

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2020**

Texas



PART B DUE February 1, 2022

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

The 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/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/state-systemic-improvement-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://rptsrv1.tea.texas.gov/idea/index.html>.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Although State operations for data collection and reporting were not shut down or delayed due to the nation-wide pandemic relating to COVID-19, several key systems and functions for monitoring, general supervision, technical assistance delivery, and availability of data were affected. These impacts are addressed in the specific areas and indicators throughout the SPP/APR.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

1,208

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 of Texas (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 including public charter schools; approval and re-approval 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 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 annually develop or update a Strategic Support Plan (SSP) 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 is 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 LEAs need 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 is designed to assist Local Education Agency (LEA) leadership teams in evaluating and improving their special education program, and 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 districts are required to develop local improvement plans addressing areas of concern. TEA requires districts 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.

TEA monitoring and contract approval processes for LEAs who place students in Nonpublic Schools or state-defined Off-Campus Programs are designed to ensure the placement of a student by a district, at district cost, into a private setting meets FAPE requirements when the special education and related services cannot be implemented by the LEA in the LEA setting. TEA's Nonpublic School Monitoring and Guidance Resources are found on the Special Education website.

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 districts that serve students with disabilities who reside in residential facilities to ensure a free and appropriate public education (FAPE). Additionally, RF monitoring has become a part of the integrated intervention process if districts are staged in more than one program area.

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 district information for items flagged as potential complaints.
- Closure Letters – maintains all closure letter data including student, complainant, and district information as well as workflow and related dispute tracking.
- Complaints – maintains all relevant complaint data including student, complainant, district 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 district's account. ASCEND documents the date that the district was notified of the finding, the due date for correction, and the date the district was cleared of noncompliance. Monitoring occurs through correspondence; uploading and tracking such things as the district CAP, interventions, and results for correction of the noncompliance; and documentation of these results. Districts 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 which address state and federal 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 results for students with disabilities.

Twenty regional education service centers (ESCs) are the foundation of the State's TA infrastructure. 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 regionally developed improvement activities based on regional data as compared to state target and 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. Networks address topics identified as critical and support needs for the state.

Networks utilize stakeholder or advisory groups in the design and implementation activities. TA, resources, and trainings from networks are available free of charge to any local education agency (LEA) in the state and are intended to leverage best practices.

Child Find is legally required, and is an important first step to finding children with disabilities and getting them the support and services they require to be successful in school. The full and individual initial evaluation (FIIE) is a critical component when determining the eligibility and needs of the child. The role of the ARD committee is to develop the IEP to enable a child with a disability to achieve the prescribed goals resulting in positive outcomes.

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

Texas Statewide Leadership for Autism Training (TSLAT) 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.

The Tiered Interventions using Evidence-based Research (TIER) network is developing comprehensive and coherent trainings and resources for evidence-based intervention practices across the state. The network strives to increase LEA and ESC capacity to develop and implement an effective, integrated, comprehensive framework for intervention that is grounded in differentiated instruction and aligns the systems that are fundamental for all students' academic, behavioral, and social achievement.

The Texas CAN 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 supports that provide for the complex and intensive educational and functional needs of students with significant cognitive disabilities.

The Texas Sensory Support Network (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.

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 will develop state-level infrastructures, resources, and professional development to support LEAs who face unique challenges, such as resource limitations and geographic remoteness.

The Student-Centered Transitions Network 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.

A student with multiple exceptionalities and multiple needs is a student served by special education and identified in one or more of the following special populations: gifted and talented (GT), English learner (EL), or highly mobile family situation, including military, migrant, foster, or homeless. The multifaceted needs of these students require planned and purposeful coordination. Through the creation of partnerships and a foundation in evidenced-based practices, the Multiple Exceptionalities and Multiple Needs network builds capacity for educator support through training and resources specific to identification and programming for students with multiple exceptionalities and multiple needs.

The School, Family, and Community Engagement 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 the School, Family, and Community Engagement Network, 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. All parent resources connected to the Special Education Strategic Plan will either be housed or linked on the SPEDTex website.

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 quality education for all Texas children requires partnerships among TEA, educator preparation programs, public and private schools, institutions of higher education, and the community. TEA is committed to ensuring that the State's educator preparation programs are high-quality institutions that recruit and prepare qualified educators to meet the needs of all learners in today's and tomorrow's Texas classrooms.

Texas issues standard certificates to educators meeting state requirements. An educator with a standard certificate in Texas is required to renew his or her standard certificate(s) every five years. A minimum number of Continuing Professional Education (CPE) hours provided by an approved CPE provider must be obtained to renew that certificate under the Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §232.13.

All CPE providers must be approved and registered by the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) and TEA. This approval process ensures that quality CPE is offered to support the professional growth of educators in the knowledge and skills necessary to improve student outcomes. Only CPE activities from approved, registered providers are recognized for certificate renewal purposes.

CPE activities are offered at a wide variety of physical and virtual locations for easy access to a continuum of quality professional development. For example:

- institutes of higher education,
- Education Service Centers (ESCs),
- local education agency provided programs,
- statewide projects and initiatives such as TEA Learn, and
- a Learning Management System available to educators across Texas that provides high-quality professional development in an interactive and engaging learning environment.

The TEA has adopted an integrated approach to special education professional development to ensure the needs of students with disabilities served by special education are reflected across statewide professional development offerings. A series of synchronous professional development focused on family engagement and applications of Universal Design for Learning for district and campus leaders was provided through the Resilient Schools Support Program in 2020-2021 with opportunities for follow-up, targeted coaching, and support by TEA special education staff. Further professional development is planned for spring 2022 through this program to continue supporting district staff in implementing inclusive practices to support learning acceleration, including implementation of high-quality instructional materials with adaptations to meet the needs of students with disabilities in inclusive settings.

The TEA offers free, asynchronous professional development for educators around the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) Framework through its Inclusion in Texas initiative. Participants can earn up to 30 CPEs through the completion of five modules on a variety of UDL topics that focus on applications of UDL principles to lesson planning.

Per House Bill 3 (HB 3), passed by the 86th Texas Legislature in June of 2019, all kindergarten through third grade teachers and principals must attend a "teacher literacy achievement academy" around the science of teaching reading. This mandate is accomplished through Reading Academies, a statewide professional development effort. The TEA has ensured the content of the Reading Academies include embedded principles of UDL and high-leverage instructional practices to meet the needs of students served by special education.

Literacy for All is a professional learning opportunity offered through the TEA's Department of Special Education and which is available to upper elementary and secondary teachers and leaders across Texas through synchronous, virtual delivery and asynchronously through TEA Learn. This series focuses specifically on supporting older students who struggle to comprehend text due to a lack of proficiency in foundational reading skills. Literacy for All provides actionable strategies educators can utilize to support students in becoming proficient readers through the application of research-based instructional strategies aligned to the science of teaching reading.

Math for All is a one-day workshop for educators and leaders offered by the TEA's Department of Special Education that is offered synchronously and asynchronously through TEA Learn. This workshop provides hands-on activities that allow participants to explore how disabilities impact the learning of mathematics and develop effective, instructional supports to meet students' needs through Universal Design for Learning applications, assistive technologies, and high-impact accommodations.

The TEA has integrated principles of special education into its Evaluating and Improving Student Outcomes (EISO) training delivered to local, school board trustees participating in the TEA's Lone Star Governance initiative. This training initiative provides hands-on training and coaching to board members through a continuous-improvement framework. In 2021-2022, EISO training intentionally addressed the topics of Child Find, evaluation practices for students suspected of having disabilities, principles of inclusive education, and person-first language for children with disabilities. Future EISO trainings will continue to address these topics, and include expanded topics related to special education.

Beginning in the spring of 2022 and beyond, the TEA intends to expand professional development offerings to support educators and leaders across the State in meeting the needs of students with disabilities who are served by special education. These offerings include a series of asynchronous professional development courses focused on effective collaboration and co-teaching approaches to meet the diverse needs of learners in inclusive settings, including the use of flexible grouping strategies to support student engagement and progress in the general education curriculum. These courses will include a parallel pathway for teachers and leaders. The TEA also plans to ensure continued integration for the expansion of the Texas Reading Academies focused on building foundational literacy skills for PreK learners and engaging with stakeholders to develop future professional development and guidance to support effective instructional practices for dual-identified students with disabilities who are also English Learners and promote meaningful, cross-collaboration at the campus and district level to support the needs of dual-identified students.

Additionally, ESCs provide professional development and training activities based on state needs and the monitoring priorities identified in the SPP. The TEA provides a wide array of services supporting educators to improve student outcomes. An overview of these services can be found on TEA's Texas Educator website and each ESC's regional website.

School closures, and in-person training and development due to Covid-19 required quick re-think and re-boot of planned events for remote access environments. Additionally, service provider demands above and beyond normal circumstance limited time for all planned PD during Spring, Summer, Fall 2020, and beyond.

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, 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, formed in the spring of 2014, combined two former stakeholder groups that separately provided perspectives on state supervision, monitoring, target setting, and improvement planning, and 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 institutes, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. By combining membership and bringing forward individuals with a historical perspective to the TCIP process, the continuing conversation in Texas has sustained. New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple face-to-face and other meeting modalities 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. CAC meets at a minimum quarterly. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged. The Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education (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 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.

TEA is committed to using input and feedback to better inform state practices and policies by engaging diverse stakeholders and building relationships. To support this effort, TEA launched its Stakeholder Engagement Initiative during the 2019-2020 school year. The purpose of this initiative is to establish strong universal processes with strategic and timely communication plans to improve the stakeholder engagement practices and to facilitate opportunities that will optimize agency resources toward achieving meaningful interaction and critical feedback. The initiative is charged with the following three goals:

- enhance website & database interaction to allow for specific communication so that all stakeholders can receive information that is relevant to them;
- agency special education staff will receive targeted training and tools to improve stakeholder engagement skills (templates regarding best practices for stakeholder engagement meetings to address recommended activities for pre, during, and post stakeholder meetings);
- and creation of a master calendar with all stakeholder engagement touchpoints.

As with other person access tasked systems, stakeholder involvement activities were impacted by COVID-19 related barriers. The State made quick action to accommodate stakeholder access for purpose of required rule-making processes, provision of information relating to COVID-19 impacts, and State resources and guidance including critical tools for IEP teams to support continued services to students receiving special education in the State. These resources continue to be available on the TEA website at <https://tea.texas.gov/texas-schools/health-safety-discipline/covid/parent-resources-for-students-in-special-education>.

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

YES

Number of Parent Members:

10

Parent Members Engagement:

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

The 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, formed in the spring of 2014, combined two former stakeholder groups that separately provided perspectives on state supervision, monitoring, target setting, and improvement planning, and 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 institutes, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups.

Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education (CAC)

The 17-member CAC is statutorily required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) IDEA-B (PL 101-476) and Texas Education Code § 29.006. It is directed to advise TEA on issues such as the unmet needs within the state in the education of children with disabilities, developing evaluations and reporting on data, and setting standards related to significant disproportionality determinations. The CAC provides the public an opportunity to speak at committee meetings and encourages that 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>

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.

SpedTex works collaboratively with stakeholders to provide resources and facilitate collaboration that supports the development and delivery of services to children with disabilities in our State. The website provides information for all stakeholders across the state. There is an opportunity to join the mailing list to receive special education updates as the opportunity to volunteer to participate in our advisory committee and/or one of our focus groups. They are also invited to provide feedback and input that will fuel efforts for continuous improvement. They offer several opportunities for you to get involved through their advisory committee and focus groups. Advisory committee members provide input that can help improve special education services. Focus group participants engage in discussions sharing feedback and ideas that inform the development of resources for parents and educators.

The website (<https://www.spedtex.org/>) is a resource for parents and stakeholders. It provides information regarding COVID-19, Special Education Supplemental Services, a Resource Locator, Parent Involvement Survey Results and information on Conferences and Events.

The parent resource tab includes information concerning:

- Supplemental Special Education Services,
- COVID 19 and Special Education Services,
- Statewide Webinars,
- Special Education Dispute Resolution,
- General Resources,
- Disabilities,
- Procedural Safeguards,
- Parent's Guide to the ARD Process,
- STAAR and Student Success Initiative,
- Special Education Advocacy, and a
- Video Gallery

Additionally it provides Procedural Safeguards and the Parent's Guide to the ARD Process in the following languages:

- English
- Spanish
- Arabic
- Bengali
- Burmese
- Chinese
- Farsi
- French
- German
- Gujarti
- Hindi
- Japanese
- Khmer
- Korean
- Kurdish
- Laotian
- Nepali
- Portuguese
- Russian
- Somali
- Swahili
- Tagalog
- Urdu
- Vietnamese

These are available directly to parents or for LEAs and other stakeholders to download and share.

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, 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, formed in the spring of 2014, combined two former stakeholder groups that separately provided perspectives on state supervision, monitoring, target setting, and improvement planning, and 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 institutes, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. By combining membership and bringing forward individuals with a historical perspective to the TCIP process, the continuing conversation in Texas has sustained. New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple face-to-face and other meeting modalities 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. 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 Section 1418 of the 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.

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.

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

Reporting to the Public

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

TEA publicly reports district performance against state targets in the SPP for Indicators 1-14 for a given year on its Local Education Agency Reports and Requirements webpage. 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). Also, 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 and Requirements webpage. 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 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. TEA provides these reports publicly on its Reports and Data.

The Results Driven Accountability (RDA) reporting system is the public report used to evaluate LEAs in special population program performance areas. 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 RDA, a redesign of the former Performance-Based-Analysis-System (PBMA), is a dynamic system in which indicators are added, revised, or deleted in response to changes and developments that occur outside of the system, including new legislation and the development of new assessments.

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.

Impacts from COVID-19 resulting barriers demonstrated increased urgency for speed, transparency, and accessible reporting needs that are being met through efforts to target and align systems for data and reporting needs.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

OSEP notes that the State submitted verification that the attachment complies with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508). However, one or more of the attachments included in the State's FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2020 and 2021 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2021 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State did not provide the required information.

The State did not describe 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. Although the State included a link for this prompt, the link goes to the State Systemic Improvement Plan rather than to the information required.

OSEP's Required Actions to the State's FFY 2019 SPP/APR required the State to make available the attachment(s) not posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter. The State has not publicly posted the attachment(s).

The State's outstanding required actions necessary to address longstanding noncompliance identified in OSEP's January 11, 2018 monitoring report may affect the State's determination under section 616(d) of IDEA and may result in the imposition of specific conditions on the State's IDEA Part B grant funds.

Intro - 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.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data¹

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	44.77%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	88.00%	88.00%	88.50%	88.50%	90.00%
Data	78.20%	77.87%	77.41%	77.86%	77.9% ²

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	44.77%	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, 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, formed in the spring of 2014, combined two former stakeholder groups that separately provided perspectives on state supervision, monitoring, target setting, and improvement planning, and 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 institutes, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. By combining membership and bringing forward individuals with a historical perspective to the TCIP process, the continuing conversation in Texas has sustained. New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple face-to-face and other meeting modalities to provide thoughtful input to the important work that has focused on

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

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. CAC meets at a minimum quarterly. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged. The Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education (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 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.

TEA is committed to using input and feedback to better inform state practices and policies by engaging diverse stakeholders and building relationships. To support this effort, TEA launched its Stakeholder Engagement Initiative during the 2019-2020 school year. The purpose of this initiative is to establish strong universal processes with strategic and timely communication plans to improve the stakeholder engagement practices and to facilitate opportunities that will optimize agency resources toward achieving meaningful interaction and critical feedback. The initiative is charged with the following three goals:

- enhance website & database interaction to allow for specific communication so that all stakeholders can receive information that is relevant to them;
- agency special education staff will receive targeted training and tools to improve stakeholder engagement skills (templates regarding best practices for stakeholder engagement meetings to address recommended activities for pre, during, and post stakeholder meetings);
- and creation of a master calendar with all stakeholder engagement touchpoints.

As with other person access tasked systems, stakeholder involvement activities were impacted by COVID-19 related barriers. The State made quick action to accommodate stakeholder access for purpose of required rule-making processes, provision of information relating to COVID-19 impacts, and State resources and guidance including critical tools for IEP teams to support continued services to students receiving special education in the State. These resources continue to be available on the TEA website at <https://tea.texas.gov/texas-schools/health-safety-discipline/covid/parent-resources-for-students-in-special-education>.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	14,966
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	13,828
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	151
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	4,484

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
14,966	33,429	77.9% ³	44.77%	44.77%	N/A	N/A

Graduation Conditions

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

The conditions for earning a general education diploma for youth are provided in Title 19 of the Texas Administrative Code (TAC) Chapter 74 Curriculum Requirements, Subchapter B Graduation Requirements, specifically at 19 TAC §74.11 (exempt for primary conditions are included below, full text of rule can be found at [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$ext.ViewTAC?tac_view=5&ti=19&pt=2&ch=74&sch=B&rl=Y)); (full text of testing requirements found in Chapter 101 as referenced in §74.11(a)(2) can be found at [https://texreg.sos.state.tx.us/public/readtac\\$ext.ViewTAC?tac_view=4&ti=19&pt=2&ch=101](https://texreg.sos.state.tx.us/public/readtac$ext.ViewTAC?tac_view=4&ti=19&pt=2&ch=101)).

³ Percentage blurred due to privacy protection

- (a) To receive a high school diploma, a student entering Grade 9 in the 2014-2015 school year and thereafter must complete the following:
- (1) in accordance with subsection (d) of this section, requirements of the Foundation High School Program specified in §74.12 of this title (relating to Foundation High School Program);
 - (2) testing requirements for graduation as specified in Chapter 101 of this title (relating to Assessment); and
 - (3) demonstrated proficiency, in Grade 8 or higher, as determined by the district in which the student is enrolled, in delivering clear verbal messages; choosing effective nonverbal behaviors; listening for desired results; applying valid critical-thinking and problem-solving processes; and identifying, analyzing, developing, and evaluating communication skills needed for professional and social success in interpersonal situations, group interactions, and personal and professional presentations.

...

(d) A student entering Grade 9 in the 2014-2015 school year and thereafter shall enroll in the courses necessary to complete the curriculum requirements for the Foundation High School Program specified in §74.12 of this title and the curriculum requirements for at least one endorsement specified in §74.13 of this title (relating to Endorsements).

- (e) A student may graduate under the Foundation High School Program without earning an endorsement if, after the student's sophomore year:
- (1) the student and the student's parent or person standing in parental relation to the student are advised by a school counselor of the specific benefits of graduating from high school with one or more endorsements; and
 - (2) the student's parent or person standing in parental relation to the student files with a school counselor written permission, on a form adopted by the TEA, allowing the student to graduate under the Foundation High School Program without earning an endorsement.

...

(g) An out-of-state or out-of-country transfer student (including foreign exchange students) or a transfer student from a Texas nonpublic school is eligible to receive a Texas diploma but must complete all requirements of this section to satisfy state graduation requirements. Any course credit required in this section that is not completed by the student before he or she enrolls in a Texas school district may be satisfied through the provisions of §74.23 of this title (relating to Correspondence Courses and Distance Learning) and §74.24 of this title (relating to Credit by Examination) or by completing the course or courses according to the provisions of §74.26 of this title (relating to Award of Credit).

...

(i) Courses offered for dual credit at or in conjunction with an institution of higher education that provide advanced academic instruction beyond, or in greater depth than, the essential knowledge and skills for the equivalent high school course required for graduation may satisfy graduation requirements, including requirements for required courses, advanced courses, and courses for elective credit as well as requirements for endorsements.

...

(o) A school district shall permit a student to comply with the curriculum requirements under the Foundation High School Program by successfully completing appropriate courses in the core curriculum of an institution of higher education (IHE). A student who has completed the core curriculum of an IHE in accordance with TEC, §61.822, as certified by the IHE in accordance with §4.28 of this title (relating to Core Curriculum):

- (1) is considered to have earned an endorsement by successfully completing the appropriate courses for that endorsement;
- (2) is considered to have earned a distinguished level of achievement under the Foundation High School Program; and
- (3) is entitled to receive a high school diploma.

Additional information and resources may be found at:

<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/graduation-information/house-bill-5-foundation-high-school-program>

https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/SidebySideGraduationPrograms_030114.pdf

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)

Per clarification call on 4/21/2022 with OSEP team for Texas, the State has included 2020 Targets for this indicator. Although the State has designated 2020 as the baseline year, and written instructions in the OSEP provided U.S Department of Education IDEA Part B FFY 2020 SPP/APR User Guide, section 6.1 located on page 28 reads "Baselines and Targets - If your State needs to update the baseline data for any Indicator, manually update the baseline data field and include a detailed explanation at the bottom of the Indicator Data page in the optional comment box. Baseline dates must be updated under the following circumstances: • OSEP requests them to be updated in the required actions • There is a change in the calculation methodology and/or • A change in the measurement/reporting requirement States can select the current year as an Indicator's baseline year. If the baseline year is FFY 2020, do not enter a target for that year.", OSEP has now directed states to comply with assigning a target, while acknowledging the requirement to enter a target in a baseline year does not align with the written instructions. Stakeholders will be informed of this directive by the Department outside of the expected stakeholder involvement requirements for setting targets in these indicators.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

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

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

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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

Measurement

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

OPTION 1:

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

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

OPTION 2:

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

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

Options 1 and 2:

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

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

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data⁴

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	13.41%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	2.10%	2.00%	1.90%	1.80%	1.80%
Data	2.01%	1.96%	1.82%	1.93%	1.85%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	13.41%	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

⁴ Prior to the FFY 2020 submission, the State used a different data source to report data under this indicator..

typically parents, teachers, campus and school district administrators, parent-support and advocacy groups, higher education institutions, 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, formed in the spring of 2014, combined two former stakeholder groups that separately provided perspectives on state supervision, monitoring, target setting, and improvement planning, and 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 institutes, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. By combining membership and bringing forward individuals with a historical perspective to the TCIP process, the continuing conversation in Texas has sustained. New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple face-to-face and other meeting modalities 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. CAC meets at a minimum quarterly. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged. The Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education (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 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.

TEA is committed to using input and feedback to better inform state practices and policies by engaging diverse stakeholders and building relationships. To support this effort, TEA launched its Stakeholder Engagement Initiative during the 2019-2020 school year. The purpose of this initiative is to establish strong universal processes with strategic and timely communication plans to improve the stakeholder engagement practices and to facilitate opportunities that will optimize agency resources toward achieving meaningful interaction and critical feedback. The initiative is charged with the following three goals:

- enhance website & database interaction to allow for specific communication so that all stakeholders can receive information that is relevant to them;
- agency special education staff will receive targeted training and tools to improve stakeholder engagement skills (templates regarding best practices for stakeholder engagement meetings to address recommended activities for pre, during, and post stakeholder meetings);
- and creation of a master calendar with all stakeholder engagement touchpoints.

As with other person access tasked systems, stakeholder involvement activities were impacted by COVID-19 related barriers. The State made quick action to accommodate stakeholder access for purpose of required rule-making processes, provision of information relating to COVID-19 impacts, and State resources and guidance including critical tools for IEP teams to support continued services to students receiving special education in the State. These resources continue to be available on the TEA website at <https://tea.texas.gov/texas-schools/health-safety-discipline/covid/parent-resources-for-students-in-special-education>.

The 2020-21 implementation of the data source and measurement changes necessitated a new Indicator 2 baseline. Therefore, results from this school year are not comparable to prior school years and instead set a new baseline for the state.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 1

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	14,966
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	13,828
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	151
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	4,484

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
4,484	33,429	1.85%	13.41%	13.41%	N/A	N/A

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)

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) allows states two options for measuring dropout rates (i.e., Option 1 and Option 2). Option 1 reports the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out. Option 2 reports the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year. Previously, Texas reported Drop Out Rate using Option 2 in alignment with state accountability targets and measurements. Specifically, Texas utilized the U.S. Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) computation methodology in the Part B Indicator Measurement Table for this indicator for students enrolled in grades 7-12 meeting the state definition of a dropout in alignment with state accountability targets and measurements. Since Option 2 will not be available beginning FFY 2021, based on advisement from stakeholder input, beginning FFY 2020, Texas is reporting Drop Out Rate using Option 1. As such, Texas identifies FFY 2020 as a re-baseline year due to the impact from data source and calculation changes.

Per clarification call on 4/21/2022 with OSEP team for Texas, the State has included 2020 Targets for this indicator. Although the State has designated 2020 as the baseline year, and written instructions in the OSEP provided U.S Department of Education IDEA Part B FFY 2020 SPP/APR User Guide, section 6.1 located on page 28 reads "Baselines and Targets - If your State needs to update the baseline data for any Indicator, manually update the baseline data field and include a detailed explanation at the bottom of the Indicator Data page in the optional comment box. Baseline dates must be updated under the following circumstances: • OSEP requests them to be updated in the required actions • There is a change in the calculation methodology and/or • A change in the measurement/reporting requirement States can select the current year as an Indicator's baseline year. If the baseline year is FFY 2020, do not enter a target for that year.", OSEP has now directed states to comply with assigning a target, while acknowledging the requirement to enter a target in a baseline year does not align with the written instructions. Stakeholders will be informed of this directive by the Department outside of the expected stakeholder involvement requirements for setting targets in these indicators.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

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

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

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	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	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	87.82%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	80.65%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	74.25%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	88.21%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	81.85%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	85.18%	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, 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, formed in the spring of 2014, combined two former stakeholder groups that separately provided perspectives on state supervision, monitoring, target setting, and improvement planning, and 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 institutes, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. By combining membership and bringing forward individuals with a historical perspective to the TCIP process, the continuing conversation in Texas has sustained. New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple face-to-face and other meeting modalities 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. CAC meets at a minimum quarterly. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged. The Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education (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 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.

TEA is committed to using input and feedback to better inform state practices and policies by engaging diverse stakeholders and building relationships. To support this effort, TEA launched its Stakeholder Engagement Initiative during the 2019-2020 school year. The purpose of this initiative is to establish strong universal processes with strategic and timely communication plans to improve the stakeholder engagement practices and to facilitate opportunities that will optimize agency resources toward achieving meaningful interaction and critical feedback. The initiative is charged with the following three goals:

- enhance website & database interaction to allow for specific communication so that all stakeholders can receive information that is relevant to them;
- agency special education staff will receive targeted training and tools to improve stakeholder engagement skills (templates regarding best practices for stakeholder engagement meetings to address recommended activities for pre, during, and post stakeholder meetings);
- and creation of a master calendar with all stakeholder engagement touchpoints.

As with other person access tasked systems, stakeholder involvement activities were impacted by COVID-19 related barriers. The State made quick action to accommodate stakeholder access for purpose of required rule-making processes, provision of information relating to COVID-19 impacts, and State resources and guidance including critical tools for IEP teams to support continued services to students receiving special education in the State. These resources continue to be available on the TEA website at <https://tea.texas.gov/texas-schools/health-safety-discipline/covid/parent-resources-for-students-in-special-education>.

Due to changes in indicator measurement, stakeholders advised, and the State agrees to re-baseline in FFY 2020.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

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

Date:

03/30/2022

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	52,828	44,842	62,132
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	6,539	3,144	4,541
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	34,821	28,514	37,114

d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	5,043	4,511	4,499
---	-------	-------	-------

Data Source:

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

Date:

03/30/2022

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	52,681	46,151	47,692
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	6,303	3,753	4,168
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	35,128	29,513	31,942
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	5,040	4,507	4,514

*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 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	46,403	52,828		87.82%	87.84%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	36,169	44,842		80.65%	80.66%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	46,154	62,132		74.25%	74.28%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	46,471	52,681		88.21%	88.21%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	37,773	46,151		81.85%	81.85%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	40,624	47,692		85.18%	85.18%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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 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 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>

Links to public reporting are inclusive of:

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

https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/perfreport/tprs/tprs_srch.html

<https://txreports.emetric.net/>

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>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Of note, Texas put in a ticket with PSC and assigned ticket #2200361 requesting information regarding the inclusion of the student counts reported SPP Indicator 3A specifically in FS188 under category PARTELP (meeting definition and requirements for participating in ELP in lieu of state assessment) that are included in the denominator for calculation under SPP Indicator 3A, and why these students are not similarly excluded from the denominator as is with students reported in same files under category MEDEXEMPT (meeting definition of medical exemption). Indicator 3A allows for the removal of students included in FS188 as MEDEXEMPT, but includes PARTELP with no place to include positively in the numerator, and thus counts negatively for the state. For Texas, this number is not large, and doesn't have impact to statewide percentage. However, when calculating at the LEA level, it can impact some LEA participation rates and therefore difficult to reconcile with stakeholders on why this group (meeting the requirements for taking ELP in lieu of the state assessment) counts negatively against their participation rate. We received an email back from PSC stating, "Please let TX know that PARTELP is included in both the numerator and denominator for 3A".

The State does not accept this response, as we have found in the file submitted, in comparison to the numbers represented in 3A Reading using FS188 Data Group 589, that the counts of PARTELP are not included in the numerator, but are included in the denominator. Below are the counts excluded in numerator but included in the count for denominator as calculated by grade level:

4 ALTPARTALTACH 5043
4 MEDEXEMPT 35
4 NPART 6425
4 PARTELP 8
4 REGPARTWACC 34821
4 REGPARTWOACC 6539
Total reported in SPP3A Grade 4 - a. Children with IEPs* includes PARTELP and not MEDEXEMPT = 52,836

8 ALTPARTALTACH 4511
8 MEDEXEMPT 49
8 NPART 8673
8 PARTELP 4
8 REGPARTWACC 28514
8 REGPARTWOACC 3144
Total reported in SPP3A Grade 8 - a. Children with IEPs* includes PARTELP and not MEDEXEMPT = 44,846

HS ALTPARTALTACH 4499
HS MEDEXEMPT 61
HS NPART 15978
HS PARTELP 30
HS REGPARTWACC 37114
HS REGPARTWOACC 4541
Total reported in SPP3A Grade HS - a. Children with IEPs* includes PARTELP and not MEDEXEMPT = 62,162

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589) For FS188, please consider - 1) PARTELP needs to be included in both numerator and denominator to comply with the federal regulations based on ESSA; 2) SPP program or OSEP needs to add one category to accommodate the PARTELP counts or also exempt from denominator inclusion as does for MEDEXEMPT.

Per clarification call on 4/21/2022 with OSEP team for Texas, the State has included 2020 Targets for this indicator. Although the State has designated 2020 as the baseline year, and written instructions in the OSEP provided U.S Department of Education IDEA Part B FFY 2020 SPP/APR User Guide, section 6.1 located on page 28 reads "Baselines and Targets - If your State needs to update the baseline data for any Indicator, manually update the baseline data field and include a detailed explanation at the bottom of the Indicator Data page in the optional comment box. Baseline dates must be updated under the following circumstances: • OSEP requests them to be updated in the required actions • There is a change in the calculation methodology and/or • A change in the measurement/reporting requirement States can select the current year as an Indicator's baseline year. If the baseline year is FFY 2020, do not enter a target for that year.", OSEP has now directed states to comply with assigning a target, while acknowledging the requirement to enter a target in a baseline year does not align with the written instructions. Stakeholders will be informed of this directive by the Department outside of the expected stakeholder involvement requirements for setting targets in these indicators.

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

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

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets. OSEP notes that, for the 2020-2021 school year, the State received, from the Department's Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, a waiver of accountability and school identification requirements in sections 1111(4) and 1111(d)(2)I-(D) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), including a waiver of the requirement that the Academic Achievement indicator be adjusted to account for a participation rate below 95 percent, based on the State's data from the 2020-2021 school year. Therefore, the targets below 95 percent are accepted for FFY 2020. OSEP accepts the targets of 95 percent for FFYs 2021 through 2025 because the targets are consistent with the requirement in ESEA section 1111(4) to annually measure the achievement of not less than 95 percent of all students, and 95 percent of all students in each subgroup of students, who are enrolled in public schools on the State's assessments, and the requirement in ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(i)(II) that a State's assessments be administered to all public elementary and secondary school

students in the State.

The State did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities participating in regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the State, district and school levels. In addition, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities, if any, participating in alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the State, district and school levels.

OSEP notes that the State provided links to its 2021-22 Accommodations Resources Website, 2021-2022 Accessibility Features document, STARR Grades 3-8 2022 Test Administration Reporting Student Data File Format. These documents provide information regarding accessibility features available to students with and without disabilities, designated supports that the State explains are locally-approved supports for students who meet eligibility criteria, and designated supports requiring TEA approval using an accommodations request process administered by the State. This information does not meet the public reporting requirements under 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). The failure to publicly report as required under 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) is noncompliance."

3A - 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.

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	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	11.83%	14.00%	20.00%	25.00%	30.00%	40.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	10.04%	12.00%	18.00%	25.00%	30.00%	40.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	10.49%	12.00%	18.00%	25.00%	30.00%	40.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	13.25%	19.00%	23.00%	25.00%	30.00%	40.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	10.96%	20.00%	23.00%	25.00%	30.00%	40.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	10.28%	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, 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, formed in the spring of 2014, combined two former stakeholder groups that separately provided perspectives on state supervision, monitoring, target setting, and improvement planning, and 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 institutes, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. By combining membership and bringing forward individuals with a historical perspective to the TCIP process, the continuing conversation in Texas has sustained. New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple face-to-face and other meeting modalities 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. CAC meets at a minimum quarterly. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged. The Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education (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 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.

TEA is committed to using input and feedback to better inform state practices and policies by engaging diverse stakeholders and building relationships. To support this effort, TEA launched its Stakeholder Engagement Initiative during the 2019-2020 school year. The purpose of this initiative is to establish strong universal processes with strategic and timely communication plans to improve the stakeholder engagement practices and to facilitate opportunities that will optimize agency resources toward achieving meaningful interaction and critical feedback. The initiative is charged with the following three goals:

- enhance website & database interaction to allow for specific communication so that all stakeholders can receive information that is relevant to them;
- agency special education staff will receive targeted training and tools to improve stakeholder engagement skills (templates regarding best practices for stakeholder engagement meetings to address recommended activities for pre, during, and post stakeholder meetings);
- and creation of a master calendar with all stakeholder engagement touchpoints.

As with other person access tasked systems, stakeholder involvement activities were impacted by COVID-19 related barriers. The State made quick action to accommodate stakeholder access for purpose of required rule-making processes, provision of information relating to COVID-19 impacts, and State resources and guidance including critical tools for IEP teams to support continued services to students receiving special education in the State. These resources continue to be available on the TEA website at <https://tea.texas.gov/texas-schools/health-safety-discipline/covid/parent-resources-for-students-in-special-education>.

Due to changes in indicator measurement, stakeholders advised, and the State agrees to re-baseline in FFY 2020.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

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

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	41,360	31,658	41,655
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,825	1,191	1,247
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,068	1,989	3,121

Data Source:

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

Date:

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	41,431	33,266	36,110
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,929	1,366	874
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,561	2,281	2,839

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	4,893	41,360		11.83%	11.83%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	3,180	31,658		10.04%	10.04%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	4,368	41,655		10.49%	10.49%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	5,490	41,431		13.25%	13.25%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	3,647	33,266		10.96%	10.96%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	3,713	36,110		10.28%	10.28%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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 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 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>

Links to public reporting are inclusive of:

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

https://rptsrv1.tea.texas.gov/perfreport/tprs/tprs_srch.html

<https://txreports.emetric.net/>

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>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Additional information about the Texas Assessment Program can be found on the TEA STAAR Resources website and the STAAR Statewide Summary Reports website.

<https://tea.texas.gov/student-assessment/testing/taar/taar-resources>

<https://tea.texas.gov/student-assessment/testing/taar/taar-statewide-summary-reports>

Per clarification call on 4/21/2022 with OSEP team for Texas, the State has included 2020 Targets for this indicator. Although the State has designated 2020 as the baseline year, and written instructions in the OSEP provided U.S Department of Education IDEA Part B FFY 2020 SPP/APR User Guide, section 6.1 located on page 28 reads "Baselines and Targets - If your State needs to update the baseline data for any Indicator, manually update the baseline data field and include a detailed explanation at the bottom of the Indicator Data page in the optional comment box. Baseline dates must be updated under the following circumstances: • OSEP requests them to be updated in the required actions • There is a change in the calculation methodology and/or • A change in the measurement/reporting requirement States can select the current year as an Indicator's baseline year. If the baseline year is FFY 2020, do not enter a target for that year.", OSEP has now directed states to comply with assigning a target, while acknowledging the requirement to enter a target in a baseline year does not align with the written instructions. Stakeholders will be informed of this directive by the Department outside of the expected stakeholder involvement requirements for setting targets in these indicators.

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

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

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

3B - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	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	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	85.35%	91.00%	92.00%	92.00%	93.00%	93.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	94.81%	93.00%	93.00%	94.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	94.47%	94.00%	94.00%	95.00%	95.00%	96.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	92.62%	94.00%	94.00%	95.00%	95.00%	96.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.25%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	96.00%	96.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	91.16%	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, 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, formed in the spring of 2014, combined two former stakeholder groups that separately provided perspectives on state supervision, monitoring, target setting, and improvement planning, and 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 institutes, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. By combining membership and bringing forward individuals with a historical perspective to the TCIP process, the continuing conversation in Texas has sustained. New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple face-to-face and other meeting modalities 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. CAC meets at a minimum quarterly. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged. The Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education (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 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.

TEA is committed to using input and feedback to better inform state practices and policies by engaging diverse stakeholders and building relationships. To support this effort, TEA launched its Stakeholder Engagement Initiative during the 2019-2020 school year. The purpose of this initiative is to establish strong universal processes with strategic and timely communication plans to improve the stakeholder engagement practices and to facilitate opportunities that will optimize agency resources toward achieving meaningful interaction and critical feedback. The initiative is charged with the following three goals:

- enhance website & database interaction to allow for specific communication so that all stakeholders can receive information that is relevant to them;
- agency special education staff will receive targeted training and tools to improve stakeholder engagement skills (templates regarding best practices for stakeholder engagement meetings to address recommended activities for pre, during, and post stakeholder meetings);
- and creation of a master calendar with all stakeholder engagement touchpoints.

As with other person access tasked systems, stakeholder involvement activities were impacted by COVID-19 related barriers. The State made quick action to accommodate stakeholder access for purpose of required rule-making processes, provision of information relating to COVID-19 impacts, and State resources and guidance including critical tools for IEP teams to support continued services to students receiving special education in the State. These resources continue to be available on the TEA website at <https://tea.texas.gov/texas-schools/health-safety-discipline/covid/parent-resources-for-students-in-special-education>.

Due to changes in indicator measurement, stakeholders advised, and the State agrees to re-baseline in FFY 2020.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

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

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	5,043	4,511	4,499
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	4,304	4,277	4,250

Data Source:

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

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	5,040	4,507	4,514
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	4,668	4,293	4,115

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	4,304	5,043		85.35%	85.35%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	4,277	4,511		94.81%	94.81%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	4,250	4,499		94.47%	94.47%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	4,668	5,040		92.62%	92.62%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	4,293	4,507		95.25%	95.25%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	4,115	4,514		91.16%	91.16%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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 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>

Links to public reporting are inclusive of:

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

https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/perfreport/tprs/tprs_srch.html

<https://txreports.emetric.net/>

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>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Per clarification call on 4/21/2022 with OSEP team for Texas, the State has included 2020 Targets for this indicator. Although the State has designated 2020 as the baseline year, and written instructions in the OSEP provided U.S Department of Education IDEA Part B FFY 2020 SPP/APR User Guide, section 6.1 located on page 28 reads "Baselines and Targets - If your State needs to update the baseline data for any Indicator, manually update the baseline data field and include a detailed explanation at the bottom of the Indicator Data page in the optional comment box. Baseline dates must be updated under the following circumstances: • OSEP requests them to be updated in the required actions • There is a change in the calculation methodology and/or • A change in the measurement/reporting requirement States can select the current year as an Indicator's baseline year. If the baseline year is FFY 2020, do not enter a target for that year.", OSEP has now directed states to comply with assigning a target, while acknowledging the requirement to enter a target in a baseline year does not align with the written instructions. Stakeholders will be informed of this directive by the Department outside of the expected stakeholder involvement requirements for setting targets in these indicators.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

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

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

The State did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported publicly on the performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, the performance results of children with disabilities on alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the district and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) is noncompliance.

3C - 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.

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	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	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	23.38	23.00	23.00	22.00	21.00	20.00
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	35.25	36.00	35.00	34.00	32.00	30.00
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	37.91	38.00	37.00	35.00	32.00	30.00
Math	A <=	Grade 4	20.90	20.00	20.00	19.00	19.00	18.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	32.72	32.00	31.00	30.00	29.00	28.00
Math	C <=	Grade HS	26.66	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, 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, formed in the spring of 2014, combined two former stakeholder groups that separately provided perspectives on state supervision, monitoring, target setting, and improvement planning, and 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 institutes, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. By combining membership and bringing forward individuals with a historical perspective to the TCIP process, the continuing conversation in Texas has sustained. New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple face-to-face and other meeting modalities 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. CAC meets at a minimum quarterly. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged. The Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education (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 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.

TEA is committed to using input and feedback to better inform state practices and policies by engaging diverse stakeholders and building relationships. To support this effort, TEA launched its Stakeholder Engagement Initiative during the 2019-2020 school year. The purpose of this initiative is to establish strong universal processes with strategic and timely communication plans to improve the stakeholder engagement practices and to facilitate opportunities that will optimize agency resources toward achieving meaningful interaction and critical feedback. The initiative is charged with the following three goals:

- enhance website & database interaction to allow for specific communication so that all stakeholders can receive information that is relevant to them;
- agency special education staff will receive targeted training and tools to improve stakeholder engagement skills (templates regarding best practices for stakeholder engagement meetings to address recommended activities for pre, during, and post stakeholder meetings);
- and creation of a master calendar with all stakeholder engagement touchpoints.

As with other person access tasked systems, stakeholder involvement activities were impacted by COVID-19 related barriers. The State made quick action to accommodate stakeholder access for purpose of required rule-making processes, provision of information relating to COVID-19 impacts, and State resources and guidance including critical tools for IEP teams to support continued services to students receiving special education in the State. These resources continue to be available on the TEA website at <https://tea.texas.gov/texas-schools/health-safety-discipline/covid/parent-resources-for-students-in-special-education>.

Baseline established due to new measurement.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

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

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	338,663	343,263	439,786
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	41,360	31,658	41,655
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	107,067	144,299	196,060
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	12,189	11,167	16,798

e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,825	1,191	1,247
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,068	1,989	3,121

Data Source:

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

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	338,892	408,209	371,980
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	41,431	33,266	36,110
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	101,163	165,257	125,590
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	14,560	13,053	11,814
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,929	1,366	874
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,561	2,281	2,839

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	11.83%	35.21%		23.38	23.38	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	10.04%	45.29%		35.25	35.25	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	10.49%	48.40%		37.91	37.91	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	13.25%	34.15%		20.90	20.90	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	10.96%	43.68%		32.72	32.72	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	10.28%	36.94%		26.66	26.66	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Per clarification call on 4/21/2022 with OSEP team for Texas, the State has included 2020 Targets for this indicator. Although the State has designated 2020 as the baseline year, and written instructions in the OSEP provided U.S Department of Education IDEA Part B FFY 2020 SPP/APR User Guide, section 6.1 located on page 28 reads "Baselines and Targets - If your State needs to update the baseline data for any Indicator, manually update the baseline data field and include a detailed explanation at the bottom of the Indicator Data page in the optional comment box. Baseline dates must be updated under the following circumstances: • OSEP requests them to be updated in the required actions • There is a change in the calculation methodology and/or • A change in the measurement/reporting requirement States can select the current year as an Indicator's baseline year. If the baseline year is FFY 2020, do not enter a target for that year.", OSEP has now directed states to comply with assigning a target, while acknowledging the requirement to enter a target in a baseline year does not align with the written instructions. Stakeholders will be informed of this directive by the Department outside of the expected stakeholder involvement requirements for setting targets in these indicators.

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

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

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

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	28.57%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.17%	2.29%	1.89%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	28.57%	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, 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, formed in the spring of 2014, combined two former stakeholder groups that separately provided perspectives on state supervision, monitoring, target setting, and improvement planning, and 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 institutes, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. By combining membership and bringing forward individuals with a historical perspective to the TCIP process, the continuing conversation in Texas has sustained. New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple face-to-face and other meeting modalities 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. CAC meets at a minimum quarterly. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged. The Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education (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 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.

TEA is committed to using input and feedback to better inform state practices and policies by engaging diverse stakeholders and building relationships. To support this effort, TEA launched its Stakeholder Engagement Initiative during the 2019-2020 school year. The purpose of this initiative is to establish strong universal processes with strategic and timely communication plans to improve the stakeholder engagement practices and to facilitate opportunities that will optimize agency resources toward achieving meaningful interaction and critical feedback. The initiative is charged with the following three goals:

- enhance website & database interaction to allow for specific communication so that all stakeholders can receive information that is relevant to them;
- agency special education staff will receive targeted training and tools to improve stakeholder engagement skills (templates regarding best practices for stakeholder engagement meetings to address recommended activities for pre, during, and post stakeholder meetings);
- and creation of a master calendar with all stakeholder engagement touchpoints.

As with other person access tasked systems, stakeholder involvement activities were impacted by COVID-19 related barriers. The State made quick action to accommodate stakeholder access for purpose of required rule-making processes, provision of information relating to COVID-19 impacts, and State resources and guidance including critical tools for IEP teams to support continued services to students receiving special education in the State. These resources continue to be available on the TEA website at <https://tea.texas.gov/texas-schools/health-safety-discipline/covid/parent-resources-for-students-in-special-education>.

Due to changes in indicator measurement methodology and calculation application, stakeholders advised, and the State agrees to re-baseline in FFY 2020.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

1,169

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
10	35	0.00%	28.57%	28.57%	N/A	N/A

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 LEA meeting the State's established minimum size requirement and exceeding the established risk ratio threshold of >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 be included in this measurement, a local education agency (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 nondisabled students in the same LEA with out of school suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days to determine the risk ratio.

An alternate risk ratio is applied when the target group meets MSR, but the comparison group in the LEA does not meet the MSR requirements. The calculation is performed by dividing the rate of children with disabilities for out of school suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a single school year within an LEA by the risk of that outcome for nondisabled students in the State. No risk ratio or alternate risk ratio is calculated in a particular category for an LEA if the target group being analyzed does not meet the minimum cell size (10) or minimum n-size (30).

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

TEA has updated its methodology to use risk ratio by comparing each LEA rate for LEAs meeting the minimum size requirements established by the State for children with IEPs with out of school suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 cumulative school days in a single school year to the rate of nondisabled students in the same LEA based on feedback and discussion with OSEP during the OSEP clarification period with the State.

Additionally, per clarification call on 4/21/2022 with OSEP team for Texas, the State has included 2020 Targets for this indicator. Although the State has designated 2020 as the baseline year, and written instructions in the OSEP provided U.S Department of Education IDEA Part B FFY 2020 SPP/APR User Guide, section 6.1 located on page 28 reads "Baselines and Targets - If your State needs to update the baseline data for any Indicator, manually update the baseline data field and include a detailed explanation at the bottom of the Indicator Data page in the optional comment box. Baseline dates must be updated under the following circumstances: • OSEP requests them to be updated in the required actions • There is a change in the calculation methodology and/or • A change in the measurement/reporting requirement States can select the current year as an Indicator's baseline year. If the baseline year is FFY 2020, do not enter a target for that year.", OSEP has now directed states to comply with assigning a target, while acknowledging the requirement to enter a target in a baseline year does not align with the written instructions. Stakeholders will be informed of this directive by the Department outside of the expected stakeholder involvement requirements for setting targets in these indicators.

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

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

TEA required identified local education agencies (LEAs), through a self-assessment, 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. Upon the completion of the LEA's self-assessment of policies and procedures, TEA required submission of the self-assessment results via a Strategic Support Plan. TEA staff reviewed the resulting SSP for identified needs and noncompliance.

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 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

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

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

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

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

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

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

Targets

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/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.

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
10	0	24	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

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 and exceeding the established risk ratio threshold of >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 be included in this measurement, a local education agency (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 a particular 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 the same racial/ethnic group in the same LEA with out of school suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days to determine the risk ratio.

An alternate risk ratio is applied when the 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 rate of children with disabilities in a particular racial or ethnic group for out of school suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a single school year within an LEA by the risk of that outcome for nondisabled students in the same racial or ethnic group 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).

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Due to changes in indicator measurement methodology and calculation application, stakeholders advised, and the State agrees to re-baseline in FFY 2020. Targets are required at 0%.

TEA has updated its methodology to use risk ratio, described in the State definition, based on feedback and discussion with OSEP during the OSEP clarification period with the State.

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

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

TEA required identified local education agencies (LEAs), through a self-assessment, 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. Upon the completion of the LEA's self-assessment of policies and procedures, TEA required submission of the self-assessment results via a Strategic Support Plan (SPP). TEA staff reviewed the resulting SSP for identified needs and noncompliance.

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 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

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

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

The State did not report the number of districts that did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement and were excluded from the calculation.

4B- 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.

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

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

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2020	Target >=	67.00%	67.50%	68.00%	68.00%	
A	71.84%	Data	68.13%	68.42%	68.75%	69.45%	71.04%
B	2020	Target <=	13.50%	13.00%	12.50%	12.00%	
B	14.07%	Data	14.60%	14.79%	14.94%	14.88%	14.42%
C	2020	Target <=	1.30%	1.30%	1.30%	1.29%	
C	0.80%	Data	1.12%	1.15%	1.11%	0.91%	0.84%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	71.84%	73.00%	73.00%	74.00%	74.00%	75.00%
Target B <=	14.07%	14.00%	13.00%	12.00%	11.00%	10.00%
Target C <=	0.80%	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, 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, formed in the spring of 2014, combined two former stakeholder groups that separately provided perspectives on state supervision, monitoring, target setting, and improvement planning, and 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 institutes, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. By combining membership and bringing forward individuals with a historical perspective to the TCIP process, the continuing conversation in Texas has sustained. New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple face-to-face and other meeting modalities 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. CAC meets at a minimum quarterly. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged. The Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education (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 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.

TEA is committed to using input and feedback to better inform state practices and policies by engaging diverse stakeholders and building relationships. To support this effort, TEA launched its Stakeholder Engagement Initiative during the 2019-2020 school year. The purpose of this initiative is to establish strong universal processes with strategic and timely communication plans to improve the stakeholder engagement practices and to facilitate opportunities that will optimize agency resources toward achieving meaningful interaction and critical feedback. The initiative is charged with the following three goals:

- enhance website & database interaction to allow for specific communication so that all stakeholders can receive information that is relevant to them;
- agency special education staff will receive targeted training and tools to improve stakeholder engagement skills (templates regarding best practices for stakeholder engagement meetings to address recommended activities for pre, during, and post stakeholder meetings);
- and creation of a master calendar with all stakeholder engagement touchpoints.

As with other person access tasked systems, stakeholder involvement activities were impacted by COVID-19 related barriers. The State made quick action to accommodate stakeholder access for purpose of required rule-making processes, provision of information relating to COVID-19 impacts, and State resources and guidance including critical tools for IEP teams to support continued services to students receiving special education in the State. These resources continue to be available on the TEA website at <https://tea.texas.gov/texas-schools/health-safety-discipline/covid/parent-resources-for-students-in-special-education>.

Specifically for target setting in SPP Indicator 5, stakeholders agreed that due to the change in data set inclusion of 5 year olds, now part of the school aged data set used for calculation in SPP Indicator 5, the State should consider re-baselining to appropriately reset on LEA implications against the target. Although percentage wise, statewide impact was minimal due to size of State as seen from FFY 18, to FFY 19 (voluntary/optional application of the file exclusion change to 5-year olds enrolled in Kindergarten moved into SPP Indicator 5) to FFY 2020 data, LEA data against the target sees more impact against a statewide target. Stakeholders advised that since application against target to most LEAs would have impact, rebaselining and applying target measurements in FFY 2021 to LEAs would be advisable. The State agreed and will work toward advising LEAs of target expectations for FFY 2021 and beyond.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	575,438
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	413,366
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	80,945
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	2,302
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	85
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	2,188

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

NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	413,366	575,438	71.04%	71.84%	71.84%	N/A	N/A
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	80,945	575,438	14.42%	14.07%	14.07%	N/A	N/A
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	4,575	575,438	0.84%	0.80%	0.80%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Per clarification call on 4/21/2022 with OSEP team for Texas, the State has included 2020 Targets for this indicator. Although the State has designated 2020 as the baseline year, and written instructions in the OSEP provided U.S Department of Education IDEA Part B FFY 2020 SPP/APR User Guide, section 6.1 located on page 28 reads "Baselines and Targets - If your State needs to update the baseline data for any Indicator, manually update the baseline data field and include a detailed explanation at the bottom of the Indicator Data page in the optional comment box. Baseline dates must be updated under the following circumstances: • OSEP requests them to be updated in the required actions • There is a change in the calculation methodology and/or • A change in the measurement/reporting requirement States can select the current year as an Indicator's baseline year. If the baseline year is FFY 2020, do not enter a target for that year.", OSEP has now directed states to comply with assigning a target, while acknowledging the requirement to enter a target in a baseline year does not align with the written instructions. Stakeholders will be informed of this directive by the Department outside of the expected stakeholder involvement requirements for setting targets in these indicators. 2019 was also considered a baseline year, and therefore no target was entered in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR as per instruction during the submission year. Additionally, the State discussed with OSEP that it feels setting a target below 1% in a state our size eventually erodes the possibility of continuum for settings included in 5C. In OSEP's Universal Technical Assistance for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2020-2025 it provides that "Generally, targets are not approvable if they do not show improvement over baseline; however, there have been specific instances where OSEP has allowed States to set targets that do not reflect improvement over baseline." TEA had requested that given our state size and rank among other states (Texas - 0.8% ranks in lowest 3 states, and below comparable sized states - CA 3.0%, FL 3.1%) setting a target for progression below 1% would be inappropriate. OSEP directed the State that it needed to comply with the application requirements and set the 2025 Target below the baseline data level. The State complied and set the Target for 2025 at 0.79%.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

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

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets. OSEP notes that the State did not report FFY 2019 targets for this indicator in the Historical Data table.

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	Target >=	32.00%	32.50%	33.00%	33.00%	
A	Data	32.05%	32.87%	31.79%	32.03%	26.75%
B	Target <=	16.50%	16.00%	15.50%	15.00%	
B	Data	16.59%	16.99%	16.88%	17.59%	26.58%

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, 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, formed in the spring of 2014, combined two former stakeholder

groups that separately provided perspectives on state supervision, monitoring, target setting, and improvement planning, and 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 institutes, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. By combining membership and bringing forward individuals with a historical perspective to the TCIP process, the continuing conversation in Texas has sustained. New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple face-to-face and other meeting modalities 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. CAC meets at a minimum quarterly. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged. The Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education (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 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.

TEA is committed to using input and feedback to better inform state practices and policies by engaging diverse stakeholders and building relationships. To support this effort, TEA launched its Stakeholder Engagement Initiative during the 2019-2020 school year. The purpose of this initiative is to establish strong universal processes with strategic and timely communication plans to improve the stakeholder engagement practices and to facilitate opportunities that will optimize agency resources toward achieving meaningful interaction and critical feedback. The initiative is charged with the following three goals:

- enhance website & database interaction to allow for specific communication so that all stakeholders can receive information that is relevant to them;
- agency special education staff will receive targeted training and tools to improve stakeholder engagement skills (templates regarding best practices for stakeholder engagement meetings to address recommended activities for pre, during, and post stakeholder meetings);
- and creation of a master calendar with all stakeholder engagement touchpoints.

As with other person access tasked systems, stakeholder involvement activities were impacted by COVID-19 related barriers. The State made quick action to accommodate stakeholder access for purpose of required rule-making processes, provision of information relating to COVID-19 impacts, and State resources and guidance including critical tools for IEP teams to support continued services to students receiving special education in the State. These resources continue to be available on the TEA website at <https://tea.texas.gov/texas-schools/health-safety-discipline/covid/parent-resources-for-students-in-special-education>.

Specifically for target setting in SPP Indicator 6, stakeholders agreed that due to the change in data set exclusion of 5-year-olds, now part of the school aged data set used for calculation in SPP Indicator 5, impact was significant for SPP Indicator 6 as seen from FFY 18, to FFY 19 (voluntary/optional application of the file exclusion change to 5-year-olds enrolled in Kindergarten moved into SPP Indicator 5) to FFY 2020 data. Stakeholders advised that application against target to most LEAs would have impact and therefore, re-baseline and applying target measurements in FFY 2021 to LEAs would be advisable. The State agreed and will work toward advising LEAs of target expectations for FFY 2021 and beyond.

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	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	27.05%	27.00%	27.00%	28.00%	29.00%	30.00%
Target B <=	25.70%	26.00%	25.00%	24.00%	24.00%	23.00%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
-----	------	------	------	------	------	------

Target C <=	0.85%	0.85%	0.85%	0.85%	0.85%	0.84%
-------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

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

Date:

07/07/2021

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	8,096	17,859	3,958	29,913
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	1,404	5,406	1,282	8,092
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	3,146	3,847	672	7,665
b2. Number of children attending separate school	9	10	3	22
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	1	1	0	2
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	99	125	31	255

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

NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	8,092	29,913	26.75%	27.05%	27.05%	N/A	N/A
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	7,689	29,913	26.58%	25.70%	25.70%	N/A	N/A
C. Home	255	29,913		0.85%	0.85%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Per clarification call on 4/21/2022 with OSEP team for Texas, the State has included 2020 Targets for this indicator. Although the State has designated 2020 as the baseline year, and written instructions in the OSEP provided U.S Department of Education IDEA Part B FFY 2020 SPP/APR User Guide, section 6.1 located on page 28 reads "Baselines and Targets - If your State needs to update the baseline data for any Indicator, manually update the baseline data field and include a detailed explanation at the bottom of the Indicator Data page in the optional comment box. Baseline dates must be updated under the following circumstances: • OSEP requests them to be updated in the required actions • There is a change in the calculation methodology and/or • A change in the measurement/reporting requirement States can select the current year as an Indicator's baseline year. If the baseline year is FFY 2020, do not enter a target for that year.", OSEP has now directed states to comply with assigning a target, while acknowledging the requirement to enter a target in a baseline year does not align with the written instructions. Stakeholders will be informed of this directive by the Department outside of the expected stakeholder involvement requirements for setting targets in these indicators.

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

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

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets. OSEP notes that the State did not report FFY 2019 targets for this indicator in the Historical Data table.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1	2008	Target >=	83.00%	84.00%	84.00%	85.00%	86.00%
A1	73.40%	Data	83.73%	84.26%	84.81%	84.36%	85.03%
A2	2008	Target >=	62.00%	62.00%	63.00%	63.00%	63.00%

A2	62.20%	Data	59.86%	60.74%	61.04%	59.65%	60.07%
B1	2008	Target >=	83.00%	84.00%	84.00%	85.00%	86.00%
B1	67.00%	Data	82.34%	83.56%	84.41%	84.25%	84.41%
B2	2008	Target >=	57.00%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%
B2	52.00%	Data	55.91%	57.61%	58.51%	56.95%	57.49%
C1	2008	Target >=	83.00%	84.00%	84.00%	85.00%	86.00%
C1	72.50%	Data	83.37%	84.73%	84.86%	84.71%	84.62%
C2	2008	Target >=	73.00%	73.00%	74.00%	74.00%	74.00%
C2	73.60%	Data	71.00%	72.32%	71.65%	71.29%	72.15%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	85.00%	85.00%	86.00%	86.00%	87.00%	87.00%
Target A2 >=	63.00%	63.00%	63.00%	63.00%	63.00%	64.00%
Target B1 >=	84.00%	84.00%	85.00%	85.00%	86.00%	86.00%
Target B2 >=	56.00%	57.00%	57.00%	58.00%	59.00%	60.00%
Target C1 >=	84.00%	85.00%	85.00%	86.00%	86.00%	87.00%
Target C2 >=	71.00%	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, 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, formed in the spring of 2014, combined two former stakeholder groups that separately provided perspectives on state supervision, monitoring, target setting, and improvement planning, and 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 institutes, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. By combining membership and bringing forward individuals with a historical perspective to the TCIP process, the continuing conversation in Texas has sustained. New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple face-to-face and other meeting modalities 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. CAC meets at a minimum quarterly. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged. The Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education (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 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.

TEA is committed to using input and feedback to better inform state practices and policies by engaging diverse stakeholders and building relationships. To support this effort, TEA launched its Stakeholder Engagement Initiative during the 2019-2020 school year. The purpose of this initiative is to establish strong universal processes with strategic and timely communication plans to improve the stakeholder engagement practices and to facilitate opportunities that will optimize agency resources toward achieving meaningful interaction and critical feedback. The initiative is charged with the following three goals:

- enhance website & database interaction to allow for specific communication so that all stakeholders can receive information that is relevant to them;
- agency special education staff will receive targeted training and tools to improve stakeholder engagement skills (templates regarding best practices for stakeholder engagement meetings to address recommended activities for pre, during, and post stakeholder meetings);
- and creation of a master calendar with all stakeholder engagement touchpoints.

As with other person access tasked systems, stakeholder involvement activities were impacted by COVID-19 related barriers. The State made quick action to accommodate stakeholder access for purpose of required rule-making processes, provision of information relating to COVID-19 impacts, and State resources and guidance including critical tools for IEP teams to support continued services to students receiving special education in the State. These resources continue to be available on the TEA website at <https://tea.texas.gov/texas-schools/health-safety-discipline/covid/parent-resources-for-students-in-special-education>.

Although baseline data was established in 2008, the indicator data has remained relatively stable since 2015 with no measurement, methodology, or calculation change in the application, stakeholders advised, and the State agrees to no reason for re-baseline.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

23,396

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	170	0.73%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	2,821	12.06%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	6,552	28.00%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	8,891	38.00%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	4,962	21.21%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	15,443	18,434	85.03%	85.00%	83.77%	Did not meet target	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>	13,853	23,396	60.07%	63.00%	59.21%	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	159	0.68%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	3,085	13.19%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	7,001	29.93%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	9,264	39.60%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,886	16.61%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	16,265	19,509	84.41%	84.00%	83.37%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	13,150	23,395	57.49%	56.00%	56.21%	Met 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	174	0.74%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	2,301	9.83%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	4,287	18.32%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	8,727	37.30%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	7,909	33.80%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	13,014	15,489	84.62%	84.00%	84.02%	Met 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> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	16,636	23,398	72.15%	71.00%	71.10%	Met target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	Slight statistical slippage impacts from Covid 19 are still being felt especially at early education programs, disruption in routine, interruption in continuous education opportunities, access to in person learning, absence of continuous in person learning, and disruption to routine, had substantial and significant impact on students entering the program and student learning.
B1	Slight statistical slippage impacts from Covid 19 are still being felt especially at early education programs, disruption in routine, interruption in continuous education opportunities, access to in person learning, absence of continuous in person learning, and disruption to routine, had substantial and significant impact on students entering the program and student learning.

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)

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

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

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

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8 - Indicator Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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, 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, formed in the spring of 2014, combined two former stakeholder groups that separately provided perspectives on state supervision, monitoring, target setting, and improvement planning, and 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 institutes, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. By combining membership and bringing forward individuals with a historical

perspective to the TCIP process, the continuing conversation in Texas has sustained. New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple face-to-face and other meeting modalities 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. CAC meets at a minimum quarterly. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged. The Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education (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 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.

TEA is committed to using input and feedback to better inform state practices and policies by engaging diverse stakeholders and building relationships. To support this effort, TEA launched its Stakeholder Engagement Initiative during the 2019-2020 school year. The purpose of this initiative is to establish strong universal processes with strategic and timely communication plans to improve the stakeholder engagement practices and to facilitate opportunities that will optimize agency resources toward achieving meaningful interaction and critical feedback. The initiative is charged with the following three goals:

- enhance website & database interaction to allow for specific communication so that all stakeholders can receive information that is relevant to them;
- agency special education staff will receive targeted training and tools to improve stakeholder engagement skills (templates regarding best practices for stakeholder engagement meetings to address recommended activities for pre, during, and post stakeholder meetings);
- and creation of a master calendar with all stakeholder engagement touchpoints.

As with other person access tasked systems, stakeholder involvement activities were impacted by COVID-19 related barriers. The State made quick action to accommodate stakeholder access for purpose of required rule-making processes, provision of information relating to COVID-19 impacts, and State resources and guidance including critical tools for IEP teams to support continued services to students receiving special education in the State. These resources continue to be available on the TEA website at <https://tea.texas.gov/texas-schools/health-safety-discipline/covid/parent-resources-for-students-in-special-education>.

The 2020-21 implementation of the new sampling approach and a shorter survey necessitated a new Indicator 8 calculation. Therefore, results from this school year are not comparable to prior school years and instead set a new baseline for the state.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	73.04%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	79.00%	80.00%	80.00%	81.00%	81.00%
Data	77.99%	77.99%	76.40%	76.70%	80.80%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	73.04%	81.00%	81.00%	81.00%	82.00%	82.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
11,507	15,755	80.80%	73.04%	73.04%	N/A	N/A

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 Texas Grade Level Survey Response attachment.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

85,254

Percentage of respondent parents

18.48%

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	17.30%	18.48%

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

For the 2020-21 school year, Texas transitioned from a six-year sampling plan (where districts would survey a sample of its special education families once every six years) to a three-year sampling plan. Being on a three-year cycle allows parent input on a more regular schedule.

Given the relative success of the online-only survey administration in the wake of school closures resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020, an online-only survey administration was continued for the 2020-21 school year. This ensured that schools holding remote-only instruction could participate equally with those that were offering in-person instruction as the pandemic persisted into the 2020-21 school year. Survey 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.

School districts were provided multiple supports for the online survey administration. Two options were offered to districts: 1) they could distribute invitations to selected families themselves (via email or text message); or 2) they could send the contractor that TEA selected to field the survey a list of email addresses and/or phone numbers for selected families and the contractor would send the invitations directly. Through an online portal, a host of materials was provided, including templates that districts could use to disseminate email or text invitations, a Frequently Asked Questions document, flyers to advertise the survey opportunity, posts appropriate for various social media outlets, etc. The portal also hosted a live response rate dashboard so that districts could monitor responses in real-time to help inform follow-up efforts to increase family participation. Extensive support was offered to districts in the dissemination of materials and a support line was created that families could use to answer survey questions over the phone. All materials included both English and Spanish instructions for families.

To help engage districts and facilitate survey administration, the survey contractor worked closely with a "district liaison" throughout the survey fielding process. An instructional webinar was offered in advance of the survey launch, which was recorded and hosted by SPEDTex, the Special Education Information Center for Texas. Throughout the survey fielding window, liaisons at the included districts were engaged in extensive follow-up activities, encouraging them to use the response rate dashboard to inform continued outreach. Throughout the survey window, the survey contractor reached out directly to 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. Education Service Center (ESC) Special Education Directors helped encourage and support the included districts in their regions. The survey contractor also made phone calls directly to families for districts asking for survey fielding support.

State-, district-, and ESC-level reports summarizing results at the local level, provide feedback to educators and special education administration increasing the likelihood that results can inform improvements to family-school partnerships and promote an increase in response rates.

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/>.

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.

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. 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.

Additionally, the State and its vendor reviewed results from the 2020-21 administration of the Parent Involvement Survey in Texas to consider any nonresponse bias for improvements in future response to surveys and found the following: On the whole, parents of students receiving special education services responded positively to survey items. Parents of 15,759 students receiving special education services submitted a survey response, for a response rate of 18.5%. This was an increase of 1.2 percentage points from the prior year's response rate. At least one parent submitted a survey from 391 of 417 included school districts. The most common district-level response rate across the state was between 21% and 30%, with 118 of 417 districts achieving a response rate in that range.

Nonresponse bias was not identified in these results, however, the State recognized that 26 districts had a 0% response rate and identified this as an area targeted with follow-up monitoring efforts via the tie to cyclical reviews post parent survey years. The following information is more indepth to the response rate analysis, and describes analysis techniques for understanding survey outputs and participation.

Over 80% of parents surveyed reported that they were satisfied with their child's progress toward Individualized Education Plan goals (84.5%) and that they believe their child is receiving the special education services they need (82.7%).

Response rates ranged by district from 0.0% (26 districts) to 96.7% (1 district). Most response rates at the district level were between 21% and 30% (118 districts).

Diagnostics were conducted to explore the possibility of biased or otherwise invalid completions. For example, in an effort to obtain more responses, some districts may have directly called parents and recorded their responses over the phone. Under these conditions parents may have provided more favorable responses than they might have otherwise. Or, district personnel may have completed surveys on behalf of parents to increase response rates. These responses could artificially inflate statewide results. Metadata were used (e.g., IP addresses, operating system, time stamp) to look for specific patterns — such as multiple surveys completed on the same device with consecutive time stamps, along with other unusual characteristics (such as extreme patterns of response or extremely short durations). For the most part, these types of patterns were rare. Less than 2% of submitted

surveys were flagged as consistent with being completed over the phone by a district representative (i.e., multiple surveys completed from the same IP address, with consecutive time stamps and sufficient duration to have been asking questions and recording responses). Another 310 (2%) were flagged consistent with a single individual completing surveys in place of parents (i.e., same IP address, four or more consecutive time stamps, extremely short duration). All submitted responses were retained in the final analysis in part because these diagnostics cannot confirm that any of these submissions were actually invalid or overly positive, and because of the rare occurrence of such patterns. Ultimately, this diagnostic lent some assurance that the vast majority of submitted surveys are indeed from parents or families as intended.

Survey results were further examined by student subgroup to explore whether parent perceptions were similar or different across subgroups of students with different characteristics. Confidence intervals of 95% were provided around the estimated percentages to help convey the level of certainty around the subgroup estimate. This range is the range of values that would be obtained if many different samples were pulled and the survey conducted over and over again. Estimates from smaller groups tend to have more uncertainty than estimates from larger groups, and so the range of plausible values for a given subgroup will be wider for small groups and narrower for larger groups. For example, while Indicator 8 for this group of responding parents of Asian students (a small group) was 77.6%, if 100 different samples were pulled and the survey repeated, the result would likely be between 73.9% and 81.2% every time - a range of about 7 percentage points. For families of Hispanic students (a large group), likely Indicator 8 values across many samples ranges from 73.6% to 75.5%, a range of only about 2 percentage points. Additional information can be found in Table 4 of the publicly posted 2020-21 Texas Parent Involvement Survey Report located at <https://www.spedtex.org/index.cfm/parent-involvement-survey-results/>.

Percentages for parents of students with (73.7%) and without economic disadvantage (72.1) were similar, as shown in Table 5 of the publicly posted 2020-21 Texas Parent Involvement Survey Report located at <https://www.spedtex.org/index.cfm/parent-involvement-survey-results/>.

Survey results were highest among elementary families (and those whose school included mixed grade bands) and Asian families and lowest among families of high school students and Black/African American students as shown in Table 6 of the publicly posted 2020-21 Texas Parent Involvement Survey Report located at <https://www.spedtex.org/index.cfm/parent-involvement-survey-results/>.

Although nonresponse bias was not identified, the State continues to utilize these findings from the response rate analysis year to year and works with its contracted vendor to ensure the survey reaches a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities representative of the enrolled children with disabilities in the State every year. All potential nonresponse bias possibilities are discussed and steps are taken to mitigate potential barriers that would prevent parents from providing response to the survey.

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/>.

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

The characteristics of the students whose parents completed a survey were compared to the state population of students receiving special education services to examine the degree to which survey responses were representative of the state's population of students receiving special education services. The more comparable the characteristics of the responding sample to the state population, the more generalizable the results are to all students in Texas who received special education services.

The gender composition of the sample of students whose parents responded to the survey was very similar to the gender composition of the population of students receiving services in Texas. Parents of male students receiving special education services made up 66.6% of completed surveys compared with 66.0% of the statewide population. Parents of female students completed 33.4% of surveys compared with 34.0% female students statewide.

The responding sample was relatively closely aligned to the state population of students receiving special education services as defined by race/ethnicity. White families were somewhat overrepresented (27.4% of the state's students receiving special education services compared to 31.9% in the survey sample) while Black or African American and Hispanic students were somewhat underrepresented (15.1% and 51.9% in the state, compared to 12.7% and 49% in the survey sample, respectively) but within the State definition +/- 5%. All other race/ethnicity groups were represented in the survey sample within one percentage point of their proportion in the state population. Additional information can be found in the publicly posted 2020-21 Texas Parent Involvement Survey Report Table 2 located at <https://www.spedtex.org/index.cfm/parent-involvement-survey-results/>.

Students represented by the survey sample were mostly similar to the state population of students receiving special education services as described by primary exceptionality/disability. Families of students with Learning Disabilities were somewhat under-represented in the responding sample (by almost four percentage points) and families of children with Autism were somewhat over-represented (by three percentage points) but within the State definition +/- 5%. All other disability types were represented within one percentage point of their prevalence in the population. Additional information can be found in the publicly posted 2020-21 Texas Parent Involvement Survey Report Table 3 located at <https://www.spedtex.org/index.cfm/parent-involvement-survey-results/>.

Across all surveys, 12.5% were completed in Spanish and the remaining 87.4% were completed in English. This represents a decrease in the proportion of surveys completed in Spanish from prior years (16.5% in 2017, 16.1% in 2018, 16.7% in 2019, and 13.1% in 2020). Among other variables, this decrease may be partially attributable to the shift to an exclusively online survey administration.

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/>.

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?	YES
If yes, provide sampling plan.	Texas-FFY-2020-SPP8-Sampling-Plan

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

With over 1,200 school districts and more than 600,000 students receiving special education services across the state, Texas does not survey every family every year. Instead, Texas uses a sample to obtain representative data from a rotating subset of districts and schools each year. Starting with the 2020-21 school year, Texas transitioned to a three-year cycle such that each district would be included in the survey every three years. (districts with student enrollments larger than 50,000 are included every year.)

Below is an outline of the complete set of sampling rules used to create the 2020-21 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, over a one campus minimum, for each grade span category in a district were included.

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 from the included campuses were sampled 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 were sampled at each campus 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.
- an additional 15 percent of students receiving services in districts serving more than 10,000 student were sampled.

A complete description of the sampling rules are presented in Appendix B of the publicly posted 2020-21 Texas Parent Involvement Survey Report located at <https://www.spedtex.org/index.cfm/parent-involvement-survey-results/> .

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	YES
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	Texas-FFY-2020-SPP 8-parent-involvement-survey

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For the 2020-21 school year, Texas transitioned from a six-year sampling plan (where districts would survey a sample of its special education families once every six years) to a three-year sampling plan. This transition had two advantages. First, resetting the cycles allowed TEA to align the Parent Involvement survey to its existing Special Education Differentiated Monitoring and Support cyclical reviews. By design, districts will now participate in the Indicator 8 survey two years before a cyclical review (receiving results one year prior to that review), and one year following. Second, being on a three-year cycle allows school districts to receive parent input and feedback on a more regular schedule and increase the utility of data collected through surveys to inform local improvement efforts.

More information can be found at: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/parent-involvement>

To align the Parent Involvement survey cycles to the Continuous Monitoring and Support cycles, the sets of districts scheduled for monitoring site visits in 2022-23 — one year after results from this year’s survey would become available — and those that were reviewed in the prior school year (2019-20) were selected. Second, any district serving over 50,000 students, and not already in the list of included districts was added. Together, these 417 districts formed the 2020-21 Parent Involvement survey target group.

In Texas, 2020-21 brought the implementation of a shorter survey in an effort to reduce burden on parents and increase completion rates. The new survey was composed of two sets of items: 1) ten items developed by the National Center for Special Education Accountability and Monitoring; and 2) two items designed to capture parent satisfaction with student services and student progress. Additional information concerning the survey can be found in the Survey Design and Administration section of the publicly posted 2020-21 Texas Parent Involvement Survey Report located at <https://www.spedtex.org/index.cfm/parent-involvement-survey-results/>.

Following the successful online-only administration in 2019-20 due to the COVID-19 pandemic, all surveys were administered online or over the phone in 2021.

The 2020-21 implementation of the new sampling approach and a shorter survey necessitated a new Indicator 8 calculation. Therefore, results from this school year are not comparable to prior school years and instead set a new baseline for the state. More details about the Indicator 8 calculation are provided in the Data Analysis section of the publicly posted 2020-21 Texas Parent Involvement Survey Report located at <https://www.spedtex.org/index.cfm/parent-involvement-survey-results/> . The full 2020-21 survey instrument is included in Appendix A of the report.

Per clarification call on 4/21/2022 with OSEP team for Texas, the State has included 2020 Targets for this indicator. Although the State has designated 2020 as the baseline year, and written instructions in the OSEP provided U.S Department of Education IDEA Part B FFY 2020 SPP/APR User Guide, section 6.1 located on page 28 reads "Baselines and Targets - If your State needs to update the baseline data for any Indicator, manually update the baseline data field and include a detailed explanation at the bottom of the Indicator Data page in the optional comment box. Baseline dates must be updated under the following circumstances: • OSEP requests them to be updated in the required actions • There is a change in the calculation methodology and/or • A change in the measurement/reporting requirement States can select the current year as an Indicator's baseline year. If the baseline year is FFY 2020, do not enter a target for that year.", OSEP has now directed states to comply with assigning a target, while acknowledging the requirement to enter a target in a baseline year does not align with the written instructions. Stakeholders will be informed of this directive by the Department outside of the expected stakeholder involvement requirements for setting targets in these indicators. Additionally, the State confirmed with OSEP during the 4/21/2022 clarification call that it had provided accessibility reports along with the uploaded accessible documents attached to this indicator in its original submission.

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8 - OSEP Response

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

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

The State submitted its sampling plan for this indicator with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR. OSEP will follow up with the State under separate cover regarding the submission.

8 - Required Actions

8 – State Attachments



Texas-FFY-2020-SPP
8-parent-involvemer

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

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

Targets

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

85

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
20	0	1,119	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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 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.

TEA required identified local education agencies (LEAs), through a self-assessment, 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. Upon the completion of the LEA's self-assessment of policies and procedures, TEA required submission of the self-assessment results via a Strategic Support Plan. TEA staff reviewed the resulting SSP for identified needs and noncompliance.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

TEA has updated its methodology and student exclusions by removing pre-school aged students from the data set based on feedback and discussion with OSEP during the OSEP clarification period with the State. States were allowed to align its methodology for this indicator to its required significant disproportionality (SD) calculations. The state wishes to fully align with the SD analysis, but is unable to do so without including ages 3-21 in the calculation. The State requested OSEP to allow full alignment with its SD analysis and methodology by expanding the age group analysis to include ages 3-21 for this indicator in the future or allow states to have the flexibility to do so in efforts to reduce stakeholder confusion burden to states.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

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

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

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

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

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

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

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

Targets

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

359

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
102	0	845	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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 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.

TEA required identified local education agencies (LEAs), through a self-assessment, 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. Upon the completion of the LEA's self-assessment of policies and procedures, TEA required submission of the self-assessment results via a Strategic Support Plan. TEA staff reviewed the resulting SSP for identified needs and noncompliance.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

TEA has updated its methodology and student exclusions by removing pre-school aged students from the data set based on feedback and discussion with OSEP during the OSEP clarification period with the State. States were allowed to align its methodology for this indicator to its required significant disproportionality (SD) calculations. The state wishes to fully align with the SD analysis, but is unable to do so without including ages 3-21 in the calculation. The State requested OSEP to allow full alignment with its SD analysis and methodology by expanding the age group analysis to include ages 3-21 for this indicator in the future or allow states to have the flexibility to do so in efforts to reduce stakeholder confusion burden to states.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

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

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

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

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

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2007	89.19%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.73%	99.02%	99.77%	99.05%	98.63%

Targets

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
114,775	107,370	98.63%	100%	93.55%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

After a review of the overall decline in State compliance, data obtained regarding reason for delay provided the most impacting information related to the slippage in the compliance percentage for SPP 11 in the State.

The primary reason noted, measured in the data collection as reason for delay, details COVID-19 related barriers of access to children and evaluation personnel. The following points were primary contributors found to support these delay reasons and barriers:

- Evaluations that may have begun in spring early 2020 and held over until in person contact, demonstrated in the unprecedented number of delays in the state beyond 30 days, are included in this year's capture of initial evaluations.
- Some schools returned to remote and/or in person learning quickly while others had difficulty in maintaining continuous learning access due to local COVID issues.
- In Texas, the state established timeline accounts for instructional rather than calendar days, which includes remote and/or in person. Schools that operated in remote without direct access to students for evaluations that required observation and/or contact with the child were significantly delayed while the evaluation timeline was progressing.
- Typical comprehensive evaluation standards of practice were not easily adapted to or understood and many evaluators had questions related to the reliability and validity of assessments in a virtual setting.

These and many other issues that faced the nation's evaluation staffs, outlined in later Fall 2020 by the National Center for Learning Disabilities in their Navigating Special Education Evaluations for Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD) Amid the COVID-19 Pandemic found at <https://www.ncl.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Navigating-Special-Education-Evaluations-for-Specific-Learning-Disabilities-SLD-Amid-the-COVID-19-Pandemic.pdf>, were evidenced in Texas as well.

The State continues to work with LEAs to ensure all children suspected of having a disability requiring special education and related services are found, evaluated, and provided a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) within the state established timelines, and have access to the most relevant and best resources for ensuring that student evaluations and access to FAPE is timely.

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

7,405

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 114,775 initial referrals for children with parental consent to evaluate. Upon review by the State a total of 7,405 children's evaluations were not completed within the State-established timeline. Of those children, 6,171 were determined to be completed 31+ days beyond the timeline requirement and 1,234 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 162 LEAs did not meet "pre-finding corrected" status (increase from 52 LEAs in FFY 2019) 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. See slippage information, of note, on the increase of evaluation delays due to COVID-19 related issues and barriers that attributes to the increase in the number of LEAs cited for 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 AC §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 scientific, research-based intervention; and other academic or behavior support services. If the student continues to experience difficulty in the general classroom after the provision of interventions, district personnel must refer the student for a full individual and initial evaluation. This referral for a full individual and initial evaluation may be initiated 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, 2020 to June 30, 2021 school year are included in this data collection. This would also include students for whom parental consent was obtained late in the 2019-20 reporting period and the eligibility process was completed between July 1, 2020 and June 30, 2021.

During FFY 2020, 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. Additional information about the data collection process for Indicator 11 (instructions, collection instrument, etc.) can be found on the TEA LEA Reports and Requirements website (<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/timely-initial-evaluation-child-find>).

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Additional information can be found on the 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 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
51	50	0	1

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The Texas Education Agency Division of Special Education notified LEAs of noncompliance with FFY 2019 SPP Indicator 11 in October 2020. 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 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

TEA noticed 1 LEA in October 2021 regarding their status of continuing noncompliance, providing directives 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 the pandemic and 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

The LEA has evaluated and made eligibility determinations for the identified students, although late, and are now improving systems to ensure all regulatory requirements are being met. Once TEA is assured through data and other monitoring observations the LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, the LEA will be determined as corrected.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2018	7	7	0

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

FFY 2018

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 continuing noncompliance with FFY 2018 SPP Indicator 11 in October 2020. TEA required LEAs to submit an amended "Corrective Action Plan (CAP)" with any changes determined needed. 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 updated CAP, these 7 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. For each of the 7 LEAs in continuing noncompliance, student level correction was not the issue, rather implementation of systemic changes that demonstrated confidence for implementation of the regulatory requirements was not achieved by the 1 year correction timeline.

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.

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

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

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2007	77.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.82%	99.50%	99.92%	99.47%	97.26%

Targets

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	11,304
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	999

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	8,113
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.	1,073
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	439
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	8,113	8,793	97.26%	100%	92.27%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

After a review of the overall decline in State compliance, data obtained regarding reason for delay provided the most impacting information related to the slippage in the compliance percentage for SPP 12 in the State.

The primary reason noted, measured in the data collection as reason for delay, details COVID-19 related barriers of access to children and evaluation personnel. The following points were primary contributors found to support these delay reasons and barriers:

- Evaluations that may have begun in spring early 2020 and held over until in person contact could be mitigated in evaluation practice, demonstrated in the unprecedented number of delays in the state beyond 30 days, are included in this year's capture of initial evaluations originating with Part C referral.
- Some early childhood services returned to remote and/or in person services and practice quickly while others had difficulty in maintaining continuous service provision due to local COVID issues. Transition meetings and evaluation planning coordination was impacted by these events.
- Typical comprehensive evaluation standards of practice were not easily adapted to, or understood and many evaluators had questions related to the reliability and validity of assessments in a virtual setting.

These and many other issues that faced the nation's evaluation staffs, outlined in later Fall 2020 by the National Center for Learning Disabilities in their Navigating Special Education Evaluations for Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD) Amid the COVID-19 Pandemic found at <https://www.nclld.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Navigating-Special-Education-Evaluations-for-Specific-Learning-Disabilities-SLD-Amid-the-COVID-19-Pandemic.pdf>, were evidenced in Texas as well.

The State continues to work with LEAs to ensure all children suspected of having a disability requiring special education and related services are found, evaluated, and provided a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) for eligible children by their third birthday, and have access to the most relevant and best resources for ensuring that student evaluations and access to FAPE is timely.

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

680

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 11,304 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 680 included in the total count of children in section (a), but not included in sections (b), (c), (d), (e), or (f). Of those children, 133 were determined to be completed 31+ days beyond the timeline requirement and 547 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. See slippage information, of note, on the increase of evaluation delays due to COVID-19 related issues and barriers that attributes to the increase in the number of LEAs cited for 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 webpage: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/early-childhood-transition>

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
23	23		0

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The Texas Education Agency Division of Special Education notified LEAs of noncompliance with FFY 2019 SPP Indicator 12 in October 2020. 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 2019

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

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

FFY 2018

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 continuing noncompliance with FFY 2018 SPP Indicator 12 in October 2020. TEA required LEAs to submit an amended "Corrective Action Plan (CAP)" with any changes determined needed. Staff in the Division of Special Education Monitoring reviewed the updated 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 both (2) of the LEAs have corrected the noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator in FFY 2018 and 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 updated CAP, these 2 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. For both (2) LEAs in continuing noncompliance, student level correction was not the issue, rather implementation of systemic changes that demonstrated confidence for implementation of the regulatory requirements was not achieved by the 1 year correction timeline.

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 individual case of noncompliance within the LEA contained within the corrected noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator has completed the required action (e.g., the evaluation), 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 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. 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.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	97.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.58%	99.79%	99.52%	99.29%	99.73%

Targets

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
4,788	4,796	99.73%	100%	99.83%	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, 2020 and June 30, 2021 and included students who were age 15 but turned age 16 by June 30, 2020

During FFY 2020, 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 TEA LEA Reports and Requirements website.

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 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 clerical mistakes in the system was the prevalent issue for corrections. However, 11 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)

Additional information can be found on the webpage: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/secondary-transition>

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
12	12	0	0

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The Texas Education Agency Division of Special Education notified LEAs of noncompliance with FFY 2019 SPP Indicator 13 in October 2020. 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., 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 2019

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

FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The Texas Education Agency Division of Special Education notified LEAs of noncompliance with FFY 2019 SPP Indicator 13 in October 2020. TEA required LEAs to submit an amended "Corrective Action Plan (CAP)" with any changes determined needed. 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., 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.

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. 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.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

I. Definitions

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

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

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

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

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

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

II. Data Reporting

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

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

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

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

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

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

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

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2009	Target >=	28.00%	29.00%	29.00%	30.00%	30.00%
A	26.00%	Data	24.39%	21.41%	18.31%	16.36%	19.55%
B	2009	Target >=	61.00%	62.00%	62.00%	63.00%	63.00%
B	59.00%	Data	57.38%	53.69%	50.88%	51.10%	50.84%
C	2009	Target >=	74.00%	76.00%	78.00%	80.00%	80.00%
C	72.00%	Data	68.52%	66.67%	64.78%	93.31%	63.93%

FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	30.00%	31.00%	31.00%	32.00%	32.00%	33.00%
Target B >=	63.00%	64.00%	64.00%	65.00%	65.00%	66.00%
Target C >=	80.00%	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, 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, formed in the spring of 2014, combined two former stakeholder groups that separately provided perspectives on state supervision, monitoring, target setting, and improvement planning, and 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 institutes, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. By combining membership and bringing forward individuals with a historical perspective to the TCIP process, the continuing conversation in Texas has sustained. New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple face-to-face and other meeting modalities 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. CAC meets at a minimum quarterly. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged. The Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education (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 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.

TEA is committed to using input and feedback to better inform state practices and policies by engaging diverse stakeholders and building relationships. To support this effort, TEA launched its Stakeholder Engagement Initiative during the 2019-2020 school year. The purpose of this initiative is to establish strong universal processes with strategic and timely communication plans to improve the stakeholder engagement practices and to facilitate opportunities that will optimize agency resources toward achieving meaningful interaction and critical feedback. The initiative is charged with the following three goals:

- enhance website & database interaction to allow for specific communication so that all stakeholders can receive information that is relevant to them;
- agency special education staff will receive targeted training and tools to improve stakeholder engagement skills (templates regarding best practices for stakeholder engagement meetings to address recommended activities for pre, during, and post stakeholder meetings);
- and creation of a master calendar with all stakeholder engagement touchpoints.

As with other person access tasked systems, stakeholder involvement activities were impacted by COVID-19 related barriers. The State made quick action to accommodate stakeholder access for purpose of required rule-making processes, provision of information relating to COVID-19 impacts, and State resources and guidance including critical tools for IEP teams to support continued services to students receiving special education in the State. These resources continue to be available on the TEA website at <https://tea.texas.gov/texas-schools/health-safety-discipline/covid/parent-resources-for-students-in-special-education>.

Re-baseline determined not needed. Targets for FFY2020 and beyond were set.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	33,144
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	7,222
Response Rate	21.79%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1,718
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	2,141
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)	189
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).	617

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	1,718	7,222	19.55%	30.00%	23.79%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	3,859	7,222	50.84%	63.00%	53.43%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	4,665	7,222	63.93%	80.00%	64.59%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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	2019	2020
Response Rate	19.35%	21.79%

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

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:

- Direct LEAs to update contact information at students’ final IEP meeting requiring students’ personal email address and phone numbers.
- Increase LEA staff involvement in the data collection process.
- Increase awareness and importance of the survey at the LEA, parent, and student levels.
- 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.
- Gather home language survey information and provide additional translations of the survey in languages other than English and Spanish currently provided.

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.

Response rate data was measured by modality to explore the effectiveness of various outreach methods to inform future survey data collections. Results from the Post high school survey showed that Text messaging (12.6%) and Phone calls (9.0%) resulted in the highest response rate. In contrast Postcards (1.6%) and Paper Surveys (1.6%) resulted in the lowest response rates. Emailed surveys resulted in a response rate 5.5% of completed surveys.

A total of 7,222 of 33,144 students in the exited student dataset submitted a survey response for a Statewide response rate of 22%. This represents an increase of three (+3) percentage points from the 2020 survey administration. Across LEAs, response rates ranged from 0% (256 LEAs) to 100% (34 LEAs). Response rates by Texas Education Service Center (ESC), ranged from a low of 16% to a high of 25%.

Nonresponse bias was considered by examining under-representativeness of the survey respondent groups based on race/ethnicity, and primary disability category. In order to mitigate any possible nonresponse bias, calls were made at varying times of day and days of the week (including

weekends) to maximize the chance to make contact. Additionally Spanish speaking surveyors were available for participants speaking Spanish.

Responses from Hispanic students were under-represented by 5.6 percentage points compared to the demographics of the population of Hispanic exiters. Students with Learning Disabilities were under-represented by 7.8 percentage points compared to the population of exiting students. These under-representations may indicate a nonresponse bias, however in the previous year survey Hispanic responders were over-represented, and historically learning disability has been slightly under-represented but not specifically identified with non-response bias for this group. Steps the State will take to mitigate or target historically under-represented groups may include over inclusion for survey population, tracking specific populations at increased interval checks during the survey period, and expansion of outreach opportunities/efforts with expanded languaged surveys.

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

The survey results indicated, Hispanic students were under-represented (by 5.6 percentage points). All other race/ethnicities were represented within one percentage point of their prevalence in the population of exiters. Primary disability categories were represented in the respondent sample at similar rates of their prevalence in the population, with two exceptions: students with Autism were over-represented in the survey sample (by 5.4 percentage points) and students with Learning Disability were under-represented in the survey sample (by 7.8 percentage points).

Additional information can be found in the publicly posted 2020-21 Indicator 14: Texas Post School Outcomes Survey at <https://4.files.edl.io/82c1/01/13/22/190038-2c31c854-91a2-4651-99a8-6b8b58e68881.pdf>

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)

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 gender, race/ethnicity, and primary exceptionality.

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 2021.

In 2019-20, the State implemented a new system for LEAs to report contact records, which shares contact information with the selected vendor for survey administration purposes. Surveys were sent to 33,144 students across the State. These exited students were distributed across 1,200+ LEAs, with 20 of the state’s largest LEAs accounting for more than one-quarter (28%) of exited students. In contrast, 742 of the state’s smallest LEAs accounted for 15% 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 30,000 unique sample records were included to conduct this year’s study.

Several modalities were leveraged to improve participation:

- 9,385 phone calls were made,
- 15,000 paper surveys sent,
- 19,999 postcards sent,
- 31,785 text messages and
- 30,237 emails were sent.

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=2182542v

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-FFY 2020-Post-School-Outcomes-Survey

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Additional information can be found on the webpage: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/post-school-outcomes>

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

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

The State reported that the response data for this indicator were representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. However, in its narrative, the State also reported "[h]ispanic students were under-represented (by 5.6 percentage points). All other race/ethnicities were represented within one percentage point of their prevalence in the population of exiters. Primary disability categories were represented in the respondent sample at similar rates of their prevalence in the population, with two exceptions: students with Autism were over-represented in the survey sample (by 5.4 percentage points) and students with Learning Disability were under-represented in the survey sample (by 7.8 percentage points)". Therefore, it is unclear whether the response data was representative. OSEP notes that the State did describe the strategies to address this issue in the future.

14 - Required Actions

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

14 – State Attachments



Texas-FFY
2020-Post-School-Ou

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 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	82
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	36

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, 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, formed in the spring of 2014, combined two former stakeholder groups that separately provided perspectives on state supervision, monitoring, target setting, and improvement planning, and 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 institutes, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. By combining membership and bringing forward individuals with a historical perspective to the TCIP process, the continuing conversation in Texas has sustained. New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple face-to-face and other meeting modalities 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. CAC meets at a minimum quarterly. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged. The Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education (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 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.

TEA is committed to using input and feedback to better inform state practices and policies by engaging diverse stakeholders and building relationships. To support this effort, TEA launched its Stakeholder Engagement Initiative during the 2019-2020 school year. The purpose of this initiative is to establish strong universal processes with strategic and timely communication plans to improve the stakeholder engagement practices and to facilitate opportunities that will optimize agency resources toward achieving meaningful interaction and critical feedback. The initiative is charged with the following three goals:

- enhance website & database interaction to allow for specific communication so that all stakeholders can receive information that is relevant to them;
- agency special education staff will receive targeted training and tools to improve stakeholder engagement skills (templates regarding best practices for stakeholder engagement meetings to address recommended activities for pre, during, and post stakeholder meetings);
- and creation of a master calendar with all stakeholder engagement touchpoints.

As with other person access tasked systems, stakeholder involvement activities were impacted by COVID-19 related barriers. The State made quick action to accommodate stakeholder access for purpose of required rule-making processes, provision of information relating to COVID-19 impacts, and State resources and guidance including critical tools for IEP teams to support continued services to students receiving special education in the State. These resources continue to be available on the TEA website at <https://tea.texas.gov/texas-schools/health-safety-discipline/covid/parent-resources-for-students-in-special-education>.

Because FFY 2020 data is higher than historical trending data (with exception to FFY 2015), stakeholders advised it wise to re-baseline, but expect targets to center around historical data trends pre-COVID impact. Stakeholders plan to revisit the target range in the fall prior to SPP 2021 submission to determine if the COVID suspected impact in the FFY 2020 data remains a trend or is considered an anomaly and proceed with any target considerations. For now, FFY 2020 will be considered baseline with targets starting in FFY 2021 and beyond.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	43.90%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	25.00%-30.00%	25.00%-30.00%	25.00% - 30.00%	25.00% - 30.00%	25.00%-30.00%
Data	47.89%	35.63%	31.78%	31.65%	36.28%

Targets

FFY	2020 (low)	2020 (high)	2021 (low)	2021 (high)	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	43.00%	43.90%	30.00%	35.00%	30.00%	35.00%	30.00%	35.00%	30.00%	35.00%	30.00%	35.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target (low)	FFY 2020 Target (high)	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
36	82	36.28%	43.00%	43.90%	43.90%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Additional information can be found on the webpage: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/resolution-sessions>

Per clarification call on 4/21/2022 with OSEP team for Texas, the State has included 2020 Targets for this indicator. Although the State has designated 2020 as the baseline year, and written instructions in the OSEP provided U.S Department of Education IDEA Part B FFY 2020 SPP/APR User Guide, section 6.1 located on page 28 reads "Baselines and Targets - If your State needs to update the baseline data for any Indicator, manually update the baseline data field and include a detailed explanation at the bottom of the Indicator Data page in the optional comment box. Baseline dates must be updated under the following circumstances: • OSEP requests them to be updated in the required actions • There is a change in the calculation methodology and/or • A change in the measurement/reporting requirement States can select the current year as an Indicator's baseline year. If the baseline year is FFY 2020, do not enter a target for that year.", OSEP has now directed states to comply with assigning a target, while acknowledging

the requirement to enter a target in a baseline year does not align with the written instructions. Stakeholders will be informed of this directive by the Department outside of the expected stakeholder involvement requirements for setting targets in these indicators.

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

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

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

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the 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 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1 Mediations held	197
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	85
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	60

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, 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, formed in the spring of 2014, combined two former stakeholder groups that separately provided perspectives on state supervision, monitoring, target setting, and improvement planning, and 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 institutes, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. By combining membership and bringing forward individuals with a historical perspective to the TCIP process, the continuing conversation in Texas has sustained. New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple face-to-face and other meeting modalities 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. CAC meets at a minimum quarterly. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged. The Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education (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 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.

TEA is committed to using input and feedback to better inform state practices and policies by engaging diverse stakeholders and building relationships. To support this effort, TEA launched its Stakeholder Engagement Initiative during the 2019-2020 school year. The purpose of this initiative is to establish strong universal processes with strategic and timely communication plans to improve the stakeholder engagement practices and to facilitate opportunities that will optimize agency resources toward achieving meaningful interaction and critical feedback. The initiative is charged with the following three goals:

- enhance website & database interaction to allow for specific communication so that all stakeholders can receive information that is relevant to them;
- agency special education staff will receive targeted training and tools to improve stakeholder engagement skills (templates regarding best practices for stakeholder engagement meetings to address recommended activities for pre, during, and post stakeholder meetings);
- and creation of a master calendar with all stakeholder engagement touchpoints.

As with other person access tasked systems, stakeholder involvement activities were impacted by COVID-19 related barriers. The State made quick action to accommodate stakeholder access for purpose of required rule-making processes, provision of information relating to COVID-19 impacts, and State resources and guidance including critical tools for IEP teams to support continued services to students receiving special education in the State. These resources continue to be available on the TEA website at <https://tea.texas.gov/texas-schools/health-safety-discipline/covid/parent-resources-for-students-in-special-education>.

Although FFY 2020 data is lower than historical trending data (with exception to FFY 2019), and stakeholders advisement to re-baseline, the State expects targets to center around historical data trends pre-COVID impact. Stakeholders plan to revisit the target range in the fall prior to SPP 2021 submission to determine if the COVID suspected impact in the FFY 2020 data remains a trend or is considered an anomaly and proceed with any other target considerations. For now, FFY 2015 will be considered baseline with range of targets remaining the same.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2015	73.60%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	75.00%-80.00%	75.00%-80.00%	75.00% - 80.00%	75.00% - 80.00%	75.00%-80.00%
Data	75.22%	76.50%	75.81%	75.78%	70.88%

Targets

FFY	2020 (low)	2020 (high)	2021 (low)	2021 (high)	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	75.00%	80.00%	75.00%	80.00%	75.00%	80.00%	75.00%	80.00%	75.00%	80.00%	75.00%	80.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target (low)	FFY 2020 Target (high)	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
85	60	197	70.88%	75.00%	80.00%	73.60%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

SPPI 16 webpage:
<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/mediation>

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

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

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

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

Phase I: Analysis:

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

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

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

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

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

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

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

C. Stakeholder Engagement

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

Additional Implementation Activities

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

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

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

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)

YES

Provide a description of the system analysis activities conducted to support changing the SiMR.

The agency held internal reviews inclusive of data availability; barriers to data or systems to derive data outputs; SPP data reporting and evaluations for the 2020-2025 6-year cycle; and initiatives and student data outputs current or future in use of measuring student results in reading achievement. Additionally, the agency reached out to a broad range of stakeholders inclusive of established stakeholder groups to discuss and identify continued needs for focus and measurement within the scope of SPP Indicator 17 (SSIP) and in support of changing the SiMR.

Please list the data source(s) used to support the change of the SiMR.

1. State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) data and results (or lack of during COVID)
2. Evaluation and Identification rate data 2018-2021
3. Dyslexia Handbook and resulting changes to policy and procedure occurring in 2021
4. OSEP monitoring interaction and discussion outputs
5. Stakeholder feedback

Provide a description of how the State analyzed data to reach the decision to change the SiMR.

Agency analysis included a review of previous SiMR data sources inclusive of state assessment data and lack thereof due to COVID assessment waivers and limitations to valid and reliable longitudinal results. Although most states with SiMR ties to statewide assessment results due to COVID waivers, Texas identified with stakeholders limitations to other student formative data, and is working to identify opportunities to engage with certain populations of students to obtain benchmarks and other lead data to analyze in the future regarding student success in closing the reading achievement gap. In the interim, stakeholders expressed desire to continue to align where possible in the measurement of student success and need with Indicator 3B.

Please describe the role of stakeholders in the decision to change the SiMR.

Various stakeholder groups including the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee TCISC, the Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC), state and local advocacy groups, local and state SPED Director groups, and other assembled and individual stakeholders internal and external to the Agency were engaged regarding Reading Achievement, Dyslexia supports and services, and student outcomes and successes. These engagements helped the State determine what changes, if any, were needed to the SiMR and Area of Focus through discussion, feedback, input, and in some cases surveyed input on needs of the state. Internal and external stakeholder support was expressed for changes to SiMR to align with SPP Indicator 3 grade level identified measures in Reading Achievement through State Assessment results, but also identified limitations to the SiMR when state assessments were either not available (as was during 2019-2020 SY with impacts from COVID) or disruptions occurred that limited the longitudinal summative analysis. Options for obtaining more immediate student level data through new or planned initiative work in support of students with Dyslexia is being evaluated for possible SiMR inclusion or added measure for future reporting in meeting the identified measurement needs expressed by both internal and external to the Agency stakeholders. Some of these data are not available until later 2022, but will be evaluated in context to how it might be included to supplement improvement decision making based on SSIP results against targets.

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.

<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.

Implementation of project management systems that analyze progress in major projects and initiatives provide evaluation data support that allows the state to practice continuous monitoring of these systems of support and activities. Although there have been no significant revisions to these in the last year, with exception to a few newly identified initiatives under contracted work, the State would take this opportunity to highlight previous year updates made and identify four critical improvement strategies that are still being developed or implemented post COVID-19 access barriers and delays.

Improvement Strategy 1: Resource Allocation to Support Reading Outcomes

Improvement Strategy 2: Expand Initiatives and Opportunities to Support Reading Outcomes

Improvement Strategy 3: Communicate Standards and Expectations to Teachers and Instructional Support Personnel to Improve Reading Outcomes

Improvement Strategy 4: Collaborate with Institutions, Organizations, Agencies, and Other Stakeholders to Support Positive Reading Outcomes

The improvement strategies are connected to deliverables produced at the state, regional, LEA, and campus levels. Both the improvement strategies and the deliverables coalesce to increase stakeholder expectations, build capacity through increased access to resources and knowledge of the science of teaching reading, and provide reading interventions for students with disabilities who receive special education in Texas to achieve the SiMR goals. These strategies are further outlined and described in the attached FFY20 SSIP (see Table 2: Improvement Strategies and Activities to Promote Reading Proficiency).

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	10.85%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>=		12.00%	20.00%	25.00%	30.00%	40.00%

FFY 2020 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	Number of Children with IEPs in Grades 4, 8, and HS who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
12,441	114,673	0.00%		10.85%	N/A	N/A

Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584) grades 4, 8, and HS 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)

YES

If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.

Although the State did not find any issues with (1) data completeness, validity and reliability, or (2) barriers to collect data (that was the case in FFY19 when assessments were waived) the State did study and took steps to mitigate the overarching impacts of student performance declines seen in the data collection. And although the act of data collection has been impacted the data itself has seen impact from the pandemic. Information on these data results for all students including students with disabilities are reported in the following linked resources and show not only the declines in student performance directly impacted from COVID-19 disruptions to education and service access, but also what has and continues to be how the State addresses these impacts to students, families, and educators.

<https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/2021-tac-accountability-presentation-final.pdf>
<https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/covid/Overview-of-2021-STAAR-Results.pdf>

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> the current SSIP is available in pdf at - <https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/2020-ssip-submission-feb1-2022.pdf> (see Section 1. Overview of Evaluation Activities, Measures, and Outcomes, p.6)

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 diagnostic certification and test framework aligned with updated standards with continued work on approving specific test items for the exam, and completion for adopting three new special education certifications in July 2020 with continued work towards new certifications currently undergoing content validation with educators in the field in preparation for a September 2024 launch date.

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>. (see Section 1. Table 2: Improvement Strategies and Activities to Promote Reading Proficiency, (p. 12))

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 include achievements of 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 are 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. 100% of ESCs receive training and/or directives to establishing 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 STR 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 diagnostic certification and test framework aligned with updated standards, and the July 2020 - SBEC adoption of three new special education certifications: 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>. , (pp. 12-15))

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 Senate Bill 2570. It is designed to effectively audit, monitor, and periodically conduct onsite visits of LEAs to ensure compliance with SB 2570 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>. (see Section 1. Table 3: Future Infrastructure Improvement Strategies, (p. 16))

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

Evidence-based practices are included and embedded in identified networks listed in Section 1. Table 1: Ten Networks Implementing Statewide Improvement Strategies, (p. 10), and those included in Section 1. Table 3: Future Infrastructure Improvement Strategies, (p. 16) of 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>. 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

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

Child Find/evaluation and ARD (IEP) supports - Developed guidance documents and tools on comprehensive evaluation for SLD/dyslexia, dysgraphia, dyscalculia, including data from multiple sources.

Inclusion - 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 - 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 - Developed a set of 10 modules (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.

Increasing capacity of LEAs and families to meet the needs of students with significant cognitive disabilities - Revised and updated existing ToTs 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 - Literacy pilots provided training on implementing the Foundations for Literacy to teachers of PreKK 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).

Additionally, the Texas Lesson Study was leveraged. This inquiry-based, job embedded professional development allows teachers to work collaboratively to develop, teach, and assess research-based lessons.

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. 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 DMS 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.
- These 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 LbC 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 networks listed in Section 1. Table 1: Ten Networks Implementing Statewide Improvement Strategies, (p. 10), and those included in Section 1. Table 3: Future Infrastructure Improvement Strategies, (p. 16) of 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>.

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). Section 5. Table 5: Baseline Special Education STAAR Reading Results for Grades 4, 8, and High School (HS) (p. 24) of the attached SSIP document located on the TEA website at <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/state-systemic-improvement-plan>, shows baseline data and COVID change from 2019 and 2021 that skips 2020 because no data were available. Current data will be used to establish a baseline for the SiMR.

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 to facilitate evidencebased, 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. Students' rate of reading improvement in words correct per minute will be measured and baselined from LEA results during SY 2021–2022. The results will be compared to national rates of improvement norms for words correct per minute growth by grade level. This comparison will allow the TEA to determine if use of the intervention platform is accelerating growth toward improving reading proficiency.

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 longterm commitments are typical barriers that affect short term success. Additionally, navigating through future state and federal directives or requirements may become barriers to implementing current or planned initiatives (e.g., waiving the 2019–2020 state assessment). 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

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, 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, formed in the spring of 2014, combined two former stakeholder groups that separately provided perspectives on state supervision, monitoring, target setting, and improvement planning, and 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 institutes, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. By combining membership and bringing forward individuals with a historical perspective to the TCIP process, the continuing conversation in Texas has sustained. New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC has engaged in multiple face-to-face and other meeting modalities 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. CAC meets at a minimum quarterly. Agendas are publicly posted and public comment is encouraged. The Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education (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 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.

TEA is committed to using input and feedback to better inform state practices and policies by engaging diverse stakeholders and building relationships. To support this effort, TEA launched its Stakeholder Engagement Initiative during the 2019-2020 school year. The purpose of this initiative is to establish strong universal processes with strategic and timely communication plans to improve the stakeholder engagement practices and to facilitate opportunities that will optimize agency resources toward achieving meaningful interaction and critical feedback. The initiative is charged with the following three goals:

- enhance website & database interaction to allow for specific communication so that all stakeholders can receive information that is relevant to them;
- agency special education staff will receive targeted training and tools to improve stakeholder engagement skills (templates regarding best practices for stakeholder engagement meetings to address recommended activities for pre, during, and post stakeholder meetings);
- and creation of a master calendar with all stakeholder engagement touchpoints.

As with other person access tasked systems, stakeholder involvement activities were impacted by COVID-19 related barriers. The State made quick action to accommodate stakeholder access for purpose of required rule-making processes, provision of information relating to COVID-19 impacts, and State resources and guidance including critical tools for IEP teams to support continued services to students receiving special education in the State. These resources continue to be available on the TEA website at <https://tea.texas.gov/texas-schools/health-safety-discipline/covid/parent-resources-for-students-in-special-education>.

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 followups, etc.)

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

NO

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

No concerns are noted during engagement activities.

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 significantly in the State's recovery from COVID impacted student learning and achievement disruptions. Considered a pilot study, 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 have faced many of the same unique challenges as all other states across the country have during the 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 that have been provided across the state in response to identified needs and specific to COVID-19 Support for Special Education 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

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

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

17 - Required Actions

Overall State Attachments



Texas-FFY-2020-SPP-
APR-Web-Links.pdf

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:

Tammy Pearcy

Title:

Deputy State Director Special Education

Email:

tammy.pearcy@tea.texas.gov

Phone:

512-936-0424

Submitted on:

04/28/22 8:20:30 PM

ED Attachments



tx-resultsmatrix-202
2b.pdf



TX-B-Dispute-Resol
ution-2020-21.pdf



TX-2022DataRubric
PartB.xlsx