-line accounts for eligible parents/caregivers of students with significant and complex disabilities that have been impacted by COVID-19 school closures. For more information, please visit the Supplemental Special Education Services home page at <https://sses.tea.texas.gov/>.

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

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:

Susan Bineham

Title:

SPP/APR Data Manager

Email:

susan.bineham@tea.texas.gov

Phone:

512-463-9051

Submitted on:

04/27/23 9:48:25 AM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix
Texas

2023 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination⁴

Percentage (%)	Determination
71.67%	Needs Assistance

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	24	14	58.33%
Compliance	20	17	85.00%

2023 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	88%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	86%	1
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	23%	1
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	85%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	26%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	85%	1

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	88%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	87%	1
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	49%	2
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	84%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	19%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	90%	1

⁴ For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 2023: Part B."

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	16	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma**	46	0

**When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, "the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential."

2023 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator ⁵	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	0
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	95.86%	NO	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	97.66%	YES	2
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	99.45%	YES	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	96.15%		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	100.00%		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	100.00%		2
Longstanding Noncompliance			1
Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	Yes, 2 to 4 years		

⁵ The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2023_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

**Data Rubric
Texas**

FFY 2021 APR⁶

	Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data	
APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	0	0
4B	0	0
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1
	Subtotal	19
APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2021 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
	Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	24

⁶ In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

	618 Data ⁷			
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 4/6/22	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 12/21/2022	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/4/22	1	1	1	3
			Subtotal	21
618 Score Calculation			Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	26.00

⁷ In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	24
B. 618 Grand Total	26.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	50.00
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
Denominator	52.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator*) =	0.9615
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	96.15

***Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.**

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2023 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) Timely – A State will receive one point if it submits all EDFacts files or the entire EMAPS survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	C002 & C089	1 st Wednesday in April
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B Exiting	C009	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	Wednesday in the 3 rd week of December (aligned with CSPR data due date)
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in EMAPS	1 st Wednesday in May

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to EDFacts aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in EMAPS. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

Dispute Resolution



TX-B-DR-2021-22.pdf
f

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2023 will be posted in June 2023. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>