STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

For reporting on
FFY 2022

Texas

PART B DUE February 1, 2024

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 Texas Education Agency (TEA) is committed to preparing every child for success in college, career, or the military (i.e., TEA Strategic Plan: https://tea.texas.gov/about-tea/welcome-and-overview/tea-strategic-plan). Within TEA, the Office of Special Populations and Student Supports (OSPSS) mission is to establish high expectations and strong systems that promote equitable outcomes for students with disabilities. This mission is achieved through activities like monitoring, training and development, and student and family engagement. The alignment between TEA's strategic priorities and OSPSS's mission underscores the commitment to equitable outcomes for students with disabilities as evidenced by the FY 2022 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report submission to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) as the U.S. Department of Education.

The SPP/APR report submitted for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2022 captures the Texas Education Agency's (TEA) dedication and progress toward improving results for students with disabilities in local educational agencies (LEAs) and ensuring compliance of the TEA and the LEAs of the state meet the requirements and purposes of Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

In the introduction of this report, the TEA outlines its comprehensive approach to improving outcomes for students with disabilities across 1214 LEAs.
• General Supervision System: Ensures IDEA Part B compliance through robust monitoring and effective dispute resolution processes.
• Technical Assistance System: Provides high-quality, evidence-based support to LEAs, ensuring timely access to necessary resources.
• Professional Development System: Focuses on enhancing the skills of service providers to effectively cater to children with disabilities.
• Broad Stakeholder Input: TEA actively engages a diverse array of stakeholders in setting SPP/APR targets and refining the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).
• Parent Members Engagement: Parent members, along with parent center staff and parents from local and statewide committees, are integral in target setting, data analysis, and strategy development, ensuring inclusive activities to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.
• Soliciting Public Input: Conducted through well-defined mechanisms and timelines, promoting transparency and community involvement in target setting and strategy development.
• Making Results and Reporting Public: Committed to making the performance of each LEA available to the public within 120 days following the submission of the FFY 2022 SPP/APR report, in compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.602(b)(1)(i)(A).

The complete SPP/APR will also be made available on the TEA website to inform the public of the state's progress and compliance with Part B.

Lastly, TEA has taken responsive actions to the requirements specified in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, demonstrating our ongoing commitment to continual improvement and adherence to federal requirements of the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).

TEA then presents the results for each of the 17 State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators focused on the State's performance and compliance with the requirements and purposes of IDEA Part B categorized into five monitoring priorities including free appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE), disproportionate representation, child find, effective transition, and general supervision. Each SPP indicator includes historical and current data, targets, improvement strategies and stakeholder involvement, and progress monitoring.

Of notable importance, TEA has made substantial progress by improving data quality through data collection efforts in the recent years regarding state performance plan indicator (SPPI) 11 (Timely Initial Evaluations) and SPPI 12 (Early Childhood Transition) with the development and implementation of the Texas Student Data System (TSDS) Child Find collection. This new data collection system improved data collection and data quality, allowing the reporting of student level data and the standardization compliance calculations that operationalize Texas rules and regulations. This system reflects TEA's commitment to improved data quality for assessing timely entry of children into special education under Part B.

The SPP/APR report for Texas was submitted electronically through the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS) on February 1, 2024.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

TEA Strategic Plan: https://tea.texas.gov/about-tea/welcome-and-overview/tea-strategic-plan

SPP/APR Public Repots: https://tea.texas.gov/reports-and-data/data-submission/state-performance-plan

SPP Indicator Reports at the LEA, Regional, and State Levels: https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/idea/index.html

EMAPS SPP/APR Reporting Tool: https://emaps.ed.gov/suite/

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

1,214

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions).

Texas incorporates the SPP/APR in the Texas Continuous Improvement Process. Texas' general supervision system mirrors the requirements of IDEA. The data-driven, evidence-based improvement activities and stakeholder input guide efforts to improve results for students with disabilities.

Texas' integrated monitoring and intervention practice is a balanced system of compliance and performance-based accountability. Special education monitoring and intervention activities analyzes student level data to determine compliance and effective programs. Monitoring activities include targeted and cyclical monitoring of LEAs; approval and reapproval of nonpublic day and residential schools; cyclical monitoring of state schools; dispute

resolution tracking, and noncompliance monitoring through secure platforms.

TEA analyzes and evaluates LEA data using a Results Driven Accountability (RDA) framework. Data is aligned across various special population program areas including special education. The RDA framework is a data-informed, results-driven system of coordinated and aligned monitoring activities, inclusive of targeted and cyclical review processes, where comprehensive LEA data, patterns of past performance and other federally required indicators inform monitoring determinations and interventions. The framework supports the SEA and LEAs in developing differentiated support activities. All LEAs in the State with RDA determination levels of 2, 3 or 4 work through a strategic support plan to promote compliance and continuous improvement.

The Differentiated Monitoring and Support (DMS) system is an intervention component with processes and activities that are implemented after the initial RDA determinations occur, and like OSEP's monitoring system, aims to achieve continuous improvement. The DMS provides customized monitoring and support activities based on the needs of LEAs concentrating on three programmatic pillars: Implementation, Student Outcomes, and Family Engagement. Additional information can be found on the TEA Differentiated Monitoring site (https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/differentiated-monitoring-and-support-dms). LEA monitoring activities are targeted to address special population program needs and to meet state and federal statutory requirements for performance interventions and compliance reviews specific to each program area. TEA requires LEAs to address findings of noncompliance in a corrective action plan (CAP). LEAs must correct noncompliance as soon as possible, but not later than one year from notification by TEA. Additional information about DMS and special education monitoring activities can be found on this website: https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support.

TEA's monitoring and contract approval process for Nonpublic Schools and state-defined Off-Campus Program placements is designed to ensure LEA placements in a private setting meets FAPE requirements. Information about TEA's Special Education Nonpublic and Off-Campus Programs can be found on this website: https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/special-education-in-nonpublic-and-off-campus-programs.
TEA monitors four state schools providing 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. Under the authority of 19 TAC §97.1072, TEA monitors LEAs that serve students with disabilities, who reside in residential facilities (RF), to ensure FAPE. Additionally, RF monitoring is part of the integrated intervention process if LEAs are staged in more than one program area.

The Correspondence and Dispute Resolution Management System (CDRMS) provides integrated tracking and management of correspondence and dispute resolution processes. CDRMS is divided into modules allowing the SEA at the student level to:
 • Maintain all special education complaint data, track progress on CAPs, and manage all LEA correspondence related to special education complaints
 • Provide electronic docketing functionality and record retention for Due Process Hearings and Mediations
 • Maintain and organize the activities and information related to state sponsored Facilitations managed by the Division of Complaints, Dispute Resolution, and Intensive Monitoring
 • Mediations include electronic docketing functionality as well as tracking of related disputes events for the same student
 • Facilitations-organizes information related to state-sponsored facilitations managed by the Division of Complaints, Dispute Resolution, and Intensive Monitoring as well as tracking of related activities for the same student

Additionally, the CDRMS tracks progress on pending and completed corrective actions.
TEA monitors the finding of noncompliance through the ASCEND platform. Noncompliance findings are recorded in the LEA's account. ASCEND documents the date an LEA was notified of the finding, the due date for correction, and the date the LEA was cleared of noncompliance. Monitoring occurs through correspondence; uploading and tracking the LEA CAP, interventions, and results for correction of the noncompliance; and documentation of these results. LEAs who do not correct any instance of noncompliance within a year receive escalated oversight where additional interventions and/or sanctions are implemented and tracked. Additional information on interventions and sanctions can be found in 19 TAC §89.1076.

TEA's fiscal management and monitoring process ensures LEAs follow federal requirements when accepting federal funds including MOE and excess costs. TEA provides LEAs with various resources and tools to accurately calculate excess costs to ensure the expenditure of state and local funds prior to expending IDEA-B grant funds. In addition, TEA conducts an annual IDEA B Maintenance of Effort review for each LEA containing four tests. An LEA must pass at least one test to be considered compliant. LEAs receive a preliminary compliance report, calculation tools and an exceptions workbook via the Grants and Federal Fiscal Compliance (GFFC) TEAL application. LEAs submit exceptions and documentation when applicable to justify any failed test. TEA runs the final IDEA-B MOE calculations and issues the final IDEA-B MOE Compliance report in the GFFC application which includes any mandatory refund amount the LEA must pay back if noncompliant. Additional information is on the TEA webpage (https://tea.texas.gov/finance-and-grants/grants/federal-fiscal-compliance-and-reporting/idea-fiscal-compliance/idea-b-lea-maintenance-of-effort).

Technical Assistance System:

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

TEA provides leadership in implementing the requirements of IDEA and has mechanisms in place to address both state identified monitoring priorities and federally identified monitoring priorities to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced-based TA, and to ensure that service providers maintain the skills to provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

TEA maintains 20 regional education service centers (ESCs) as a part of the TA infrastructure. ESCs provide training and TA to families, school districts, charter schools, and other community stakeholders for each region. ESCs support the State in implementing the requirements of IDEA, meeting the targets of the SPP/APR, and carrying out other results-driven measures identified in the State. Each ESC develops an annual regional special education continuous improvement plan (SECIP) describing regionally developed improvement activities based on regional data as compared to State targets and engages with state agency staff to identify successes that might be scaled statewide and/or opportunities for state agency support to enhance their efforts. ESCs report formative data quarterly and summative data in an annual report of high-leverage regional activities tied to the state agency's monitoring areas of focus at universal, targeted, and intensive levels. ESCs also provide dissemination of information throughout the state.

TEA's commitment of resources exists in collaborative projects, institutes of higher education (IHE) grants, and interagency coordination. Interagency coordination is integral in shared support within the State to those who provide services to children with disabilities specific to their state agency charge. The TEA participates in several stakeholder and interagency councils.

TEA disseminates grants though the utilization of discretionary funds from IDEA-B for TA networks. These TA networks address thematic topics and are comprised of:
 • The grantee who completes required grant activities
 • Identified network members (inclusive from all 20 ESCs across the state) who support the implementation of required grant activities

• TEA special education program staff who oversee the grants

The Child Find, Evaluation, and Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) Supports network assists LEAs by providing resources and training that are aligned with implementing effective Child Find practices, conducting, comprehensive evaluations, and practicing collaborative ARD committee processes that lead to FAPE for students with disabilities.

Texas Statewide Leadership for Autism Training (TSLAT) is a network that focuses on increasing LEAs' knowledge, understanding, and implementation of evidence-based practices (EBPs) that ensure the academic, functional, and behavioral needs of students with autism are met. TSLAT provides access to training, TA, support, and resources for educators who serve students with autism.

The Texas Complex Access (TX 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 the development of communication, mobility, tactile skills, and environmental adaptations. 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.

The Small and Rural Schools Network (SRSN) provides support to LEAs serving small and rural communities, developing infrastructures to ensure schools in these communities are well equipped to effectively serve students with disabilities. SRSN offers programs and services that support the recruitment and retention of special education staff in all types of small and rural schools, researches and deploys innovative solutions to support LEAs in meeting the diverse needs of learners with disabilities and provides other technical assistance and collaboration around agency priorities related to small and rural schools and special education.

The Student-Centered Transitions Network (SCTN) 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.

Dyslexia TA provides support, including a Dyslexia Helpline, and professional development to stakeholders across Texas related to compliance and innovative approaches for providing education and related services to students with dyslexia.

All network resources, including available professional development with a coaching component, can be found on Texas SPED Support (https://spedsupport.tea.texas.gov/). This website was launched in August 2023 and is intended to improve stakeholders' access to TEA's robust ecosystem of special education TA. Previously, TA was housed on 9 different network websites; by combining these resources into one, easily searchable website, users have access to all content related to their needs.

TEA leverages an initiative for School, Family, and Community Engagement. This initiative 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 this initiative, SPEDTex (the Texas Special Education Information Center) optimizes information and responds with TA in a user-friendly, culturally responsive, and accessible format to all individuals. Important parent resources are housed or linked on the SPEDTex website (https://www.spedtex.org/).

TEA funds a grant with the American Institute for Research (AIR) to support LEAs and help them address the identification, placement, and discipline disparities in special education. The mission of the Leaders and Educators Addressing Disproportionality in Special Education (LEADS) is to improve educational outcomes for all Texas students by combining evidence-based research with high quality training and coaching around disproportionality. Participating LEAs work with consultants to develop customized action plans to specifically address areas related to effective and equitable services to students in all groups. LEAs are provided ongoing, innovative technical assistance, including the opportunity to participate in a Community of Practice and access to a panel of national experts in disproportionality.

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 the 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 TAC §232.13.

CPE providers must be approved and registered by the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) and TEA. Approval 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 professional development is offered at a wide variety of physical and virtual locations (e.g., institutes of higher education, ESCs, LEAs), including TEALearn, which houses online, interactive courses ((https://register.tealearn.com/).
ESCs provide professional development and training activities based on state needs and the monitoring priorities identified in the SPP/APR. TEA provides a wide array of services that help educators do their jobs. An overview of these services can be found on TEA's Texas Educator website and each ESC's regional website.

TEA leverages ESCs using a train the trainer model to provide professional development and follow-up coaching to LEAs across the state. The grantees for the technical assistance network grants (identified in the Technical Assistance section) train ESC representatives from all 20 regions. ESC representatives then turn that training around to educators in their LEAs and provide coaching to ensure fidelity of implementation. Beginning in the 2023-2024 grant year, grantees will be responsible for organizing a small subset of past training participants to gauge continued fidelity of implementation 6 months to 1 year after initial training and coaching as well. A few of the most critical professional development opportunities available for Texas LEAs are:

• The Child Find, Evaluation, and ARD Supports network includes robust training series on Standards-Based Individual Education Program (IEP). This series is offered synchronously, asynchronously, and in a blended format and includes training specific to educators, administrators, speech-language pathologists, counselors, and occupational and physical therapists.

• Texas Autism Resource Guide for Effective Teaching makes available the Autism Circuit Academy which is a rigorous professional development opportunity that spans a school year and builds LEA capacity by increasing the number of educators in the state who are skilled in the implementation of evidence-based practices. Educators apply to the program and receive training, coaching, and continuous follow-up support on 8 high-yield EBPs for students with autism.

• TX CAN makes available a robust suite of professional development that includes coaching to fidelity for educators who work with students who have significant cognitive disabilities. Offerings include, but are not limited to, Building a Foundation for Supporting Students with Complex Access Needs, Inclusion Practices for Students with Complex Support Needs, A Step Toward IEP Quality and Rigor, and Universal Design for Learning (UDL) for Students with Complex Access Needs.

• SCTN makes available training with follow-up coaching on the topics of Writing Appropriate Measurable Postsecondary Goals, Conducting Necessary Transition Assessments, and Coordinated Set of Activities. This network also provides the required training to Transition and Employment Designees to ensure each LEA in Texas has an individual who has the expertise needed to support students' transition needs.

• TEA's Dyslexia TA grant oversees the Texas Dyslexia Academy which includes 6 modules: Dyslexia Foundations, The Dyslexia Handbook, Considerations for Emergent Bilingual Students, IDEA and Dyslexia, Screening for Dyslexia, and Dysgraphia.

The Inclusion network promotes a statewide culture of high expectations for students with disabilities to improve academic and functional outcomes for students served by special education and develops supports, resources, and trainings. The network assists LEAs in building capacity through the development and implementation of instructional programs that provide meaningful access to inclusive environments and grade-level standards, including inclusive early childhood programming for students with disabilities. This network offers statewide professional learning programs to increase educator knowledge and skill in meeting the needs of learners with disabilities in inclusive settings. These offerings include courses on Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and Specially Designed Instruction for students with disabilities in literacy and mathematics. The Inclusion in Texas network also develops and promotes statewide guidance, resources, and supports to assist IEP teams with the selection and implementation of assistive technologies to facilitate student access to grade-level learning experiences.

TEA started an initiative in August 2022 called Strategic Integration Liaisons (SIL). The vision of the SIL project is to improve and sustain student outcomes through the implementation of high-quality systems-level change in the areas of Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) and the Inclusion Framework by providing targeted and ongoing support, coaching, professional development, and technical assistance to LEA cross-functional leadership teams. The SIL project is currently in the pilot phase with three ESCs and will scale statewide in 2026.

The Tiered Interventions using Evidence-based Research network is developing comprehensive and coherent training and resources for evidence-based intervention practices across the state utilizing MTSS. 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. TIER training is provided through TIER certified trainers to educators across the state. To date, there are 178 TIER certified trainers who have trained 4,530 educators in TIER content.

Stakeholder Engagement:

The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Historically, Texas has solicited stakeholder engagement by using the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, and various 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 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, 20 ESCs, related service and support staff, and other state agencies. They participate in four meetings per year, where they review data and making recommendations to the TEA to improve special education policies, procedures, and practices from the state to the local levels.

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

The Special Education Directors panel is a select group of Special Education Directors who work with TEA throughout the year. They are nominated to participate on this panel by their regional Education Service Center (ESC) Special Education Directors. The purpose is to provide feedback and input on TEA initiatives and projects related to special education, including the SPP/APR. Presenting to this panel provides an opportunity to capture the current needs in the field from the perspective of an LEA Special Education Director. Additionally, the panel allows TEA staff to the opportunity to gather stakeholder input and the time to collaborate with LEA Special Education Directors currently in the field. The panel meets both in person and virtually.

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/APR, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as SPP/APR Indicators areas of slippage, Indicators 8 and 14 results and outreach, sampling plans, potential legal rule changes and legislative updates, state assessment participation, and Indicator 17: SSIP.

This group includes approximately 15 members representing key perspectives or roles to leverage diverse perspectives. The diverse nature of this group represents parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and/or campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, advocacy and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC engages in meetings quarterly 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. Most members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted, and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the 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. In 2023 topics for discussion included: TEA Updates, Legislative updates, Special Education Funding, 504 Data, Digital Curriculum Committee Reports, Teacher Vacancy Task Force updates and Updates on Recommendations and/or Proposed Bills.

Additionally, the CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.
The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year.

There are 11 special education directors specifically selected to provide feedback and support for the State. Many of the special education directors are also parents of students in the State's public school system. They meet quarterly. In 2023 the Special Education Directors provided input and support concerning the content of and outreach for the Parent Engagement survey (Indicator 8), the Differentiated Monitoring & Support (DMS) system, Legislative Updates, initiatives the state is working on such as the Special Education Diagnostic and an Administrator Toolkit, Legislative Implementation, the SSIP), a new website to house all Special Education Technical Support (Texas SPED Support), and student participation in the State's alternate assessment.

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

Number of Parent Members:
18

Parent Members Engagement:

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

In Texas, the State Advisory Panel required under 20 U.S.C. §1416(a)(21) is called the CAC. State law (TEC §29.006) requires the appointment by the Governor of 17 members. A majority of the members on CAC are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. Members are appointed for staggered four-year terms, with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year.

In addition to the requirements for the panel as prescribed under 20 U.S.C. §1416(a)(21)(D), state law requires the CAC to submit a report to the state legislature by January 1 of each odd-numbered year with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education. The CAC is also charged by state law to hold their meetings publicly in accordance with the state's Open Meetings Act, provide procedures and encourage participation for the public to speak at committee meetings.

The CAC is required by the IDEA to do the following:
 • advise the 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
 • 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 SPP indicators concerning 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. For more information on the CAC, its mandate, membership, and meeting schedule or minutes, see https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education.

The Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as an external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as general supervision, monitoring, infrastructure, intervention, and improvement activities relating to the improvement plan. This group includes members representing key perspectives or roles, including parents, teachers, related service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institution representatives, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. TEA reviews SPP/APR process and indicators, and data for each indicator is discussed. Compliance indicators are explained, as well as where and how data is gathered; these are then reviewed in reference to target setting. Progress for each indicator, current improvement, rate of historical improvement, whether targets were met or not, slippage, reasons for slippage and suggestions for improvement are reviewed and discussed. TCISC then assists with SPP/APR target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. Parents in these groups are encouraged to engage both as members of their respective committees and as private citizens.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

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

Regional ESCs play an important role in the special education TA infrastructure by providing training and TA for parents, LEAs, and other community stakeholders to meet requirements, including SPP/APR targets, and the purposes of the IDEA. Each ESC develops an annual regional special education continuous improvement plan (SECIP). These plans are aligned with the SSIP utilizing SPP/APR data to describe regionally developed improvement activities based on SPP/APR progress or slippage. The ESCs provide LEAs an array of services customized to the regional context. The ESCs deliver these services in a manner deemed appropriate. In some instances, services are delivered at the ESC and in other cases the ESC representatives provide technical assistance on-site in school districts. School districts can acquire many of these services throughout the year. Mission critical services are often delivered with additional resources to further support school district beyond the initial service delivery.

Families play an integral role in the education of their children and the State is committed to providing parents with understandable information to help them to engage meaningfully with their schools. The State utilizes SPEDTex as the primary resource to educate families and solicit their involvement .

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

The website (https://www.spedtex.org/) is a mobile friendly resource for parents and stakeholders. Parents can create an account and receive customized reminders, participate in focus groups, locate resources, and access training. The website and parent accounts can be viewed both in English and Spanish. SPEDTex provides information regarding Special Education Supplemental Services, a Resource Locator, Parent Involvement Survey results, and information on conferences and events.

Data are utilized from the SPEDTex Data Dashboard to determine the focus of webinars each year. TEA works to increase capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities by providing resources such as:
 • Statewide webinars, (including but not limited to: Families New to Special Education, Requesting an Initial Evaluation for Special Education, ARD Meeting Process, My First ARD Meeting, and the Special Education Complaints Process (see https://www.spedtex.org/families/overview-special-education-process-essentials-parents)
 • Information about the special education process, including the laws associated with special education, the evaluation process, and dispute resolution systems
 • Description of the thirteen qualifying disabilities under special education
 • Frequently asked questions, which are adjusted periodically based on the common questions received
 • Specific information for families who are new to special education

The website provides downloadable links to the State's Procedural Safeguards and the Parent's Guide to the ARD Process. These two documents are currently available in 27 languages.

Also included in the State's efforts to increase capacity, all LEAs receive a comprehensive special education program review within a six-year cycle. As part of that process, mobile friendly electronic surveys are provided to various stakeholders, which include parents and other family members. The parent and other family member electronic surveys are available in English, Spanish, Arabic, Chinese, Filipino, Vietnamese and Burmese.

LEAs are provided with the number of responses from parents and family members throughout their program review so they may reach out to parents and other family members reminding and encouraging them to provide feedback. LEAs are also encouraged to allow parents and other family members to utilize school computers in computer labs or libraries to complete the surveys. Interviews with stakeholders, including parents and other family members are included for LEAs participating in on-site program reviews. Translators are utilized for interviews where necessary. The survey and interview questions are designed around three constructs, Engagement, Understanding and Competency in Implementation. The surveys serve as a diagnostic tool to identifying areas needing improvement or areas of current success.

Soliciting Public Input:

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

TCISC is responsible for target setting, continued review and evaluation against targets, and the development of the SPP/APR. The TCISC serves as the external workgroup that advises on topics such as general supervision, monitoring, infrastructure, intervention, and improvement activities relating to the improvement plan. TCISC meets at least three times annually, TEA staff present data, reviews targets, describes the data gathering system or any other agenda items the TCISC requests. This group includes members representing key perspectives or roles, including parents, teachers, related service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, LEA and campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, multiple advocacy agencies and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC members provide thoughtful input to the important work that has focused on improving results for children and youth with disabilities and their families. TEA is currently exploring ways to make the work of the TCISC more readily available to the public so that more community members can provide input on areas that the TCISC is taking under advisement.

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

ESC special education directors meet with TEA on Tuesdays. Each regional ESC develops an annual special education continuous improvement plan (SECIP). Goals for the SECIP are aligned with the SSIP and developed from analyzing LEA level data against SPP targets. ESCs then create and provide Technical Assistance and Professional Development for all LEAs in their region targeting those with data below the target or any that want to improve student outcomes. LEA progress or implementation is measured before and after training to measure the success of the training.

LEA Special Education Directors Panel meets quarterly with TEA and provides feedback and input for initiatives and projects related to special education, including the SPP/APR. This panel provides an opportunity to capture current needs in the field from the perspective of an LEA Special Education Director. The panel allows the TEA to gather feedback and collaborate with LEA Special Education Directors currently in the field. ESC Special Education Directors nominate LEA Special Education Directors from their region to serve on this panel. All members of the public have access to a general special education inbox, any suggestions and comments are sent to appropriate TEA staff to review.

Making Results Available to the Public:

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

TEA communicates results of target setting, data analysis, improvement strategies, and evaluations to the public through multiple channels. These include listserv announcements, webinars for LEAs, and Zoom meetings for ESCs, and To the Administrator Addressed (TAA) letters updates.

Annually in the spring/summer, the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is made publicly available, detailing the reports for the current six-year cycle. This can be accessed at the TEA's dedicated webpage. Additionally, in compliance with the IDEA 2004 statute Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), the TEA annually produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators for each district, highlighting their performance against state targets. These reports are accessible on the TEA's website.

Regular webinars with LEAs and Zoom meetings with ESC are hosted by the Division of Special Education Programs offer the latest information on special education in Texas, with recordings available for those who cannot attend live. Questions regarding special education can be directed to sped@tea.texas.gov. Furthermore, a monthly Special Education newsletter, available by subscription, provides timely updates, important dates, and new resources from across TEA. Both webinars and newsletters are archived on the TEA Special Education Webinars and Newsletters webpage.

TAA letters are published ongoing throughout the year and serve as crucial communications to school districts, charter schools, and regional ESCs, published on the TEA website for broad dissemination. TEA letters are available on the agency website and through listserv announcements. TAAs provides timely updates, important dates, and new resources and information from across that are relevant for the public at large, including parents, LEA, and regional ESC. TAAs can be accessed on the web here https://tea.texas.gov/about-tea/news-and-multimedia/correspondence.
Finally, TEA also daily fields a questions from the public via phone calls, emails, and Public Information Requests (PIRs).

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2021 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 2021 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 revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, is available.

The State submitted its FFY 2021 SPP/APR for Part B state formula grant programs under IDEA to OSEP via the EMAPS tool ((https://emaps.ed.gov/suite/) on February 1, 2023. The State then publicly posted the reports of LEA performance against the SPP/APR targets on May 24, 2023, through an interactive report generator on the TEA website. The posting of LEA level SPP/APR reports to the TEA website demonstrates the State's adherence to the 120-day post-submission public reporting requirement.

Users can access the LEA level SPP/APR reports by visiting the "District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report" webpage (https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/idea/index.html). Here, users can customize their search by selecting the school year, report format, report level, and entering the LEA name (e.g., Spring Branch Independent School District [ISD]) or county-district number (CDN). The CDN is an LEA's unique 6-digit identification number registered with TEA (e.g., The CDN for Spring Branch ISD is "101920"). The system generates reports in PDF or HTML formats. Users can search for an LEA's CDN using AskTED (Texas Education Directory; https://tealprod.tea.state.tx.us/Tea.AskTed.Web/Forms/Home.aspx).

Users can also access a complete copy of the State's FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission by visiting the "State Performance Plan Annual Performance Report" (https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report). Here, users can access the SPP/APR submission by clicking on "FFY 2021" to produce the report in PDF format ((https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/ffy-2021-texas-spp-apr.pdf).

The State has not revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR on February 1, 2023.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2022 and 2023 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2023 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

In response to the required actions outlined in the State's 2023 Part B Determination Letter, Texas has engaged with several OSEP-funded technical assistance centers and taken specific actions based on the assistance received.

Technical Assistance Sources:
 • Monitoring and State Improvement Planning (MSIP): https://osepideasthatwork.org/resources-grantees/program-areas/monitoring-and-state-improvement-planning-msip?tab=pa-resources
 • OSEP Ideas That Work, IDEA Topic Areas: https://sites.ed.gov/idea/topic-areas/
 • Comprehensive Centers: https://compcenternetwork.org/
 • IDEA Data Center (IDC): https://www.ideadata.org/sea-data-processes-toolkit

Actions Taken as a Result of Technical Assistance:

MSIP:
• Implemented Section 508 Accessibility measures including ART Submission Form, Dashboard, and Web Posting Manual.
• Conducted annual accessibility trainings and reviewed publicly posted webpages/documents.
• Utilized various resources for grantees like Part B Indicator Analysis and NTACT Indicator 13 Checklist.

OSEP Ideas That Work (IDEA Topic Areas):
• Enhanced accessibility of websites and digital content.
• Addressed monitoring and enforcement issues, parents' rights, significant disproportionality, secondary transition, and virtual schools.

Comprehensive Centers & Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA):
• Updated and improved data quality for SPPI 7 using the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) Process.

National Center on Intensive Intervention:
• Utilized resources for Intensive Intervention & MTSS in the State's supports.

DEA Data Center (IDC):
• Used various IDC tools for SPP/APR Indicator Protocols and Significant Disproportionality.
• Implemented reliability and validity checks for several indicators.
• Improved data quality and documentation for multiple indicators.
• Draft SPP/APR submission for FFY 2022 reviewed by IDC State Liaison.

TEA has diligently utilized the resources and assistance provided by these technical assistance centers. The actions taken by TEA are focused on improving IDEA compliance and effectiveness, demonstrating a commitment to enhancing the education for individuals with disabilities.

Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2022 and 2023 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to Section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 23, 2023 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED*Facts* 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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

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

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	44.77%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	88.50%	88.50%	90.00%	44.77%	45.00%
Data	77.41%	77.86%	77.92%	44.77%	46.27%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Historically, Texas has solicited stakeholder engagement by using the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, and various 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 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, 20 ESCs, related service and support staff, and other state agencies. They participate in four meetings per year, where they review data and making recommendations to the TEA to improve special education policies, procedures, and practices from the state to the local levels.

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

The Special Education Directors panel is a select group of Special Education Directors who work with TEA throughout the year. They are nominated to participate on this panel by their regional Education Service Center (ESC) Special Education Directors. The purpose is to provide feedback and input on TEA initiatives and projects related to special education, including the SPP/APR. Presenting to this panel provides an opportunity to capture the current needs in the field from the perspective of an LEA Special Education Director. Additionally, the panel allows TEA staff to the opportunity to gather stakeholder input and the time to collaborate with LEA Special Education Directors currently in the field. The panel meets both in person and virtually.

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/APR, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as SPP/APR Indicators areas of slippage, Indicators 8 and 14 results and outreach, sampling plans, potential legal rule changes and legislative updates, state assessment participation, and Indicator 17: SSIP.

This group includes approximately 15 members representing key perspectives or roles to leverage diverse perspectives. The diverse nature of this group represents parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and/or campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, advocacy and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions

include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC engages in meetings quarterly 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. Most members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted, and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the 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. In 2023 topics for discussion included: TEA Updates, Legislative updates, Special Education Funding, 504 Data, Digital Curriculum Committee Reports, Teacher Vacancy Task Force updates and Updates on Recommendations and/or Proposed Bills.

Additionally, the CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.
The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year.

There are 11 special education directors specifically selected to provide feedback and support for the State. Many of the special education directors are also parents of students in the State's public school system. They meet quarterly. In 2023 the Special Education Directors provided input and support concerning the content of and outreach for the Parent Engagement survey (Indicator 8), the Differentiated Monitoring & Support (DMS) system, Legislative Updates, initiatives the state is working on such as the Special Education Diagnostic and an Administrator Toolkit, Legislative Implementation, the SSIP), a new website to house all Special Education Technical Support (Texas SPED Support), and student participation in the State's alternate assessment.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	18,938
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	13,471
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	131
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	5,844

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
18,938	38,384	46.27%	46.00%	49.34%	Met target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

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

The criteria to graduate with a regular high school diploma in Texas includes the following requirements:

Overview of Graduation Requirements: In Texas, the conditions for students to earn a high school diploma are outlined in Title 19 of the Texas Administrative Code (TAC), Chapter 74, Curriculum Requirements, Subchapter B, Graduation Requirements TAC Chapter 74 (19 TAC § 74.000(B); https://texreg.sos.state.tx.us/public/readtac$ext.ViewTAC?tac_view=5&ti=19&pt=2&ch=74&sch=B&rl=Y).

Foundation High School Program Requirements: To graduate, students must complete the foundation high school program. This program includes

several key elements:
• Minimum Credit Requirements: Students must earn at least 22 credits under the foundation program.
• Endorsements: Students starting high school are required to pursue a diploma with an endorsement (26 credits required), which may be in areas like STEM, business and industry, public services, arts and humanities, or multidisciplinary studies. Students can opt-out under specific conditions.
• Distinguished Level of Achievement: This includes earning an endorsement and completing four credits each in science and mathematics.
• Performance Acknowledgments: Acknowledgments may be earned for achievements in areas like dual credit courses, bilingualism, performance in advanced tests, or earning certifications.

State Testing Requirements: Students must also fulfill state testing requirements to be eligible for graduation.

Proficiency in Communication Skills: Proficiency in certain communication skills, as determined by the LEA is required.

Financial Aid Application: Graduation eligibility requires students complete the FAFSA or the Texas Application for State Financial Aid (TASFA), unless exception apply.

Special Education Services: For students receiving special education services, additional clarifications on graduation requirements are provided under 19 TAC Chapter 89, Adaptations for Special Populations, Subchapter AA, Commissioner's Rules Concerning Special Education Services, Division 2, Rule 89.1070 TAC Chapter 89 (19 TAC §89.1070;
https://texreg.sos.state.tx.us/public/readtac$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=19&pt=2&ch=89&rl=1070).

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

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For detailed guidance and additional information on SPPI 1, please visit the TEA website at https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/state-performance-plan-indicators.

For additional information on the state graduation requirements, please visit the TEA webpage at https://tea.texas.gov/academics/graduation-information/state-graduation-requirements.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED*Facts* 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 dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a

state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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

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

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	13.41%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	1.90%	1.80%	1.80%	13.41%	13.00%
Data	1.82%	1.93%	1.85%	13.41%	16.03%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Historically, Texas has solicited stakeholder engagement by using the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, and various 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 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, 20 ESCs, related service and support staff, and other state agencies. They participate in four meetings per year, where they review data and making recommendations to the TEA to improve special education policies, procedures, and practices from the state to the local levels.

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

The Special Education Directors panel is a select group of Special Education Directors who work with TEA throughout the year. They are nominated to participate on this panel by their regional Education Service Center (ESC) Special Education Directors. The purpose is to provide feedback and input on TEA initiatives and projects related to special education, including the SPP/APR. Presenting to this panel provides an opportunity to capture the current needs in the field from the perspective of an LEA Special Education Director. Additionally, the panel allows TEA staff to the opportunity to gather stakeholder input and the time to collaborate with LEA Special Education Directors currently in the field. The panel meets both in person and virtually.

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/APR, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as SPP/APR Indicators areas of slippage, Indicators 8 and 14 results and outreach, sampling plans, potential legal rule changes and legislative updates, state assessment participation, and Indicator 17: SSIP.

This group includes approximately 15 members representing key perspectives or roles to leverage diverse perspectives. The diverse nature of this group represents parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and/or campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, advocacy and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC engages in meetings quarterly 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. Most members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted, and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the 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. In 2023 topics for discussion included: TEA Updates, Legislative updates, Special Education Funding, 504 Data, Digital Curriculum Committee Reports, Teacher Vacancy Task Force updates and Updates on Recommendations and/or Proposed Bills.

Additionally, the CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.
The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year.

There are 11 special education directors specifically selected to provide feedback and support for the State. Many of the special education directors are also parents of students in the State's public school system. They meet quarterly. In 2023 the Special Education Directors provided input and support concerning the content of and outreach for the Parent Engagement survey (Indicator 8), the Differentiated Monitoring & Support (DMS) system, Legislative Updates, initiatives the state is working on such as the Special Education Diagnostic and an Administrator Toolkit, Legislative Implementation, the SSIP), a new website to house all Special Education Technical Support (Texas SPED Support), and student participation in the State's alternate assessment.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	18,938
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	13,471
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	131
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	5,844

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
5,844	38,384	16.03%	12.00%	15.23%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

Definition Describing Dropping Out
The SPPI 2 definition of dropping out includes students aged between 14 to 21, who:
• Enrollment Status: Were enrolled in a special education program at the start of the reporting period but were not enrolled at the end of it.
• Exit Criteria: Did not exit the program through graduation, completion of a state or district-approved educational program, or transfer to another educational institution.

Specific Reasons for Dropout (PEIMS Data Element and Code Table):
The LEAVER-REASON-CODE E1001 data element indicates the reason a prior year student in grade 7-12 student has not enrolled in the district during the current school year. The LEAVER-REASON-CODE data element is further defined by the following codes from the LEAVER-REASON-CODE C162 code table:
• Code 16: Students who left school to return to their family's home country or emigrated to another country.
• Code 78: Students expelled under TEC 37.007 and cannot return to school.
• Code 83: Students withdrawn by the district due to ineligibility for enrollment.

• Code 85: Students who graduated outside of Texas before entering a Texas public school, then left the Texas school system again.

TEA collects data for these codes using the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS).

Alignment with File Specification (FS) Document:
This definition aligns with the U.S. Department of Education's EDPass, FS032 - Dropouts File Specifications (SY 2022-2023). It includes students who were expected to continue their education but did not due to the aforementioned reasons, excluding cases of transfer to other schools, recognized temporary absences, or death.

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)

For detailed guidance and additional information on SPPI 2, please visit the TEA website at https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/state-performance-plan-indicators.

TWEDS LEAVER-REASON-CODE E1001 data element: https://tealprod.tea.state.tx.us/TWEDS/98/493/0/0/DataComponents/DataElements/List/18388.

TWEDS LEAVER-REASON-CODE C162 code table https://tealprod.tea.state.tx.us/TWEDS/98/493/0/0/CodeTable/List/14611.

FS032, Dropouts File Specifications (SY 2022-2023): https://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/edfacts/sy-22-23-nonxml.html

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED*Facts* 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	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Historically, Texas has solicited stakeholder engagement by using the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, and various 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 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, 20 ESCs, related service and support staff, and other state agencies. They participate in four meetings per year, where they review data and making recommendations to the TEA to improve special education policies, procedures, and practices from the state to the local levels.

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

The Special Education Directors panel is a select group of Special Education Directors who work with TEA throughout the year. They are nominated to participate on this panel by their regional Education Service Center (ESC) Special Education Directors. The purpose is to provide feedback and input on TEA initiatives and projects related to special education, including the SPP/APR. Presenting to this panel provides an opportunity to capture the current needs in the field from the perspective of an LEA Special Education Director. Additionally, the panel allows TEA staff to the opportunity to gather stakeholder input and the time to collaborate with LEA Special Education Directors currently in the field. The panel meets both in person and virtually.

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/APR, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as SPP/APR Indicators areas of slippage, Indicators 8 and 14 results and outreach, sampling plans, potential legal rule changes and legislative updates, state assessment participation, and Indicator 17: SSIP.

This group includes approximately 15 members representing key perspectives or roles to leverage diverse perspectives. The diverse nature of this group represents parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and/or campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, advocacy and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC engages in meetings quarterly 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. Most members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted, and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the 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. In 2023 topics for discussion included: TEA Updates, Legislative updates, Special Education Funding, 504 Data, Digital Curriculum Committee Reports, Teacher Vacancy Task Force updates and Updates on Recommendations and/or Proposed Bills.

Additionally, the CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.
The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year.

There are 11 special education directors specifically selected to provide feedback and support for the State. Many of the special education directors are also parents of students in the State's public school system. They meet quarterly. In 2023 the Special Education Directors provided input and support concerning the content of and outreach for the Parent Engagement survey (Indicator 8), the Differentiated Monitoring & Support (DMS) system, Legislative Updates, initiatives the state is working on such as the Special Education Diagnostic and an Administrator Toolkit, Legislative Implementation, the SSIP), a new website to house all Special Education Technical Support (Texas SPED Support), and student participation in the State's alternate assessment.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*
Data Source:
SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)
Date:
01/10/2024
Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	65,251	52,810	86,634
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	8,277	4,458	7,166
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	49,120	41,393	63,041
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	7,296	6,168	6,030

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	65,097	55,784	68,929
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	8,069	5,623	7,589
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	49,230	43,150	52,647
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	7,293	6,162	6,015

(1) The children with IEPs who are English learners and took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment are not included in the prefilled data in this indicator.

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

(3) The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments, as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	64,693	65,251	99.00%	95.00%	99.14%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	52,019	52,810	98.10%	95.00%	98.50%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	76,237	86,634	88.26%	95.00%	88.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	64,592	65,097	99.11%	95.00%	99.22%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	54,935	55,784	98.38%	95.00%	98.48%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	66,251	68,929	96.03%	95.00%	96.11%	Met target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in

those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

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

TEA is committed to maintaining transparency in student assessments by providing publicly accessible reporting resources:

Analytic Tools for Assessment Data: Offers detailed analysis of STAAR performance and comparisons
(see https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/perfreport/account/va/va_reports_page.html).

District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report: Presents performance indicators for school districts
(see https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/idea/index.html).

Media Inquiries: Members of the media can send inquiries regarding assessment data to the TEA Communications Division at (512) 463-9000 or MediaRelations@tea.texas.gov
(see https://tea.texas.gov/about-tea/contact-us/public-information-requests).

Public Information Requests: Individuals from the public right to request access to assessment information by submitting a public information request
(see https://tea.texas.gov/about-tea/contact-us/public-information-requests).

Results Driven Accountability Data and Reports: Features comprehensive data and reports on school performance
(see https://tea.texas.gov/reports-and-data/school-performance/results-driven-accountability-data-and-reports).

Student Assessment Results: Provides results of various student assessments conducted by TEA
(see https://tea.texas.gov/student-assessment/testing/student-assessment-results).

Student Assessment Statewide Summary Reports: Offers statewide summaries of assessment results
(see https://tea.texas.gov/student-assessment/testing/student-assessment-results/statewide-summary-reports).

Texas Academic Performance Report: Contains detailed academic performance reports of Texas schools
(see
https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/cgi/sas/broker?_service=marykay&_program=perfrept.perfmast.sas&_debug=0&lev=S&prgopt=reports/tapr/performance.sas).

Texas Assessment Research Portal: A portal for research and analysis related to Texas assessments
(see https://txresearchportal.com/).

TXschools.gov: Learn more about your school district, including performance and assessments results
(see https://txschools.gov/?lng=en).

The STAAR Assessments with Accommodations documents can be found on the "Participation and Performance Rates on State Assessments" webpage (https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/participation-and-performance-rates-on-state-assessments) in the SPPI 3A Calculation and Example.

The State and Regional SPP/APR Indicator Reports can be found on the "Local Education Agency Public Reporting" webpage (https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/local-education-agency-public-reporting).

Texas reports according to 34 CFR §300.160(f) which does not include the terminology "district and school level."

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For detailed guidance and additional information on SPPI 3a, please visit the TEA website at https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/state-performance-plan-indicators.

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

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 district and school levels. 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 2024 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2022, 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 2023 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2023.

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 ED*Facts* 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	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	20.00%	25.00%	30.00%	40.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	18.00%	25.00%	30.00%	40.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	18.00%	25.00%	30.00%	40.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	23.00%	25.00%	30.00%	40.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	23.00%	25.00%	30.00%	40.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	23.00%	25.00%	30.00%	40.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Historically, Texas has solicited stakeholder engagement by using the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, and various 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 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, 20 ESCs, related service and support staff, and other state agencies. They participate in four meetings per year, where they review data and making recommendations to the TEA to improve special education policies, procedures, and practices from the state to the local levels.

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

The Special Education Directors panel is a select group of Special Education Directors who work with TEA throughout the year. They are nominated to participate on this panel by their regional Education Service Center (ESC) Special Education Directors. The purpose is to provide feedback and input on TEA initiatives and projects related to special education, including the SPP/APR. Presenting to this panel provides an opportunity to capture the current needs in the field from the perspective of an LEA Special Education Director. Additionally, the panel allows TEA staff to the opportunity to gather stakeholder input and the time to collaborate with LEA Special Education Directors currently in the field. The panel meets both in person and virtually.

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/APR, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as SPP/APR Indicators areas of slippage, Indicators 8 and 14 results and outreach, sampling plans, potential legal rule changes and legislative updates, state assessment participation, and Indicator 17: SSIP.

This group includes approximately 15 members representing key perspectives or roles to leverage diverse perspectives. The diverse nature of this group represents parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and/or campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, advocacy and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC engages in meetings quarterly 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. Most members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted, and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the 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. In 2023 topics for discussion included: TEA Updates, Legislative updates, Special Education Funding, 504 Data, Digital Curriculum Committee Reports, Teacher Vacancy Task Force updates and Updates on Recommendations and/or Proposed Bills.

Additionally, the CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.
The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year.

There are 11 special education directors specifically selected to provide feedback and support for the State. Many of the special education directors are also parents of students in the State's public school system. They meet quarterly. In 2023 the Special Education Directors provided input and support concerning the content of and outreach for the Parent Engagement survey (Indicator 8), the Differentiated Monitoring & Support (DMS) system, Legislative Updates, initiatives the state is working on such as the Special Education Diagnostic and an Administrator Toolkit, Legislative Implementation, the SSIP), a new website to house all Special Education Technical Support (Texas SPED Support), and student participation in the State's alternate assessment.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*
Data Source:
SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)
Date:
01/10/2024
Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

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	57,397	45,851	70,207
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4,950	2,388	2,654
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4,401	4,592	7,113

Data Source:
SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

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	57,299	48,773	60,236
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	5,088	2,755	1,579
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	5,727	4,878	4,660

(1)The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	9,351	57,397	21.58%	20.00%	16.29%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	6,980	45,851	15.83%	18.00%	15.22%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	9,767	70,207	9.83%	18.00%	13.91%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

The slippage for Group A, Grade 4, reading performance can be attributed to several factors:

Impact of COVID-19: The pandemic led to disruptions in regular school routines. Stakeholders provided input that the decline in performance may be attributed to potential disruptions in fundamental education for 4th graders during their 1st and 2nd grade years, which were caused by the impact of COVID.

Challenges with Remote Learning: Children with IEPs often benefit from hands-on, personalized teaching methods, which were challenging to implement effectively in remote learning settings. This might have impacted reading performance.

Reduced Access to Support Services: Due to the pandemic, there was reduced access to essential support services like speech therapy, occupational therapy, and one-on-one assistance, which are critical for the academic success of students with IEPs.

Increased Stress and Mental Health Issues: The pandemic was a source of increased stress and anxiety for many students, which may have adversely affect academic performance, particularly for students with special needs who might find changes in routine and uncertainty more challenging to navigate.

Assessment Adjustments and Learning Gaps: The shift in teaching methods and potential learning gaps that arose during the pandemic could have impacted the way students with IEPs interacted with the assessment material, leading to a decrease in scores.

Resource Limitations: The pandemic may have led to a strain on resources, both at home and in educational institutions, affecting the quality and consistency of educational support provided to students with IEPs.

Although COVID-19 had an impact on assessment results, the reasons for test score slippage is likely multifaceted and might include other systemic and individual factors not directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic.

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	10,815	57,299	15.71%	23.00%	18.87%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	7,633	48,773	12.13%	23.00%	15.65%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	6,239	60,236	10.48%	23.00%	10.36%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

TEA is committed to maintaining transparency in student assessments by providing publicly accessible reporting resources:

Analytic Tools for Assessment Data: Offers detailed analysis of STAAR performance and comparisons
(see https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/perfreport/account/va/va_reports_page.html).

District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report: Presents performance indicators for school districts
(see https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/idea/index.html).

Media Inquiries: Members of the media can send inquiries regarding assessment data to the TEA Communications Division at (512) 463-9000 or MediaRelations@tea.texas.gov
(see https://tea.texas.gov/about-tea/contact-us/public-information-requests).

Public Information Requests: Individuals from the public right to request access to assessment information by submitting a public information request
(see https://tea.texas.gov/about-tea/contact-us/public-information-requests).

Results Driven Accountability Data and Reports: Features comprehensive data and reports on school performance
(see https://tea.texas.gov/reports-and-data/school-performance/results-driven-accountability-data-and-reports).

Student Assessment Results: Provides results of various student assessments conducted by TEA
(see https://tea.texas.gov/student-assessment/testing/student-assessment-results).

Student Assessment Statewide Summary Reports: Offers statewide summaries of assessment results
(see https://tea.texas.gov/student-assessment/testing/student-assessment-results/statewide-summary-reports).

Texas Academic Performance Report: Contains detailed academic performance reports of Texas schools
(see https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/cgi/sas/broker?_service=marykay&_program=perfrept.perfmast.sas&_debug=0&lev=S&prgopt=reports/tapr/performance.sas).

Texas Assessment Research Portal: A portal for research and analysis related to Texas assessments
(see https://txresearchportal.com/).

TXschools.gov: Learn more about your school district, including performance and assessments results
(see https://txschools.gov/?lng=en).

2022 STAAR Assessments with Accommodations Report: Detailed report on the 2022 STAAR assessments, including accommodations
(see https://tea.texas.gov/system/files/2022-staar-assessments-with-accommodations_0.pdf).

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For detailed guidance and additional information on SPPI 3b, please visit the TEA website at https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/state-performance-plan-indicators.

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

3B - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

        A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

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

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

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

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

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED*Facts* 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	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	92.00%	92.00%	93.00%	93.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	93.00%	94.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	94.00%	95.00%	95.00%	96.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	94.00%	95.00%	95.00%	96.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	96.00%	96.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	93.00%	94.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Historically, Texas has solicited stakeholder engagement by using the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, and various 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 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, 20 ESCs, related service and support staff, and other state agencies. They participate in four meetings per year, where they review data and making recommendations to the TEA to improve special education policies, procedures, and practices from the state to the local levels.

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

The Special Education Directors panel is a select group of Special Education Directors who work with TEA throughout the year. They are nominated to participate on this panel by their regional Education Service Center (ESC) Special Education Directors. The purpose is to provide feedback and input on TEA initiatives and projects related to special education, including the SPP/APR. Presenting to this panel provides an opportunity to capture the current needs in the field from the perspective of an LEA Special Education Director. Additionally, the panel allows TEA staff to the opportunity to gather stakeholder input and the time to collaborate with LEA Special Education Directors currently in the field. The panel meets both in person and virtually.

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/APR, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as SPP/APR Indicators areas of slippage, Indicators 8 and 14 results and outreach, sampling plans, potential legal rule changes and legislative updates, state assessment participation, and Indicator 17: SSIP.

This group includes approximately 15 members representing key perspectives or roles to leverage diverse perspectives. The diverse nature of this group represents parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and/or campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, advocacy and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC engages in meetings quarterly 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. Most members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted, and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the 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. In 2023 topics for discussion included: TEA Updates, Legislative updates, Special Education Funding, 504 Data, Digital Curriculum Committee Reports, Teacher Vacancy Task Force updates and Updates on Recommendations and/or Proposed Bills.

Additionally, the CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.
The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year.

There are 11 special education directors specifically selected to provide feedback and support for the State. Many of the special education directors are also parents of students in the State's public school system. They meet quarterly. In 2023 the Special Education Directors provided input and support concerning the content of and outreach for the Parent Engagement survey (Indicator 8), the Differentiated Monitoring & Support (DMS) system, Legislative Updates, initiatives the state is working on such as the Special Education Diagnostic and an Administrator Toolkit, Legislative Implementation, the SSIP), a new website to house all Special Education Technical Support (Texas SPED Support), and student participation in the State's alternate assessment.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*
Data Source:
SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)
Date:
01/10/2024

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	7,296	6,168	6,030
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	6,535	5,729	5,662

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

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	7,293	6,162	6,015
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	6,882	5,914	5,593

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	6,535	7,296	87.73%	92.00%	89.57%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	5,729	6,168	92.98%	93.00%	92.88%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	5,662	6,030	90.73%	94.00%	93.90%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	6,882	7,293	94.85%	94.00%	94.36%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	5,914	6,162	95.33%	95.00%	95.98%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	5,593	6,015	93.38%	93.00%	92.98%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

TEA is committed to maintaining transparency in student assessments by providing publicly accessible reporting resources:

Analytic Tools for Assessment Data: Offers detailed analysis of STAAR performance and comparisons
(see https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/perfreport/account/va/va_reports_page.html).

District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report: Presents performance indicators for school districts
(see https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/idea/index.html).

Media Inquiries: Members of the media can send inquiries regarding assessment data to the TEA Communications Division at (512) 463-9000 or MediaRelations@tea.texas.gov
(see https://tea.texas.gov/about-tea/contact-us/public-information-requests).

Public Information Requests: Individuals from the public right to request access to assessment information by submitting a public information request
(see https://tea.texas.gov/about-tea/contact-us/public-information-requests).

Results Driven Accountability Data and Reports: Features comprehensive data and reports on school performance
(see https://tea.texas.gov/reports-and-data/school-performance/results-driven-accountability-data-and-reports).

Student Assessment Results: Provides results of various student assessments conducted by TEA
(see https://tea.texas.gov/student-assessment/testing/student-assessment-results).

Student Assessment Statewide Summary Reports: Offers statewide summaries of assessment results
(see https://tea.texas.gov/student-assessment/testing/student-assessment-results/statewide-summary-reports).

Texas Academic Performance Report: Contains detailed academic performance reports of Texas schools
(see
https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/cgi/sas/broker?_service=marykay&_program=perfrept.perfmast.sas&_debug=0&lev=S&prgopt=reports/tapr/performance.sas).

Texas Assessment Research Portal: A portal for research and analysis related to Texas assessments
(see https://txresearchportal.com/).

TXschools.gov: Learn more about your school district, including performance and assessments results
(see https://txschools.gov/?lng=en).

2022 STAAR Assessments with Accommodations Report: Detailed report on the 2022 STAAR assessments, including accommodations
(see https://tea.texas.gov/system/files/2022-staar-assessments-with-accommodations_0.pdf).

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For detailed guidance and additional information on SPPI 3c, please visit the TEA website at https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/state-performance-plan-indicators.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

3C - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

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

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

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

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

Data Source

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED*Facts* 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 2022-2023 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 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 2022-2023 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 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	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	23.00	22.00	21.00	20.00
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	35.00	34.00	32.00	30.00
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	37.00	35.00	32.00	30.00
Math	A <=	Grade 4	20.00	19.00	19.00	18.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	31.00	30.00	29.00	28.00
Math	C <=	Grade HS	26.00	25.00	25.00	24.00

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Historically, Texas has solicited stakeholder engagement by using the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, and various 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 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, 20 ESCs, related service and support staff, and other state agencies. They participate in four meetings per year, where they review data and making recommendations to the TEA to improve special education policies, procedures, and practices from the state to the local levels.

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

The Special Education Directors panel is a select group of Special Education Directors who work with TEA throughout the year. They are nominated to participate on this panel by their regional Education Service Center (ESC) Special Education Directors. The purpose is to provide feedback and input on TEA initiatives and projects related to special education, including the SPP/APR. Presenting to this panel provides an opportunity to capture the current needs in the field from the perspective of an LEA Special Education Director. Additionally, the panel allows TEA staff to the opportunity to gather stakeholder input and the time to collaborate with LEA Special Education Directors currently in the field. The panel meets both in person and virtually.

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/APR, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as SPP/APR Indicators areas of slippage, Indicators 8 and 14 results and outreach, sampling plans, potential legal rule changes and legislative updates, state assessment participation, and Indicator 17: SSIP.

This group includes approximately 15 members representing key perspectives or roles to leverage diverse perspectives. The diverse nature of this group represents parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and/or campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, advocacy and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC engages in meetings quarterly 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. Most members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted, and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the 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. In 2023 topics for discussion included: TEA Updates, Legislative updates, Special Education Funding, 504 Data, Digital Curriculum Committee Reports, Teacher Vacancy Task Force updates and Updates on Recommendations and/or Proposed Bills.

Additionally, the CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.
The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year.

There are 11 special education directors specifically selected to provide feedback and support for the State. Many of the special education directors are also parents of students in the State's public school system. They meet quarterly. In 2023 the Special Education Directors provided input and support concerning the content of and outreach for the Parent Engagement survey (Indicator 8), the Differentiated Monitoring & Support (DMS) system, Legislative Updates, initiatives the state is working on such as the Special Education Diagnostic and an Administrator Toolkit, Legislative Implementation, the SSIP), a new website to house all Special Education Technical Support (Texas SPED Support), and student participation in the State's alternate assessment.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*
Data Source:
SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)
Date:
01/10/2024
Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	386,728	416,889	588,417
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	57,397	45,851	70,207
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	157,320	212,831	256,899
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	21,576	21,047	32,806
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4,950	2,388	2,654
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4,401	4,592	7,113

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	385,488	486,984	508,445
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	57,299	48,773	60,236
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	148,650	231,014	159,990
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	28,187	23,551	20,407
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	5,088	2,755	1,579
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	5,727	4,878	4,660

(1)The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	16.29%	46.26%	30.90	23.00	29.97	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	15.22%	56.10%	40.86	35.00	40.88	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	13.91%	49.23%	35.18	37.00	35.32	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	18.87%	45.87%	25.05	20.00	27.00	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	15.65%	52.27%	35.99	31.00	36.62	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	10.36%	35.48%	25.28	26.00	25.12	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

The slippage for Group A, Grade 4, math performance can be attributed to several factors:

Impact of COVID-19: The pandemic led to disruptions in regular school routines. Stakeholders provided input that the decline in performance may be attributed to potential disruptions in fundamental education for 4th graders during their 1st and 2nd grade years, which were caused by the impact of COVID.

Challenges with Remote Learning: Children with IEPs often benefit from hands-on, personalized teaching methods, which were challenging to implement effectively in remote learning settings. This might have impacted math performance.

Reduced Access to Support Services: Due to the pandemic, there was reduced access to essential support services like speech therapy, occupational therapy, and one-on-one assistance, which are critical for the academic success of students with IEPs.

Increased Stress and Mental Health Issues: The pandemic was a source of increased stress and anxiety for many students, which may have adversely affected academic performance, particularly for students with special needs who might find changes in routine and uncertainty more challenging to navigate.

Assessment Adjustments and Learning Gaps: The shift in teaching methods and potential learning gaps that arose during the pandemic could have impacted the way students with IEPs interacted with the assessment material, leading to a decrease in scores.

Resource Limitations: The pandemic may have led to a strain on resources, both at home and in educational institutions, affecting the quality and consistency of educational support provided to students with IEPs.

Although COVID-19 had an impact on assessment results, the reasons for test score slippage is likely multifaceted and might include other systemic and individual factors not directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For detailed guidance and additional information on SPPI 3d, please visit the TEA website at:
https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/state-performance-plan-indicators.

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs 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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), 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 rates of suspensions and expulsions for 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 section 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 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 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 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon LEAs 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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 QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%	24.00%
Data	1.89%	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%	Not Valid and Reliable

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Historically, Texas has solicited stakeholder engagement by using the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, and various 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 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, 20 ESCs, related service and support staff, and other state agencies. They participate in four meetings per year, where they review data and making recommendations to the TEA to improve special education policies, procedures, and practices from the state to the local levels.

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

The Special Education Directors panel is a select group of Special Education Directors who work with TEA throughout the year. They are nominated to participate on this panel by their regional Education Service Center (ESC) Special Education Directors. The purpose is to provide feedback and input on TEA initiatives and projects related to special education, including the SPP/APR. Presenting to this panel provides an opportunity to capture the current needs in the field from the perspective of an LEA Special Education Director. Additionally, the panel allows TEA staff to the opportunity to gather stakeholder input and the time to collaborate with LEA Special Education Directors currently in the field. The panel meets both in person and virtually.

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/APR, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as SPP/APR Indicators areas of slippage, Indicators 8 and 14 results and outreach, sampling plans, potential legal rule changes and legislative updates, state assessment participation, and Indicator 17: SSIP.

This group includes approximately 15 members representing key perspectives or roles to leverage diverse perspectives. The diverse nature of this group represents parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and/or campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, advocacy and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC engages in meetings quarterly 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. Most members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted, and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the 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. In 2023 topics for discussion included: TEA Updates, Legislative updates, Special Education Funding, 504 Data, Digital Curriculum Committee Reports, Teacher Vacancy Task Force updates and Updates on Recommendations and/or Proposed Bills.

Additionally, the CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.
The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year.

There are 11 special education directors specifically selected to provide feedback and support for the State. Many of the special education directors are also parents of students in the State's public school system. They meet quarterly. In 2023 the Special Education Directors provided input and support concerning the content of and outreach for the Parent Engagement survey (Indicator 8), the Differentiated Monitoring & Support (DMS) system, Legislative Updates, initiatives the state is working on such as the Special Education Diagnostic and an Administrator Toolkit, Legislative Implementation, the SSIP), a new website to house all Special Education Technical Support (Texas SPED Support), and student participation in the State's alternate assessment.

FFY 2022 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.

1,148

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
13	62	Not Valid and Reliable	23.00%	20.97%	Met target	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" refers to an LEA that meets the State's established minimum size requirement (MSR) and exceeds the established rate ratio threshold of greater than 3.0 (3 times the rate of non-disabled students) for out of school suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a single school year for children with IEPs would be identified as such. To meet the MSR and be included in this measurement, an LEA must have at least 30 total students served in special education during the school year measured on applicable attendance reported and have at least 10 students ages 3-21 served in special education with applicable action codes for out of school suspensions and expulsions that equal more than 10 cumulative school days. The rate ratio is calculated for each LEA meeting MSR as the rate of students ages 3-21 served in special education with out of school suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days divided by the rate of nondisabled students in the same LEA with out of school suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For detailed guidance and additional information on SPPI 4a, please visit the TEA website at https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/state-performance-plan-indicators.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 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.

LEAs were required to submit their local policies and operating procedures through the state's Legal Framework. Additionally, each LEA was required to complete a self-assessment that includes a review of policies and operating procedures to confirm alignment with state and federal rules and regulations. When significant discrepancy was identified, TEA required identified LEAs to review policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of individualized education programs (IEPs), to review its use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and to review its procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170, and sign an assurance statement.

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 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

To address the issue of invalid and unreliable data in FFY 2021, we have implemented a rigorous verification process. The discrepancy in the previous submission was due to an incorrect count of total LEAs. This year, the SPP/APR coordinator collaborated closely with the data analyst to ensure that the data extracted from the SAS program aligns accurately with the input requirements for the SPP/APR submission. This measure was taken specifically to generate correct data and reduce the likelihood of data entry errors and ensure valid and reliable data are submitted.

4A - OSEP Response

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR the State included a very low percentage of the State's LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. OSEP reminds the State that if the examination for significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs is not occurring in any meaningful way at the LEA level, OSEP may determine that a State's chosen methodology is not reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs.

4A - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State's LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State's chosen methodology.

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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), 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 the rates of suspensions and expulsions for 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 section 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 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 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 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 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, 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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 QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	28.57%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Not Valid and Reliable

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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.

1,170

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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
21	0	40	Not Valid and Reliable	0%	0.00%	Met target	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

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" refers to an LEA that meets the minimum size requirement (MSR) to be included in the measurement for this indicator. MSR means an LEA must have at least 30 total students in a particular racial/ethnic group served in special education during the school year measured on applicable attendance reported AND have at least 10 students ages 3-21 in the same racial/ethnic group served in special education. LEAs are identified with significant discrepancy if they meet MSR and exceeds the established rate ratio threshold greater than 3.0 (3 times the rate of non-disabled students) for out of school suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a single school year for children with IEPs in a particular racial/ethnic group. The rate ratio is calculated for each LEA as 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 divided by the rate of nondisabled students in all racial/ethnic groups in the same LEA with out of school suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For detailed guidance and additional information on SPPI 4b, please visit the TEA website at https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/state-performance-plan-indicators.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 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.

LEAs were required to submit their local policies and operating procedures through the state's Legal Framework. Additionally, each LEA was required to complete a self-assessment that includes a review of policies and operating procedures to confirm alignment with state and federal rules and regulations. When significant discrepancy was identified, TEA required identified LEAs to review policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of individualized education programs (IEPs), to review its use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and to review its procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170, and sign an assurance statement.

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 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

To address the issue of invalid and unreliable data in FFY 2021, we have implemented a rigorous verification process. The discrepancy in the previous submission was due to an incorrect count of total LEAs. This year, the SPP/APR coordinator collaborated closely with the data analyst to ensure that the data extracted from the SAS program aligns accurately with the input requirements for the SPP/APR submission. This measure was taken specifically to generate correct data and reduce the likelihood of data entry errors and ensure valid and reliable data are submitted.

4B - OSEP Response

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR the State included a very low percentage of the State's LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. OSEP reminds the State that if the examination for significant discrepancies, by race and ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs is not occurring in any meaningful way at the LEA level, OSEP may determine that a State's chosen methodology is not reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies, by race and ethnicity, are occurring in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs.

4B- Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies, by race and ethnicity, are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State's LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State's chosen methodology.

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 ED*Facts* 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2020	Target >=	68.00%	68.00%		71.84%	73.00%
A	71.84%	Data	68.75%	69.45%	71.04%	71.84%	72.57%
B	2020	Target <=	12.50%	12.00%		14.07%	14.00%
B	14.07%	Data	14.94%	14.88%	14.42%	14.07%	13.54%
C	2020	Target <=	1.30%	1.29%		0.80%	1.00%
C	0.80%	Data	1.11%	0.91%	0.84%	0.80%	0.95%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Historically, Texas has solicited stakeholder engagement by using the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, and various 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 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, 20 ESCs, related service and support staff, and other state agencies. They participate in four meetings per year, where they review data and making recommendations to the TEA to improve special education policies, procedures, and practices from the state to the local levels.

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

The Special Education Directors panel is a select group of Special Education Directors who work with TEA throughout the year. They are nominated to participate on this panel by their regional Education Service Center (ESC) Special Education Directors. The purpose is to provide feedback and input on TEA initiatives and projects related to special education, including the SPP/APR. Presenting to this panel provides an opportunity to capture the current needs in the field from the perspective of an LEA Special Education Director. Additionally, the panel allows TEA staff to the opportunity to gather

stakeholder input and the time to collaborate with LEA Special Education Directors currently in the field. The panel meets both in person and virtually.

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/APR, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as SPP/APR Indicators areas of slippage, Indicators 8 and 14 results and outreach, sampling plans, potential legal rule changes and legislative updates, state assessment participation, and Indicator 17: SSIP.

This group includes approximately 15 members representing key perspectives or roles to leverage diverse perspectives. The diverse nature of this group represents parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and/or campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, advocacy and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC engages in meetings quarterly 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. Most members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted, and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the 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. In 2023 topics for discussion included: TEA Updates, Legislative updates, Special Education Funding, 504 Data, Digital Curriculum Committee Reports, Teacher Vacancy Task Force updates and Updates on Recommendations and/or Proposed Bills.

Additionally, the CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.
The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year.

There are 11 special education directors specifically selected to provide feedback and support for the State. Many of the special education directors are also parents of students in the State's public school system. They meet quarterly. In 2023 the Special Education Directors provided input and support concerning the content of and outreach for the Parent Engagement survey (Indicator 8), the Differentiated Monitoring & Support (DMS) system, Legislative Updates, initiatives the state is working on such as the Special Education Diagnostic and an Administrator Toolkit, Legislative Implementation, the SSIP), a new website to house all Special Education Technical Support (Texas SPED Support), and student participation in the State's alternate assessment.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	667,298
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	490,761
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	90,021
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	2,228
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	69
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	2,624

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 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	490,761	667,298	72.57%	73.00%	73.54%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	90,021	667,298	13.54%	13.00%	13.49%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements *[c1+c2+c3]*	4,921	667,298	0.95%	1.00%	0.74%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For detailed guidance and additional information on SPPI 5, please visit the TEA website at
https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/state-performance-plan-indicators.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (*e.g.*, 75-85%).

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.
NO

Historical Data (Inclusive) – 6A, 6B, 6C

Part	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	Target >=	33.00%	33.00%		27.05%	27.00%
A	Data	31.79%	32.03%	26.75%	27.05%	26.17%
B	Target <=	15.50%	15.00%		25.70%	26.00%
B	Data	16.88%	17.59%	26.58%	25.70%	26.67%
C	Target <=				0.85%	0.85%
C	Data				0.85%	0.93%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Historically, Texas has solicited stakeholder engagement by using the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, and various 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 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, 20 ESCs, related service and support staff, and other state agencies. They participate in four meetings per year, where they review data and making recommendations to the TEA to improve special education policies, procedures, and practices from the state to the local levels.

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

The Special Education Directors panel is a select group of Special Education Directors who work with TEA throughout the year. They are nominated to

participate on this panel by their regional Education Service Center (ESC) Special Education Directors. The purpose is to provide feedback and input on TEA initiatives and projects related to special education, including the SPP/APR. Presenting to this panel provides an opportunity to capture the current needs in the field from the perspective of an LEA Special Education Director. Additionally, the panel allows TEA staff to the opportunity to gather stakeholder input and the time to collaborate with LEA Special Education Directors currently in the field. The panel meets both in person and virtually.

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/APR, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as SPP/APR Indicators areas of slippage, Indicators 8 and 14 results and outreach, sampling plans, potential legal rule changes and legislative updates, state assessment participation, and Indicator 17: SSIP.

This group includes approximately 15 members representing key perspectives or roles to leverage diverse perspectives. The diverse nature of this group represents parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and/or campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, advocacy and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC engages in meetings quarterly 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. Most members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted, and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the 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. In 2023 topics for discussion included: TEA Updates, Legislative updates, Special Education Funding, 504 Data, Digital Curriculum Committee Reports, Teacher Vacancy Task Force updates and Updates on Recommendations and/or Proposed Bills.

Additionally, the CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.
The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year.

There are 11 special education directors specifically selected to provide feedback and support for the State. Many of the special education directors are also parents of students in the State's public school system. They meet quarterly. In 2023 the Special Education Directors provided input and support concerning the content of and outreach for the Parent Engagement survey (Indicator 8), the Differentiated Monitoring & Support (DMS) system, Legislative Updates, initiatives the state is working on such as the Special Education Diagnostic and an Administrator Toolkit, Legislative Implementation, the SSIP), a new website to house all Special Education Technical Support (Texas SPED Support), and student participation in the State's alternate assessment.

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

Inclusive Targets – 6C

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

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

08/30/2023

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	11,953	19,657	4,150	35,760
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	2,114	5,878	1,359	9,351
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	4,915	4,258	683	9,856
b2. Number of children attending separate school	2	4	2	8
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	86	133	18	237

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 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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	9,351	35,760	26.17%	27.00%	26.15%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	9,864	35,760	26.67%	25.00%	27.58%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Home	237	35,760	0.93%	0.85%	0.66%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For detailed guidance and additional information on SPPI 6, please visit the TEA website at
https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/state-performance-plan-indicators.

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 3 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A1	2008	Target >=	84.00%	85.00%	86.00%	85.00%	85.00%
A1	73.40%	Data	84.81%	84.36%	85.03%	83.77%	84.20%
A2	2008	Target >=	63.00%	63.00%	63.00%	63.00%	63.00%
A2	62.20%	Data	61.04%	59.65%	60.07%	59.21%	58.32%
B1	2008	Target >=	84.00%	85.00%	86.00%	84.00%	84.00%
B1	67.00%	Data	84.41%	84.25%	84.41%	83.37%	83.78%
B2	2008	Target >=	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	56.00%	57.00%
B2	52.00%	Data	58.51%	56.95%	57.49%	56.21%	56.32%
C1	2008	Target >=	84.00%	85.00%	86.00%	84.00%	85.00%
C1	72.50%	Data	84.86%	84.71%	84.62%	84.02%	83.82%
C2	2008	Target >=	74.00%	74.00%	74.00%	71.00%	72.00%
C2	73.60%	Data	71.65%	71.29%	72.15%	71.10%	69.79%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Historically, Texas has solicited stakeholder engagement by using the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, and various 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 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, 20 ESCs, related service and support staff, and other state agencies. They participate in four meetings per year, where they review data and making recommendations to the TEA to improve special education policies, procedures, and practices from the state to the local levels.

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

The Special Education Directors panel is a select group of Special Education Directors who work with TEA throughout the year. They are nominated to participate on this panel by their regional Education Service Center (ESC) Special Education Directors. The purpose is to provide feedback and input on TEA initiatives and projects related to special education, including the SPP/APR. Presenting to this panel provides an opportunity to capture the current needs in the field from the perspective of an LEA Special Education Director. Additionally, the panel allows TEA staff to the opportunity to gather stakeholder input and the time to collaborate with LEA Special Education Directors currently in the field. The panel meets both in person and virtually.

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/APR, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as SPP/APR Indicators areas of slippage, Indicators 8 and 14 results and outreach, sampling plans, potential legal rule changes and legislative updates, state assessment participation, and Indicator 17: SSIP.

This group includes approximately 15 members representing key perspectives or roles to leverage diverse perspectives. The diverse nature of this group represents parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and/or campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, advocacy and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC engages in meetings quarterly 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. Most members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted, and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the 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. In 2023 topics for discussion included: TEA Updates, Legislative updates, Special Education Funding, 504 Data, Digital Curriculum Committee Reports, Teacher Vacancy Task Force updates and Updates on Recommendations and/or Proposed Bills.

Additionally, the CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.
The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year.

There are 11 special education directors specifically selected to provide feedback and support for the State. Many of the special education directors are also parents of students in the State's public school system. They meet quarterly. In 2023 the Special Education Directors provided input and support concerning the content of and outreach for the Parent Engagement survey (Indicator 8), the Differentiated Monitoring & Support (DMS) system, Legislative Updates, initiatives the state is working on such as the Special Education Diagnostic and an Administrator Toolkit, Legislative Implementation, the SSIP), a new website to house all Special Education Technical Support (Texas SPED Support), and student participation in the State's alternate assessment.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

27,018

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	178	0.66%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	3,622	13.41%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	7,890	29.20%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	9,533	35.28%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	5,795	21.45%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*	17,423	21,223	84.20%	86.00%	82.09%	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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*	15,328	27,018	58.32%	63.00%	56.73%	Did not meet target	Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	166	0.61%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	4,040	14.95%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	8,156	30.19%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	9,871	36.53%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	4,785	17.71%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*	18,027	22,233	83.78%	85.00%	81.08%	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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*	14,656	27,018	56.32%	57.00%	54.25%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	168	0.62%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	3,033	11.23%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	5,312	19.66%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	9,263	34.28%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	9,242	34.21%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*	14,575	17,776	83.82%	85.00%	81.99%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*	18,505	27,018	69.79%	72.00%	68.49%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	The slippage observed in SPPI 7 outcomes can be partially attributed to the initial incomplete data submissions by LEAs. This was due to incomplete data validation rules, which allowed for the submission of partial data to the SPP application. Such gaps in data collection likely affected the overall accuracy and completeness of the results, contributing to the slippage. In addition to the data improvement in this year's submission, stakeholders expressed that the slippage was likely due to post COVID availability of qualified staff to provide necessary support.
A2	The slippage observed in SPPI 7 outcomes can be partially attributed to the initial incomplete data submissions by LEAs. This was due to incomplete data validation rules, which allowed for the submission of partial data to the SPP application. Such gaps in data collection likely affected the overall accuracy and completeness of the results, contributing to the slippage for SPPI 7. In addition to the data improvement in this year's submission, stakeholders expressed that the slippage was likely due to post COVID availability of qualified staff to provide necessary support.
B1	The slippage observed in SPPI 7 outcomes can be partially attributed to the initial incomplete data submissions by LEAs. This was due to incomplete data validation rules, which allowed for the submission of partial data to the SPP application. Such gaps in data collection likely affected the overall accuracy and completeness of the results, contributing to the slippage for SPPI 7. In addition to the data improvement in this year's submission, stakeholders expressed that the slippage was likely due to post COVID availability of qualified staff to provide necessary support.
B2	The slippage observed in SPPI 7 outcomes can be partially attributed to the initial incomplete data submissions by LEAs. This was due to incomplete data validation rules, which allowed for the submission of partial data to the SPP application. Such gaps in data collection likely affected the overall accuracy and completeness of the results, contributing to the slippage for SPPI 7. In addition to the data improvement in this year's submission, stakeholders expressed that the slippage was likely due to post COVID availability of qualified staff to provide necessary support.
C1	The slippage observed in SPPI 7 outcomes can be partially attributed to the initial incomplete data submissions by LEAs. This was due to incomplete data validation rules, which allowed for the submission of partial data to the SPP application. Such gaps in data collection likely affected the overall accuracy and completeness of the results, contributing to the slippage for SPPI 7. In addition to the data improvement in this year's submission, stakeholders expressed that the slippage was likely due to post COVID availability of qualified staff to provide necessary support.
C2	The slippage observed in SPPI 7 outcomes can be partially attributed to the initial incomplete data submissions by LEAs. This was due to incomplete data validation rules, which allowed for the submission of partial data to the SPP application. Such gaps in data collection likely affected the overall accuracy and completeness of the results, contributing to the slippage for SPPI 7. In addition to the data improvement in this year's submission, stakeholders expressed that the slippage was likely due to post COVID availability of qualified staff to provide necessary support.

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 (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

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

TEA utilizes the following data collection instruments and procedures for SPPI 7.

Data Collection Instruments for SPPI 7:
Functionality of the COS Form:

Data Recording Template: The Early Childhood Outcome Center's Childhood Outcomes Summary (COS) Form serves as the primary template for LEA staff to record various assessment information about a student's functioning in each outcome area.
Standardization for Statewide Reporting: The COS form also standardizes individualized assessment data into a consistent format for statewide reporting purposes.

COS Process:
Team-Based Assessment: The COS process involves a team, including parents and professionals familiar with the child, collaboratively reviewing multiple information sources about the child's functioning.
Sources of Information: These sources include parent and provider observations, as well as results from any valid and appropriate direct assessments.
Combining Assessment Tools: This approach allows early intervention and early childhood special education programs to integrate data from various assessment tools, producing summarized data that can be compared and analyzed across different programs statewide.

Data Collection Procedures for SPPI 7:
Data Collection Database:
Texas Education Agency Login (TEAL) SPPI 7 Application: Data for SPPI 7 are collected from LEAs through the state database called the TEAL SPP 7 Application.

Data Standards Compliance: LEAs utilize the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) to summarize children's current functioning using a seven-point scale to compare the child's functioning with what is expected for the child's age. 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.

Data Collection Standards:
TEAL SPPI 7 Application: The Texas Education Agency utilizes the TEAL SPPI 7 Application for SPPI 7 data collection, measurement calculations, and analyses across the state.

Data Standard Guidelines: The SPPI 7 Application Instructions, guidance documents, and submission schedule are located on TEA's SPPI 7: Preschool Outcomes webpage at:
https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/preschool-outcomes

Data Submission Timeline for FFY 2022
Eligibility Determination Date Range: Includes 3-, 4- and 5-year-old children with IEPs at two points in time (i.e., Entry and Exit) with at least six months in between within the timeframe of July 1, 2022, to June 30, 2023.

Process: LEAs complete an Entry COS within 30 school days after a child is found eligible and placed in Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE), a child transfers into the LEA's ECSE program from another LEA's ECSE program, or a child with an Auditory and/or Visual Impairment receiving special education services prior to age 3 enrolls in ECSE. LEAs complete an Exit COS no earlier than 30 school days prior to a child turning 6-years-old or the child is dismissed from ECSE.

Data Entry Procedure:
Data Entry Window: LEAs enter Entry and Exit COS data into the TEAL SPPI 7 application during the submission window (April 3, 2023-August 11, 2023).

Late Submission Protocol:
Deadline Compliance: LEAs that fail to meet the timely data submission requirement are provided an opportunity to submit data in the TEAL SPPI 7 Application during an extension period (September 18, 2023 - September 22, 2023).

Data Submission Support for LEAs:
Initial Support: LEAs contact their regional ESC for assistance with data submissions.

Additional Support: LEAs email data submission and policy questions to TEA at spp@tea.texas.gov.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For detailed guidance and additional information on SPPI 7, please visit the TEA website at
https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/state-performance-plan-indicators.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Data validation rules were implemented to require data entry for all fields before the LEA could submit their SPPI 7 data. To identify, develop, and implement the data validation rules, TEA completed a root cause analysis and identified that the current data validation rules were incomplete, allowing LEAs to submit partial data to the SPP application. The TEA Multi Apps Team, Senior Developer, led by the Software Development Manager, then debugged the SPPI 7 application. Debugging involved identifying, analyzing, and rectifying bugs (errors or flaws) in the software application to ensure it functions correctly and efficiently. In the context of the SPPI 7 data collection application, debugging specifically targeted issues affecting the program's ability to adhere to the data validation rules for collecting all required data from LEAs. Finally, SPPI 7 guidance documents were updated to reflect this improvement, and trainings to regional education services centers (ESC) were conducted to support LEAs.

7 - OSEP Response

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 3 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 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 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 must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

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

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

8 - Indicator Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Historically, Texas has solicited stakeholder engagement by using the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, and various 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 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, 20 ESCs, related service and support staff, and other state agencies. They participate in four meetings per year, where they review data and making recommendations to the TEA to improve special education policies, procedures, and practices from the state to the local levels.

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

The Special Education Directors panel is a select group of Special Education Directors who work with TEA throughout the year. They are nominated to participate on this panel by their regional Education Service Center (ESC) Special Education Directors. The purpose is to provide feedback and input on TEA initiatives and projects related to special education, including the SPP/APR. Presenting to this panel provides an opportunity to capture the current needs in the field from the perspective of an LEA Special Education Director. Additionally, the panel allows TEA staff to the opportunity to gather stakeholder input and the time to collaborate with LEA Special Education Directors currently in the field. The panel meets both in person and virtually.

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/APR, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as SPP/APR Indicators areas of slippage, Indicators 8 and 14 results and outreach, sampling plans, potential legal rule changes and legislative updates, state assessment participation, and Indicator 17: SSIP.

This group includes approximately 15 members representing key perspectives or roles to leverage diverse perspectives. The diverse nature of this group

represents parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and/or campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, advocacy and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC engages in meetings quarterly 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. Most members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted, and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the 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. In 2023 topics for discussion included: TEA Updates, Legislative updates, Special Education Funding, 504 Data, Digital Curriculum Committee Reports, Teacher Vacancy Task Force updates and Updates on Recommendations and/or Proposed Bills.

Additionally, the CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.
The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year.

There are 11 special education directors specifically selected to provide feedback and support for the State. Many of the special education directors are also parents of students in the State's public school system. They meet quarterly. In 2023 the Special Education Directors provided input and support concerning the content of and outreach for the Parent Engagement survey (Indicator 8), the Differentiated Monitoring & Support (DMS) system, Legislative Updates, initiatives the state is working on such as the Special Education Diagnostic and an Administrator Toolkit, Legislative Implementation, the SSIP), a new website to house all Special Education Technical Support (Texas SPED Support), and student participation in the State's alternate assessment.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	73.04%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	80.00%	81.00%	81.00%	73.04%	81.00%
Data	76.40%	76.70%	80.80%	73.04%	69.41%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
14,130	20,487	69.41%	81.00%	68.97%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

TEA included both school age and preschool age children in the statewide survey results. The children sampled for this survey were randomly selected from a sampling frame extracted from the state Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) database. This sampling frame included the grade level of all children, allowing a representative sampling to be randomly drawn using a multi-stage stratification sampling method. Additional information can be found on the Texas Parent Involvement Survey webpage: https://www.spedtex.org/parent-involvement-survey.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

102,142

Percentage of respondent parents

20.06%

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	20.64%	20.06%

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

The representativeness of survey results was assessed using a +/- 5% discrepancy metric. This metric indicates that the survey results obtained from the stratified random sample of students receiving special education are considered representative of the target population in terms of race/ethnicity, gender, and disability category. The discrepancy metric provides a pragmatic balance between accuracy and feasibility, aligns with widely accepted statistical standards, and is generally sufficient for informed decision-making and policy development. This threshold is strict enough to ensure meaningful representation of different groups, yet flexible enough to account for the practical challenges of surveying diverse populations.

Include the State's analyses of 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.

The State examined the responding participants representativeness related to race/ethnicity and disability category for the target population of special education students statewide. The responding participants were representative of the target population because their differences were within the State-established discrepancy metric of +/- 5%. For example, the responding participants were over-representative of White students by +3.5 percentage points and under-representative of Hispanic students by -2.3 percentage points, while the responding participants were over-representative of students with Autism by +3.9 percentage points and under-representative of students with Learning Disabilities by -3.6 percentage points. The responding participants of all other race/ethnicity and disability categories were within 2 percentage points of the target population.

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

YES

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

To enhance the response rate year over year for underrepresented groups, the following strategies will be implemented:

Continued Collaboration with District Liaisons: Maintaining a close working relationship with district liaisons throughout the survey process to ensure effective engagement and smooth administration.

Instructional Webinars: Providing pre-launch instructional webinars, conducted by SPEDTex (https://www.spedtex.org/), available in both English and Spanish. These webinars will be recorded for broader accessibility.

Extensive Follow-Up Activities: Regularly engaging with liaisons in participating districts to encourage active use of the response rate dashboard for informed outreach.

Direct District Communication: Establishing consistent contact with all participating districts via phone and email, offering support, updating them on real-time response rates, and assisting with any survey-related inquiries. This includes directly sending survey invitations when necessary.

Support from ESC Special Education Directors: Encouraging ESC Special Education Directors to assist districts within their regions in improving survey participation.

Direct Family Outreach: For districts requiring additional support in survey fielding, direct phone calls to families will be made to encourage participation.

These strategies are designed to improve engagement and response rates with a focus on reaching underrepresented groups effectively.

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 following addresses the instructional requirements for this section in three parts:

Analysis of Response Rate: The response rate for the survey was calculated at various levels: statewide, by regional ESC, and by LEAs. This comprehensive approach ensured a detailed understanding of participation across different administrative and geographical segments. This granular analysis was crucial in identifying areas with lower participation, guiding targeted follow-up efforts.

Assessment of Nonresponse Bias: To assess nonresponse bias, the survey team compared the demographic characteristics (race/ethnicity, gender, and primary disability/exceptionality) of the survey respondents with those of the entire target population of students receiving special education services. The findings were encouraging: the difference in the representation of each demographic category between the survey respondents and the statewide student population was less than four percentage points. This small variance indicated that the survey data were broadly representative of the target population in terms of the demographic variables. As such, nonresponse bias was not a significant concern.

Measures to Reduce Bias and Promote Broad Participation: Despite the absence of significant nonresponse bias, the State and its contracted vendor undertook extensive measures to encourage a wide-ranging response. The measures taken to reduce bias and promote broad participation with the inclusion of diverse parental perspectives were focused on for the following key initiatives:

Support for Districts: The State provided extensive support to districts for disseminating survey materials effectively.

Accessible Survey Options: The survey was made available in multiple languages (English, Spanish, Vietnamese, French, and Chinese) and formats (online, phone assistance in English and Spanish).

Active Monitoring and Outreach: The vendor actively monitored response patterns, identifying, and addressing anomalies suggestive of barriers to participation. This included targeted outreach and marketing strategies to engage underrepresented groups.

Focused Attention on Low-Response Areas: Special attention was given to 23 districts with a 0% response rate, all of which had fewer than 100 students selected. Direct communication occurred with these LEAs along with collaboration with their associated ESCs.

In conclusion, while the analysis did not reveal significant nonresponse bias over the state's threshold of five percentage points, the proactive and multi-faceted approach adopted by the State and its vendor played a crucial role in ensuring the inclusiveness and representativeness of the survey's findings. This approach demonstrates a commitment to capturing the experiences and needs of all segments within the target population.

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

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

LEAs included in this year's SPPI 8 parental involvement survey were those that were scheduled for continuous monitoring and support in 2024-2025 (one year after results from this survey become available) and those that were reviewed in 2022-2023. LEAs serving over 50,000 students were added if not already included in the list of LEAs, for a total of 411 participating LEAs. From the selected LEAs, a stratified random sample of students receiving special education services was selected with the aim of sending their parents an invitation to complete the parental involvement survey. There were three main objectives when generating the student sample, including ensuring the sample was representative of the statewide target population, each student had an equal chance of being selected for the sample, and to collect five or more surveys from each LEA to maximize the likelihood that each LEA would receive parental involvement results. These objectives can compete because increasing the sample in many small LEAs can shift the demographics of the statewide sample to be not representative of statewide population parameters. To mitigate the risk of obtaining a nonrepresentative sample, a higher proportion of students were included from larger LEAs). Using this sampling strategy, 102,142 students were randomly selected from 3,377 campuses for the 2022-23 school year. Of the randomly selected students, 45.8% were enrolled in 20 of the state's largest LEAs (and from 1,294 campuses) while 54.2% were enrolled in 391 of the state's smaller LEAs (from 2,083 campuses).

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For detailed guidance and additional information on SPPI 8, please visit the TEA website at https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/state-performance-plan-indicators.

For additional information about the methodology and results for SPPI 8, please view the Texas Parent Involvement Survey Report at https://www.spedtex.org/sites/spedtex.tea.texas.gov/files/2024-01/Indicator%208%20Report%20-%20Accessible%20%2812-18-2023%29.pdf

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

TEA updated the SPPI 8 sampling plan and provided this revised plan for approval to OSEP.
On January 23, 2024 Texas received notification via email that "The revised Texas sampling plan is approvable and no further response/action is required at this time."

8 - OSEP Response

8 - Required Actions

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. 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 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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.

75

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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
21	0	1,139	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

The State's definition of "disproportionate representation" refers to a LEA exceeding the State-established risk ratio threshold of 2.5 in a single year as having disproportionate representation for children ages 5 and in kindergarten through 21 of racial/ethnic groups (American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, Two or more races). The State employed a risk ratio methodology requiring LEAs meet the minimum size requirement (MSR) for both the numerator and the denominator. LEAs must meet the minimum n-size (denominator) of at least 30 students and a minimum cell size (numerator) of at least 10 students. For LEAs meeting MSR, Rate #1 was calculated by dividing the number of children in special education from a race/ethnicity group (numerator) by the number of children in from a race/ethnicity group (denominator). Rate #2 was calculated by dividing the number of all other children in special education, except those children in the special education race/ethnicity group from the numerator of Rate #1 (numerator) by the number of all other children except those children in the race/ethnicity group from the denominator of Rate #2 (denominator). To increase precision, the quotient from both the first rate and the second rate were kept in their exact decimal form without rounding. The risk ratio was then calculated by dividing Rate #1 (numerator) by Rate #2 (denominator). The final risk ratio was then rounded to one decimal place. LEAs that exceed the risk ratio threshold of 2.5 were then categorized as having disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups for SPP indicator 9.

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.

The State's annual determination of whether the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education was due to inappropriate identification involved a structured process. First, LEAs meeting the minimum size requirement (MSR) and exceeding the State-established risk ratio threshold of 2.5 in a single year were identified as having disproportionate representation. TEA then sent the list of LEAs identified as having disproportionate representation to the state lead for the Legal Framework for the Child-Centered Special Education Process at ESC region 18 who TEA contracts with to maintain the Legal Framework website (https://fw.escapps.net/). The LEAs identified with disproportionate representation were contacted by the ESC and were required to upload their policies and operating procedures to the Legal Framework and review their policies, procedures, and practices to ensure compliance with federal and state rules and regulations concerning the identification of students with disabilities. LEAs then completed an assurance statement by logging into the Administration section of Legal Framework. This assurance statement served as a formal commitment by the LEA to adhere to appropriate identification practices. TEA utilized this process and ran reports to verify LEAs had fulfilled the requirement of uploading and reviewing policies and completing the attestation statement.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For detailed guidance and additional information on SPPI 9, please visit the TEA website at https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/state-performance-plan-indicators.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the section 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), (e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures). 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 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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.

327

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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
108	0	887	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

The State's definition of "disproportionate representation" refers to a LEA exceeding the State-established risk ratio threshold of 2.5 in a single year as having disproportionate representation for children ages 5 and in kindergarten through 21 of racial/ethnic groups (American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, Two or more races) in specific disability categories (autism, intellectual disability, specific learning disability, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairment, other health impairment). The State employed a risk ratio methodology requiring LEAs meet the minimum size requirement (MSR) for both the numerator and the denominator. LEAs must meet the minimum n-size (denominator) of at least 30 students and a minimum cell size (numerator) of at least 10 students. For LEAs meeting MSR, Rate #1 was calculated by dividing the number of children in special education from a race/ethnicity group and disability category (numerator) by the number of children in special education from a race/ethnicity group (denominator). Rate #2 was calculated by dividing the number of children in special education from a disability category (numerator) by the number of all other special education children (denominator). To increase precision, the quotient from the first rate and second rate were kept in their exact decimal form without rounding. The risk ratio was then calculated by dividing Rate #1 (numerator) by Rate #2 (denominator). The final risk ratio was then rounded to one decimal place. LEAs that exceed the risk ratio threshold of 2.5 were then categorized as having disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories.

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.

The State's annual determination of whether the disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories in special education was due to inappropriate identification involved a structured process. First, LEAs that met the minimum size requirement (MSR) and exceeded the State-established risk ratio threshold of 2.5 in a single year were identified as having disproportionate representation. TEA then sent the list of LEAs identified as having disproportionate representation to the state lead for the Legal Framework for the Child-Centered Special Education Process at ESC region 18 who TEA contracts with to maintain the Legal Framework website (https://fw.escapps.net/). LEAs identified with disproportionate representation were contacted by the ESC and were required to upload their policies and operating procedures to the Legal Framework. The LEA was then required to review their policies, procedures, and practices to ensure compliance with federal and state rules and regulations concerning the identification of students with disabilities. LEAs then completed an assurance statement by logging into the Administration section of Legal Framework. This assurance statement served as a formal commitment by the LEA to adhere to appropriate identification practices.

TEA utilized this process and ran reports to verify LEAs had fulfilled the requirement of uploading and reviewing policies and completing the attestation statement.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For detailed guidance and additional information on SPPI 10, please visit the TEA website at
https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/state-performance-plan-indicators.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.77%	99.05%	98.63%	93.55%	95.86%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
173,171	166,728	95.86%	100%	96.28%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

6,443

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.

Out of the 173,171 completed initial evaluations, 6,443 (3.7%) did not meet the state-established timeline. Of these, 4,126 evaluations (64%) were completed within a range of 1 to 30 days past the deadline, and 2,317 evaluations (36%) exceeded the timeline by 31 or more days. The most frequently cited reason by LEAs for these delays was a "Lack of Available Personnel." Other delay reasons included parent delays, scheduling delays, issues with contracted personnel, and delay agreements.

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-established timeline for initial evaluations for a child considered potentially eligible for special education services under Part B is described below (for the full legal text, see 19 TAC 89.1011):

Parental Consent: The timeline for the initial evaluation begins when the LEA receives signed, written consent from the child's parent.

Initial Evaluation Timeline: Texas Administrative Code Title 19, Chapter 89, Subchapter AA, §89.1011 mandates a full individual initial evaluation must be completed no later than the 45th school day after written consent is received, with an extension for student absences or other conditions specified in 19 TAC 89.1011.

Eligibility Determination Timeline: The Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) committee must make eligibility, IEP, and placement decisions within 30 calendar days after the initial evaluation report is completed.

Exceptions to Timelines:
End-of-Year Exception: If consent is given late in the school year, the evaluation report is due by June 30th, and the ARD committee meeting to consider the evaluation must happen within the first 15 school days of the next school year.
Inter-District Transfer Exception: If a student moves districts during an evaluation, the new district must coordinate with the previous one to complete the evaluation as expeditiously as possible.

Definition of School Day: For the purposes of evaluation timelines, a "school day" does not include days after the last instructional day of spring and before the first day of the subsequent fall term. Attendance is defined in relation to the school's official attendance-taking time.

The state-established timeline for the SPPI 11 initial evaluation process is comprehensively depicted in the Texas Student Data System (TSDS) Child Find collection flowchart:
https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/child-find-sppi-11-flowchart.pdf.

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.

To fulfill the reporting requirements for SPPI 11, the following method and procedures are used for data collection:

Data Collection Database:
Texas Student Data System (TSDS): Data for SPPI 11 are collected from LEAs through the state database called the Operational Data Store (ODS). The TSDS Child Find collection is used for collecting student-level data for both SPPI 11 and SPPI 12.

Data Standards Compliance:
All LEAs must comply with data standards as per 19 TAC §61.1025(b)(3) to ensure the integrity of data submitted to TEA.

Data Collection Standards:
TSDS Child Find Collection: Implemented in the 2021-2022 school year, this data collection is in its third year, standardizing the collection of student level data, compliance calculations, and analyses across the state.

Data Standard Guidelines:
The data standards, timelines, and validation rules are specified and accessible on the TSDS Web-Enabled Data Standards (TWEDS) website.

Data Submission Timeline for FFY 2022:
Eligibility Determination Date Range: Includes children who underwent an initial evaluation and for whom an eligibility determination was completed within the timeframe of July 1, 2022, to June 30, 2023.

Process: LEAs maintain Child Find data in third party software applications such as their student information system (SIS). XML data files are generated through this third-party software application and load loaded to the state database via the eScholar Data Manager (eDM).

Data Upload Procedure:
Initial Loading: Data loading to the Operational Data Store (ODS) began on August 1, 2022, through eScholar Data Manager (eDM).
Promotion and Validation: Promotion of data to the TSDS Child Find data collection started on September 12, 2022, with a requirement to correct all fatal validation errors.

Final Data Submission Requirements:
Deadline: All LEAs must resolve validation errors and complete their TSDS Child Find submission by July 27, 2023, at 11:59 PM.
Verification: Completing the submission signifies the LEA's affirmation of the accuracy of the data reported through the requirement that all fatal data validation errors have been corrected.

Late Submission Protocol:

Deadline Compliance: LEAs that submit data by the deadline but require corrections, or those that miss the deadline, must file a submission extension request.
Accountability Measures: LEAs that fail to meet the timely data submission requirement are noted in the annual federal LEA special education determination reports.

Data Submission Support for LEAs:
Initial Support: LEAs contact their regional ESC Child Find Champion for assistance with data submissions.
Training and Certification: ESC Child Find Champions are trained and certified by TSDS trainers to support LEAs.

Escalation Process: Issues not resolved by Champions are escalated to TEA via the TSDS Incident Management System (TIMS) for further expert support.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For detailed guidance and additional information on SPPI 11, please visit the TEA website at https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/state-performance-plan-indicators.

For comprehensive details on the TSDS Web-Enabled Data Standards (TWEDS) related to the TSDS Child Find collection, including SPPI 11, please visit the TWEDS website at
https://tealprod.tea.state.tx.us/TWEDS/98/490/0/0/DataComponents.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
116	112	0	4

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

TEA's Department of General Supervision and monitoring, in the Office of Special Populations and Student Services, notified LEAs of noncompliance with FFY 2021 SPPI 11 with due dates for corrective action plans (CAPs) one year after the date of the noncompliance findings. TEA required LEAs to submit a CAP if noncompliance was found. Monitoring staff in the Division of Review and Support reviewed the CAP, updated data, and documentation to determine if the LEA was implementing the appropriate regulatory requirements and had corrected any noncompliance findings.

TEA took the following actions for each LEA:
• LEAs policies and procedures were reviewed.
• The correspondence where noncompliance was identified was reviewed.
• The Special Education Correspondence and Dispute Resolution Management System (CDRMS) 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 technical assistance and support 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
• Collected and organized all documentation as evidence.

After receiving the requested documentation for the noncompliance finding, all documentation was reviewed, and a determination was made whether compliance had been met. This determination ensured that each LEA was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of additional records subsequently collected through monitoring (systemic compliance) and has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. Lastly, the State verified that no outstanding corrective action existed regarding complaints or due process hearing decisions for children at the LEA.
The State verified that each LEA with corrected noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance with the relevant IDEA requirements).

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

LEAs were required to submit student-level data specific to each finding of noncompliance. Monitoring staff in the Division of Review and Support reviewed the updated data and documentation to determine if each case individual case of noncompliance was corrected and to verify whether systemic corrections were made to ensure the LEA was implementing the appropriate regulatory requirements for SPPI 11.

TEA took the following actions for each LEA:
• 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, and reviewed documentation to ensure correction at the student level
• Cross-referenced with the Special Education Correspondence and Dispute Resolution Management System application for any substantiated findings that should be considered when reviewing student level 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 with the LEA to discuss progress toward meeting noncompliance goals and offer technical assistance or support, where appropriate.
• 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, provided the LEA with the "LEA Steps Required to Correct Noncompliance, Noncompliance Verification Rubric," and provided an opportunity for questions and support
• Collected and organized all documentation as evidence

After receiving all the requested documentation for the citation(s), all documentation was reviewed, and a determination was made whether compliance had been met. The State verified that each LEA with corrected noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator has completed the required action with 100% compliance unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA consistent with QA 23-01.

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

TEA notified two LEAs regarding their status of continued noncompliance for SPPI 11 from FFY 2021. Directives were given to LEAs to update corrective action plans (CAPs) and participate in additional monitoring requirements. These LEAs continue to participate in escalated monitoring activities which include:
• increased direct support from technical assistance providers, specifically addressing internal challenges the LEA is facing due to ongoing evaluation staff shortages
• increased engagement with TEA designated regional support specialist establishing timelines and next steps
• tailored support meetings to discuss specific technical assistance to address both internal and external challenges regarding the LEA's compliance through state and national resource use and strategy implementation

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2020	1	0	1
FFY 2019	1	1	0

FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The Interventions and Sanctions Coordinator met with LEA at minimum of once per month. During those meetings, the following takes place:
• Review of the LEA's progress toward completion
• Discuss obstacles for the LEA completing the Correction for Continued Noncompliance (CNC) phases
• Discuss focused technical assistance for the LEA
• Discuss what the LEA will work on for the following meeting
• Discuss phases of CNC needing to be completed
The CNC phases include the following:
• Phase I Provide Evidence of Policies and Procedures: The LEA must address all identified areas of noncompliance and ensure that its policies and procedures align with IDEA and state rules and regulations.
• Phase II Provide Evidence of Self-Monitoring System: The LEA must develop a process that allows for self-monitoring in the identified areas of noncompliance.
• Phase III Provide Evidence of Professional Development: The LEA must provide evidence of training for appropriate staff in the areas where noncompliance was identified.
• Phase IV Provide Evidence of Student-Specific Corrections: The LEA must provide evidence that noncompliance has been corrected for each student currently enrolled at the LEA.
• Phase V: Provide Evidence of Systemic Compliance: Once all documentation is submitted and the LEA provides all required evidence of compliance, TEA will notify the LEA that it has been cleared of its CNC status.

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 Interventions and Sanctions Coordinator met with LEA at minimum of once per month. During those meetings, the following took place:
• Review of the LEA's progress toward completion
• Discussed obstacles to the LEA completing the Correction for Continued Noncompliance (CNC) phases
• Discussed focused technical assistance for the LEA
• Discussed what the LEA was to work on for the next meeting
• Discussed the completed phases of CNC

The CNC phases included the following:
• Phase I: Provided Evidence of Policies and Procedures: The LEA addressed all identified areas of noncompliance and ensured that its policies and procedures aligned with IDEA and state rules and regulations.
• Phase II: Provided evidence of Self-Monitoring System: The LEA developed a process for self-monitoring the identified areas of noncompliance.
• Phase III: Provided Evidence of Professional Development: The LEA provided proof of training in needed areas for appropriate staff.
• Phase IV: Provided Evidence of Student-Specific Corrections: The LEA showed needed corrections for each student that was currently enrolled at the LEA.
• Phase V: Provided Evidence of Systemic Compliance: Once all documentation was submitted and the LEA provided all required evidence of compliance, TEA notified the LEA that it was cleared of its continued noncompliance status.

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

The State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected as part of the Correction for Continued Noncompliance (CNC) phase IV. Phase IV required LEAs to submit evidence of student-specific corrections for all students who were still enrolled at the LEA.

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

LEAs with noncompliance for FFY 2021 have been verified as corrected as described in "FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected" section for SPPI 11. The description regarding how the State verified LEAs are appropriately implementing specific regulatory requirements and addressing each individual case of noncompliance has been included in the appropriate sections above for SPPI 11. LEAs with identified noncompliance in FFY 2020 are not verified as corrected are currently engaging in the corrective action activities.

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the remaining four uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and the one remaining uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2021and in FFY 2020: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.92%	99.47%	97.26%	92.27%	97.66%

Targets

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

Measurement	Number
a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	7,122
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	689
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	5,193
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.	102
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	1,034
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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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.	5,193	5,297	97.66%	100%	98.04%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

104

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 7,122 children in the TSDS Child Find collection for SPPI 12 who were served in Part C and referred to an LEA as being potentially eligible for Part B services when they turned 3 years old with a completed initial evaluation and eligibility determination. Children who received early childhood intervention (ECI) services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays were subtracted out of SPPI 12 because of Measurement Item "c" and had their compliance calculated under SPPI 11. A total of 104 children were identified with noncompliance for SPPI 12 because they were found eligible for Part B, early childhood special education services (ECSE), but had their IEP developed and implemented after their third birthdays. Of the 104 children, 53 children had their IEP developed and implemented between 1 to 30 days beyond their third birthdays, whereas a total of 51 children had their IEP developed and implemented 31+ days beyond their third birthdays. The most frequently cited reason by LEAs for these delays was a "Parent Delay." Other delay reasons included scheduling delays, lack of available personnel, issues with contracted personnel, and delay agreements.

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.

To fulfill the reporting requirements for SPPI 12, the following method and procedures are used for data collection:

Data Collection Database:
Texas Student Data System (TSDS): Data for SPPI 12 are collected from LEAs through the state database called the Operational Data Store (ODS). The TSDS Child Find collection is used for collecting student-level data for both SPPI 11 and SPPI 12.

Data Standards Compliance:
All LEAs must comply with data standards as per 19 TAC §61.1025(b)(3) to ensure the integrity of data submitted to TEA.

Data Collection Standards:
TSDS Child Find Collection: Implemented in the 2021-2022 school year, this data collection is in its third year, standardizing the collection of student level data, compliance calculations, and analyses across the state.
Data Standard Guidelines: The data standards, timelines, and validation rules are specified and accessible on the TSDS Web-Enabled Data Standards (TWEDS) website.

Data Submission Timeline for FFY 2022:
Eligibility Determination Date Range: Includes children who received early childhood intervention (ECI) services who were referred to an LEA to undergo an initial evaluation and for whom an eligibility determination was completed within the timeframe of July 1, 2022, to June 30, 2023.

Process: LEAs maintain Child Find data in third party software applications such as their student information system (SIS). XML data files are generated through this third-party software application and load loaded to the state database via the eScholar Data Manager (eDM).

Data Upload Procedure:
Initial Loading: Data loading to the Operational Data Store (ODS) began on August 1, 2022, through eScholar Data Manager (eDM).
Promotion and Validation: Promotion of data to the TSDS Child Find data collection started on September 12, 2022, with a requirement to correct all

fatal validation errors.

Final Data Submission Requirements:
Deadline: All LEAs must resolve validation errors and complete their TSDS Child Find submission by July 27, 2023, at 11:59 PM.
Verification: Completing the submission signifies the LEA's affirmation of the accuracy of the data reported through the requirement that all fatal data validation errors have been corrected.

Late Submission Protocol:
Deadline Compliance: LEAs that submit data by the deadline but require corrections, or those that miss the deadline, must file a submission extension request.
Accountability Measures: LEAs that fail to meet the timely data submission requirement are noted in the annual federal LEA special education determination reports.

Data Submission Support for LEAs:
Initial Support: LEAs contact their regional ESC Child Find Champion for assistance with data submissions.
Training and Certification: ESC Child Find Champions are trained and certified by TSDS trainers to support LEAs.

Escalation Process:
Issues not resolved by Champions are escalated to TEA via the TSDS Incident Management System (TIMS) for further expert support.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

TEA updated its Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) regarding Early Childhood Intervention (ECI). Previously, ECI providers were not obligated to inform LEAs of the start date of ECI services when referring children potentially eligible for Part B services once they turned 3 years old. However, the revised MOU now mandates ECI providers to supply LEAs with the start date for ECI services. This revision to the interagency coordination facilitates LEAs' data submission to the TSDS Child Find collection
(see revised TEA/HHSC ECI MOU https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/tea-hhsc-eci-mou-2023.pdf).

For data elements, business rules, and timelines related to the TSDS Child Find collection, view the TSDS Web-Enabled Data Standards (TWEDS) https://tealprod.tea.state.tx.us/TWEDS/98/490/0/0/DataComponents.

For policy and measurement guidance related to SPPI 12, see
https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/state-performance-plan-indicators.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

TEA's Department of General Supervision and monitoring, in the Office of Special Populations and Student Services, notified LEAs of noncompliance with FFY 2021 SPPI 12 with due dates for corrective action plans (CAPs) one year after the date of the noncompliance findings. TEA required LEAs to submit a CAP if noncompliance was found. Monitoring staff in the Division of Review and Support reviewed the CAP, updated data, and documentation to determine if the LEA was implementing the appropriate regulatory requirements and had corrected any noncompliance findings.
TEA took the following actions for each LEA:
• LEAs policies and procedures were reviewed.
• The correspondence where noncompliance was identified was reviewed.
• The Special Education Correspondence and Dispute Resolution Management System (CDRMS) 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 technical assistance and support 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
• Collected and organized all documentation as evidence.

After receiving the requested documentation for the noncompliance finding, all documentation was reviewed, and a determination was made whether compliance had been met. This determination ensured that each LEA was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of additional records subsequently collected through monitoring (systemic compliance) and has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. Lastly, the State verified that no outstanding corrective action existed regarding complaints or due process hearing decisions for children at the LEA.

The State verified that each LEA with corrected noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance with the relevant IDEA requirements).

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

LEAs were required to submit student-level data specific to each finding of noncompliance. Monitoring staff in the Division of Review and Support reviewed the updated data and documentation to determine if each case individual case of noncompliance was corrected and to verify whether systemic corrections were made to ensure the LEA was implementing the appropriate regulatory requirements for SPPI 12.

TEA took the following actions for each LEA:
• 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, and reviewed documentation to ensure correction at the student level
• Cross-referenced with the Special Education Correspondence and Dispute Resolution Management System application for any substantiated findings that should be considered when reviewing student level 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 with the LEA to discuss progress toward meeting noncompliance goals and offer technical assistance or support, where appropriate.
• 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, provided the LEA with the "LEA Steps Required to Correct Noncompliance, Noncompliance Verification Rubric," and provided an opportunity for questions and support
• Collected and organized all documentation as evidence

After receiving all the requested documentation for the citation(s), all documentation was reviewed, and a determination was made whether compliance had been met. The State verified that each LEA with corrected noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator has completed the required action with 100% compliance unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA consistent with QA 23-01.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

All LEAs with noncompliance for FFY 2021 have been verified as corrected as described in "FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected" section for SPPI 12. The description regarding how the state verified LEAs are appropriately implementing specific regulatory requirements and addressing each individual case of noncompliance has been included in the appropriate sections above for SPPI 12.

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 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 QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.52%	99.29%	99.73%	99.83%	99.45%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
26,431	26,809	99.45%	100%	98.59%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

State monitoring

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

TEA utilizes a secure, online application for the collection of data related to SPPI 13. LEAs select students for data collection who have disabilities and are at least age 16 up through age 21 (age 22 if appropriate) between July 1, 2022, and June 30, 2023.

In previous years TEA reported that the source of the data provided for this indicator was sourced from a "State database that includes data for the entire reporting year." However, the State has determined, in consultation with the IDC State Liaison, that while the process remains the same as previous years by using a database to identify students, the source of the folder review data for this Indicator is from State monitoring.

During FFY 2022, all LEAs serving students with disabilities receiving special education services ages 16-21 submitted student level data on compliance aspects of the secondary transition process. LEAs that did not serve students with disabilities ages 16-21 were required to submit a zero count. LEAs with less than 30 students with disabilities ages 16-21 were required to submit data on all students. LEAs with more than 30 students with disabilities were required to submit data on a selection of students. A description of the selection process can be found on the TEA SPP Indicator 13 webpage: https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/secondary-transition.

Data collection and use of an online SPP 13 application is an integral part of the statewide training process for this indicator. The training includes data collection tools including a Data Collection Checklist for measuring SPP Indicator 13 and the Data Collection Checklist Guidance (Student Folder/IEP Review Chart). Additionally, a Data Integrity Checklist is provided to facilitate LEAs' review of student 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. www.nsttac.org/sites/default/files/assets/pdf/ChecklistFormB.pdf

The use of these tools ensures that comparable data are collected throughout the state. The LEA reviewer responded 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 IDEA.

To report an IEP in compliance for this indicator, all eight compliance Data Collection Checklist items must have been marked with "Yes". If there was one "No" response, the IEP did not meet the SPP Indicator 13 measurement requirements for compliance. The online SPP 13 application automatically calculates compliance based on the response to the Data Collection Checklist items.

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)

For detailed guidance and additional information on SPPI 13, please visit the TEA website at https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/state-performance-plan-indicators.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

TEA's Department of General Supervision and monitoring, in the Office of Special Populations and Student Services, notified LEAs of noncompliance with FFY 2021 SPPI 13 with due dates for corrective action plans (CAPs) one year after the date of the noncompliance findings. TEA required LEAs to submit a CAP if noncompliance was found. Monitoring staff in the Division of Review and Support reviewed the CAP, updated data, and documentation to determine if the LEA was implementing the appropriate regulatory requirements and had corrected any noncompliance findings.
TEA took the following actions for each LEA:
• LEAs policies and procedures were reviewed.
• The correspondence where noncompliance was identified was reviewed.
• The Special Education Correspondence and Dispute Resolution Management System (CDRMS) 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 technical assistance and support 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
• Collected and organized all documentation as evidence.

After receiving the requested documentation for the noncompliance finding, all documentation was reviewed, and a determination was made whether compliance had been met. This determination ensured that each LEA was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of additional records subsequently collected through monitoring (systemic compliance) and has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. Lastly, the State verified that no outstanding corrective action existed regarding complaints or due process hearing decisions for children at the LEA.

The State verified that each LEA with corrected noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance with the relevant IDEA requirements).

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

LEAs were required to submit student-level data specific to each finding of noncompliance. Monitoring staff in the Division of Review and Support reviewed the updated data and documentation to determine if each case individual case of noncompliance was corrected and to verify whether systemic corrections were made to ensure the LEA was implementing the appropriate regulatory requirements for SPPI 13.

TEA took the following actions for each LEA:
• 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, and reviewed documentation to ensure correction at the student level
• Cross-referenced with the Special Education Correspondence and Dispute Resolution Management System application for any substantiated findings that should be considered when reviewing student level 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 with the LEA to discuss progress toward meeting noncompliance goals and offer technical assistance or support, where appropriate.
• 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, provided the LEA with the "LEA Steps Required to Correct Noncompliance, Noncompliance Verification Rubric," and provided an opportunity for questions and support
• Collected and organized all documentation as evidence

After receiving all the requested documentation for the citation(s), all documentation was reviewed, and a determination was made whether compliance had been met. The State verified that each LEA with corrected noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator has completed the required action with 100% compliance unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA consistent with QA 23-01.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

All LEAs with noncompliance for FFY 2021 have been verified as corrected as described in "FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected" section of Indicator 13 above. The description regarding how the state verified LEAs are appropriately implementing specific regulatory requirements and addressing each individual case of noncompliance has been included in the appropriate section above for SPPI 13.

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 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 QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

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 <u>General Instructions</u> on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2023 on students who left school during 2021-2022, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2021-2022 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).

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 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 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 analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2009	Target >=	29.00%	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%	31.00%
A	26.00%	Data	18.31%	16.36%	19.55%	23.79%	25.80%
B	2009	Target >=	62.00%	63.00%	63.00%	63.00%	64.00%
B	59.00%	Data	50.88%	51.10%	50.84%	53.43%	55.23%
C	2009	Target >=	78.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	81.00%
C	72.00%	Data	64.78%	93.31%	63.93%	64.59%	65.83%

FFY 2021 Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Historically, Texas has solicited stakeholder engagement by using the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, and various 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 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, 20 ESCs, related service and support staff, and other state agencies. They participate in four meetings per year, where they review data and making recommendations to the TEA to improve special education policies, procedures, and practices from the state to the local levels.

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

The Special Education Directors panel is a select group of Special Education Directors who work with TEA throughout the year. They are nominated to participate on this panel by their regional Education Service Center (ESC) Special Education Directors. The purpose is to provide feedback and input on

TEA initiatives and projects related to special education, including the SPP/APR. Presenting to this panel provides an opportunity to capture the current needs in the field from the perspective of an LEA Special Education Director. Additionally, the panel allows TEA staff to the opportunity to gather stakeholder input and the time to collaborate with LEA Special Education Directors currently in the field. The panel meets both in person and virtually.

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/APR, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as SPP/APR Indicators areas of slippage, Indicators 8 and 14 results and outreach, sampling plans, potential legal rule changes and legislative updates, state assessment participation, and Indicator 17: SSIP.

This group includes approximately 15 members representing key perspectives or roles to leverage diverse perspectives. The diverse nature of this group represents parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and/or campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, advocacy and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC engages in meetings quarterly 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. Most members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted, and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the 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. In 2023 topics for discussion included: TEA Updates, Legislative updates, Special Education Funding, 504 Data, Digital Curriculum Committee Reports, Teacher Vacancy Task Force updates and Updates on Recommendations and/or Proposed Bills.

Additionally, the CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.
The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year.

There are 11 special education directors specifically selected to provide feedback and support for the State. Many of the special education directors are also parents of students in the State's public school system. They meet quarterly. In 2023 the Special Education Directors provided input and support concerning the content of and outreach for the Parent Engagement survey (Indicator 8), the Differentiated Monitoring & Support (DMS) system, Legislative Updates, initiatives the state is working on such as the Special Education Diagnostic and an Administrator Toolkit, Legislative Implementation, the SSIP), a new website to house all Special Education Technical Support (Texas SPED Support), and student participation in the State's alternate assessment.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Responses	Number
Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	36,761
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	9,340
Response Rate	25.41%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	2,654
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	2,843
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)	378
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).	679

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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	2,654	9,340	25.80%	31.00%	28.42%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	5,497	9,340	55.23%	64.00%	58.85%	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)	6,554	9,340	65.83%	81.00%	70.17%	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	2021	2022
Response Rate	23.85%	25.41%

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

The representativeness of survey results was assessed using a +/- 5% discrepancy metric. This discrepancy metric indicates that the survey results obtained from the stratified random sample of students receiving special education are considered representative of the target population in terms of race/ethnicity, gender, and disability category. The discrepancy metric provides a pragmatic balance between accuracy and feasibility, aligns with widely accepted statistical standards, and is generally sufficient for informed decision-making and policy development. This threshold is strict enough to ensure meaningful representation of different groups, yet flexible enough to account for the practical challenges of surveying diverse populations.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

The State examined the responding participants representativeness related to race/ethnicity and disability category for the target population of special education students statewide. The responding participants were representative of the target population because their differences were within the State-established discrepancy metric of +/- 5% except for one race/ethnicity and two disability categories. In terms of race/ethnicity, the responding participants were under-representative of Hispanic students by -1.3 percentage points below the discrepancy metric. In terms of disability categories, the responding participants were over-representative of students with Autism by 0.4 percentage points above the discrepancy metric, whereas they were under-representative of students with Learning Disability by 1.7 percentage points below the discrepancy metric.

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

NO

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

To ensure future response data accurately reflect the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, particularly underrepresented groups, the State will implement the following strategies:

• Distribute surveys and communications in Spanish via text messaging
• Employ bilingual speakers for conducting telephone interviews in Spanish
• Collect information from home language surveys to identify needed translations beyond English and Spanish
• Enhance the involvement of LEA staff in gathering data
• Motivate teachers with close ties to students and families to assist in outreach efforts
• Prompt LEAs to issue reminders and disseminate information about the survey in multiple languages to increase accessibility and response rates
These targeted efforts aim to create a more inclusive data collection process to improve representativeness of the response data.

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

To enhance response rates year over year, particularly among underrepresented groups, the State has developed a multifaceted strategy focusing on high school students and their families by taking the following actions:
• Updating Contact Information: LEAs are instructed to ensure the accuracy of contact information for students exiting high school. This includes collecting personal email addresses and phone numbers during the final Individualized Education Program (IEP) meeting.
• Raising Awareness: There is a concerted effort to heighten the awareness and perceived importance of the survey at various levels – within LEAs, among parents, and students themselves.
• Supplementing Data Collection: Texas is exploring the possibility of integrating additional data sources such as Postsecondary enrollment, Texas Workforce Commission enrollment, and Employment data. This integration aims to enrich the information gathered from the SPP/APR Indicator 14 survey.

By educating high school students and their families about the survey's purpose, its administration process, and its significance, the likelihood of their participation may increase. Addressing the issue of outdated LEA-assigned email addresses and enhancing the overall understanding and importance of the post-secondary outcomes survey are key steps toward increasing response rates, particularly for underrepresented groups.

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.

The following addresses the instructional requirements for this section in three parts: analysis of response rate, assessment of nonresponse bias, and measures to reduce bias and promote broad participation for post-school outcomes:

Analysis of Response Rate: The response rate for the survey was calculated at various levels: statewide, by regional ESC, and by LEAs. This comprehensive approach ensured a detailed understanding of participation across different administrative and geographical segments. This granular analysis was crucial in identifying areas with lower participation, guiding targeted follow-up efforts.

Assessment of Nonresponse Bias: To assess nonresponse bias, the survey team compared the demographic characteristics (race/ethnicity, gender, and primary disability/exceptionality) of the survey respondents with those of the entire target population of students receiving special education services. The findings were encouraging, but there is still room for improvement. The responding participants were representative of the target population because their differences were within the State-established discrepancy metric of +/- 5% except for one race/ethnicity and two disability categories. However, the responding participants were under-representative of Hispanic students by -1.3 percentage points below the discrepancy metric while the responding participants were over-representative of students with Autism by 0.4 percentage points above the discrepancy metric and under-representative of students with Learning Disability by 1.7 percentage points below the discrepancy metric. The variance indicates survey data were broadly representative of the target population, expect for some nonresponse bias that was identified.

Measures to Reduce Bias and Promote Broad Participation: The State and its contracted vendor undertook extensive measures to encourage a wide-ranging response to address nonresponse bias exceeding the State's discrepancy metric. The measures taken to reduce bias and promote broad participation with the inclusion of diverse perspectives were focused on for the following key initiatives:
• Support for Districts: The State provided extensive support to districts related to data submission for the students' former LEA.
• Outreach Modality Options: The survey was made available to survey respondents by text message, email, phone call, post card, word of mouth, social media, and the students' former LEA.
• Active Monitoring and Outreach: The vendor actively monitored response patterns, identifying and addressing anomalies suggestive of barriers to participation. This included targeted outreach and marketing strategies to engage underrepresented groups.
• Focused Attention on Low-Response Areas: Focused Attention on Low-Response Areas: Special attention was given to 20 LEAs with a 0% response rate from students who were no longer enrolled at the LEA. Direct communication occurred with these LEAs.

In conclusion, while the analysis revealed some nonresponse bias exceeding the States' discrepancy metric for both ethnic/racial and disability, the State along with its vendor will continue to take a proactive and multi-faceted approach to reduce nonresponse bias related to the discrepancy metric.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For detailed guidance and additional information on SPPI 14, please visit the TEA website at
https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/state-performance-plan-indicators.

For comprehensive details on the TSDS Web-Enabled Data Standards (TWEDS) related to SPPI 14 data standards, please visit the TWEDS website at https://tealprod.tea.state.tx.us/TWEDS/98/490/0/0/DataComponents.

SPPI 14 Response Rate Dashboard for the 2023 Texas Post School Outcomes Survey (Statewide):
http://www.gibsonsurveys.com/psos/rratesstatewide.html

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The survey data were broadly representative of the target population expect for the following nonresponse bias beyond the +/- 5% discrepancy metric. The responding participants were under-representative of Hispanic students by -1.3 percentage points below the discrepancy metric while the responding participants were over-representative of students with Autism by 0.4 percentage points above the discrepancy metric and under-representative of students with Learning Disability by 1.7 percentage points below the discrepancy metric.

To ensure future response data accurately reflect the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, particularly underrepresented groups, the State will implement the following strategies:
• Distribute surveys and communications in Spanish via text messaging
• Employ bilingual speakers for conducting telephone interviews in Spanish
• Collect information from home language surveys to identify needed translations beyond English and Spanish
• Enhance the involvement of LEA staff in gathering data
• Motivate teachers with close ties to students and families to assist in outreach efforts
• Prompt LEAs to issue reminders and disseminate information about the survey in multiple languages to increase accessibility and response rates
These targeted efforts aim to create a more inclusive data collection process to improve representativeness of the response data.

14 - OSEP Response

14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2023 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	109
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	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 stakeholder engagement by using the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, and various 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 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, 20 ESCs, related service and support staff, and other state agencies. They participate in four meetings per year, where they review data and making recommendations to the TEA to improve special education policies, procedures, and practices from the state to the local levels.

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

The Special Education Directors panel is a select group of Special Education Directors who work with TEA throughout the year. They are nominated to participate on this panel by their regional Education Service Center (ESC) Special Education Directors. The purpose is to provide feedback and input on TEA initiatives and projects related to special education, including the SPP/APR. Presenting to this panel provides an opportunity to capture the current needs in the field from the perspective of an LEA Special Education Director. Additionally, the panel allows TEA staff to the opportunity to gather stakeholder input and the time to collaborate with LEA Special Education Directors currently in the field. The panel meets both in person and virtually.

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/APR, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as SPP/APR Indicators areas of slippage, Indicators 8 and 14 results and outreach, sampling plans, potential legal rule changes and legislative updates, state assessment participation, and Indicator 17: SSIP.

This group includes approximately 15 members representing key perspectives or roles to leverage diverse perspectives. The diverse nature of this group represents parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and/or campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, advocacy and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC engages in meetings quarterly 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. Most members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted, and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the 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. In 2023 topics for discussion included: TEA Updates, Legislative updates, Special Education Funding, 504 Data, Digital Curriculum Committee Reports, Teacher Vacancy Task Force updates and Updates on Recommendations and/or Proposed Bills.

Additionally, the CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.
The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year.

There are 11 special education directors specifically selected to provide feedback and support for the State. Many of the special education directors are also parents of students in the State's public school system. They meet quarterly. In 2023 the Special Education Directors provided input and support concerning the content of and outreach for the Parent Engagement survey (Indicator 8), the Differentiated Monitoring & Support (DMS) system, Legislative Updates, initiatives the state is working on such as the Special Education Diagnostic and an Administrator Toolkit, Legislative Implementation, the SSIP), a new website to house all Special Education Technical Support (Texas SPED Support), and student participation in the State's alternate assessment.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	43.90%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	25.00% - 30.00%	25.00% - 30.00%	25.00%-30.00%	43.00%-43.90%	30.00%-35.00%
Data	31.78%	31.65%	36.28%	43.90%	33.62%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target (low)	FFY 2022 Target (high)	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
36	109	33.62%	30.00%	35.00%	33.03%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For detailed guidance and additional information on SPPI 15, please visit the TEA website at
https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/state-performance-plan-indicators.

Special Education Dispute Resolution Process
https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/dispute-resolution/special-education-dispute-resolution-processes

Special Education Dispute Resolution Systems Handbook
https://tea.texas.gov/about-tea/government-relations-and-legal/se-dispute-resolution-handbook-english.pdf

Special Education Due Process Hearing Program
https://tea.texas.gov/about-tea/government-relations-and-legal/special-education-hearings/due-process-hearings

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of 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 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1 Mediations held	243
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	86
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	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 stakeholder engagement by using the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, and various 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 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, 20 ESCs, related service and support staff, and other state agencies. They participate in four meetings per year, where they review data and making recommendations to the TEA to improve special education policies, procedures, and practices from the state to the local levels.

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

The Special Education Directors panel is a select group of Special Education Directors who work with TEA throughout the year. They are nominated to participate on this panel by their regional Education Service Center (ESC) Special Education Directors. The purpose is to provide feedback and input on TEA initiatives and projects related to special education, including the SPP/APR. Presenting to this panel provides an opportunity to capture the current needs in the field from the perspective of an LEA Special Education Director. Additionally, the panel allows TEA staff to the opportunity to gather stakeholder input and the time to collaborate with LEA Special Education Directors currently in the field. The panel meets both in person and virtually.

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/APR, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as SPP/APR Indicators areas of slippage, Indicators 8 and 14 results and outreach, sampling plans, potential legal rule changes and legislative updates, state assessment participation, and Indicator 17: SSIP.

This group includes approximately 15 members representing key perspectives or roles to leverage diverse perspectives. The diverse nature of this group represents parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and/or campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, advocacy and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC engages in meetings quarterly 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. Most members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted, and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the 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. In 2023 topics for discussion included: TEA Updates, Legislative updates, Special Education Funding, 504 Data, Digital Curriculum Committee Reports, Teacher Vacancy Task Force updates and Updates on Recommendations and/or Proposed Bills.

Additionally, the CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.
The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year.

There are 11 special education directors specifically selected to provide feedback and support for the State. Many of the special education directors are also parents of students in the State's public school system. They meet quarterly. In 2023 the Special Education Directors provided input and support concerning the content of and outreach for the Parent Engagement survey (Indicator 8), the Differentiated Monitoring & Support (DMS) system, Legislative Updates, initiatives the state is working on such as the Special Education Diagnostic and an Administrator Toolkit, Legislative Implementation, the SSIP), a new website to house all Special Education Technical Support (Texas SPED Support), and student participation in the State's alternate assessment.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2015	73.60%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	75.00% - 80.00%	75.00% - 80.00%	75.00%-80.00%	75.00%-80.00%	75.00%-80.00%
Data	75.81%	75.78%	70.88%	73.60%	66.24%

Targets

FFY	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%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target (low)	FFY 2022 Target (high)	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
86	60	243	66.24%	75.00%	80.00%	60.08%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Because of the inherently voluntary nature of the mediation process, the percentage of mediations that will end in agreement depends on the parties' willingness to come to an agreement. Accordingly, this percentage will vary from year to year.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) maintains consistently high standards for the pool of mediators under contract with the agency. The majority of contract mediators have worked in the field for a decade or more. In addition, all special education mediators are required to participate in relevant annual training and continuing legal education to hone their skills. Given these factors, TEA believes that the current year slippage is a function of fluctuations inherent in a system that encourages, but cannot require, parties to work together toward mutually agreeable solutions.

For detailed guidance and additional information on SPPI 16, please visit the TEA website at https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/state-performance-plan-indicators.

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Baseline Data*:* The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) (SiMR) 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 2022 through February 2027, 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) Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

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

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

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

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

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

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

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

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

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

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPPs/APRs, 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., February 1, 2023). 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 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

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 (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., 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 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) 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)?

The State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) is to enhance the reading proficiency rate among children with disabilities in grades 4, 8, and high school. This will be measured by aggregating the results from state assessments in grades 4 and 8, along with End of Course exams in Reading Achievement, to evaluate their performance against grade-level standards, inclusive of any accommodations.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (*e.g.*, a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

The State's theory of action is accessible at the following link: https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/texas-ssip-theory-of-action-one-pager.pdf

Progress toward the SiMR

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

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

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	10.85%

Targets

FFY	Current Relationship	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	20.00%	25.00%	30.00%	40.00%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
26,098	173,455	15.22%	20.00%	15.05%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 data.

The FFY 2022 data source is the Consolidated Accountability File (CAF) for SY 2022-2023. This data file contains grades 4, 8, and high school from the relevant Reading assessment data groups and is aligned with the federal data submitted to EDFacts file specification 178 and Data Group 584 (FS178, DG584). CAF data was combined with student-level data from the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) to provide program participation, disability categories, and other demographic characteristic information about students to provide context understanding the reading assessment results.

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

The Consolidated Accountability File (CAF) pulls together assessment data and other student information and is provided by a testing contractor to TEA. LEAs in Texas submit student enrollment and attendance, personnel, and financial data to TEA four times a year through secure online systems, forming the comprehensive PEIMS data set. Both CAF data and PEIMS data are joined together to create one comprehensive data set. The data are descriptively analyzed at the state, region, and LEA levels in terms of grades 4, 8, and high school reading performance for children with disabilities who receive special education. The data are also utilized to make determinations about improvement, variability, slippage, and re-baseline targets.

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

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)
NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)
NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

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

https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/state-systemic-improvement-plan

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)
NO

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

Improvement Strategy 1 (Allocate Resources): The goal of this strategy is to support regional ESCs and LEA efforts toward enhancing student outcomes. This strategy includes leveraging state and federal funds to bolster technical assistance capacity, professional development, and resource allocation for expanding dyslexia support and reading instruction programs. It also encompasses the adoption of early childhood literacy programs by LEAs and providing additional support to LEAs through expanded grants for regional liaisons.

Improvement Strategy 2 (Expand Initiatives and Opportunities): The goal of this strategy involves the continuation of network supports, resources, and professional development opportunities in various areas to enhance reading instruction and address related issues.

Improvement Strategy 3 (Communicate Expectations, Standards, and Results): The goal of this strategy includes activities to opportunities for ongoing statewide training through Reading Academies and Reading Academies ESC Implementation Grant.) These initiatives aim to communicate expectations, set standards, and achieve results. Additional measures include the implementation of certification requirements and training for school personnel to extend the reach of reading instructional strategies.

Improvement Strategy 4 (Collaboration): The goal of this strategy is collaboration with higher education institutions, statewide agencies, and organizations to improve teacher quality initiatives and ensure consistency across programs and policies that impact student outcomes. This strategy's activities include completing a revised education diagnostician certification and test framework that aligns with updated standards, as well as ongoing efforts to approve specific test items for the exam.

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.

The following summary outlines the key short-term and intermediate outcomes for four infrastructure improvement strategies, focusing on their alignment with different components of the systems framework like governance, data, and professional development.

• Strategy 1 (Resource Allocation): This strategy, linked to governance and financial frameworks, involves the use of federal and state funds. Intermediate outcomes include:
Hiring staff for developing TA resources, FAQs, webinars, newsletters, and website redesign.
Increased funding for dyslexia training, therapist positions, screening tools, and intervention programs. This aims to enhance reading curriculum access and monitoring of kindergarten reading readiness.
School boards are required to implement early childhood plans focusing on 3rd-grade reading levels and targeted professional development for K-3 teachers.
Funds allocated for enhancing teacher knowledge in effective reading instruction.
Ongoing state funding supports ESCs in training, consultation, and leadership for federal and state programs.
Enhanced funding for ESC liaison personnel, aiding in information dissemination, training, and consultation in special education.

• Strategy 2 (Expanding Initiatives and Opportunities): This strategy focuses on data and professional development. Success is measured through annual goal setting and reporting by each technical assistance network and ESC. All ESCs received directives for training and resource delivery, with participation goals ranging from 10% to 100%.

• Strategy 3 (Communication of Expectations and Standards): This strategy, tied to quality standards and accountability, is assessed by certification and hiring requirements. Key initiatives include the Science of Teaching Reading certification for all certifications beginning in January 2021 and literacy programs for teachers in lower-performing and low-income schools.

• Strategy 4 (Collaborative Improvement): This approach, related to governance and quality standards, involves collaboration with higher education and

other agencies. Notable outcomes include the launch of the education diagnostician certification and updated educator standards by SBEC.

The strategies collectively represent a comprehensive approach to enhancing educational infrastructure for the State's systemic improvement goals.

Did the State implement any <u>new</u> (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 upcoming phase for the infrastructure improvement strategies involves continuing the activities outlined in Strategies. These include increasing LEA access to technical assistance, professional development, high-quality materials, standardized practices based on research, and monitoring leveraged resources and participation requirements. The focus remains on leveraging resources and employing best practices to monitor progress toward improvement special education student reading achievement. Additionally, TEA plans to continue with the dyslexia program monitoring, aimed at ensuring LEAs' compliance with TEC §38.003, this project will involve auditing, monitoring, and conducting periodic onsite visits to oversee the dyslexia program approved by the State Board of Education.
These steps are expected to significantly contribute to our overarching goal of improved educational outcomes during the next reporting period.

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

The following evidence-based practices were implemented by the Networks Implementing Statewide Improvement Strategies to the Initiatives:
• Child Find/evaluation and ARD (IEP) supports.
• Inclusion Supports.
• Autism training.
• Tiered interventions.
• Increasing capacity of LEAs and families for students with significant cognitive disabilities.
• Sensory supports.
• Texas Lesson Study (TXLS) - a professional development program.

This comprehensive approach ensures continuous improvement in services and outcomes for students with special needs across Texas.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

The following summary describes various evidence-based practices being supported by the State:

• Child Find/Evaluation and ARD (IEP) Supports: This program offers comprehensive training in Standards-Based Individual Education Program (IEP) for educators, administrators, SLPs, counselors, and therapists. Training is available in multiple formats, including synchronous, asynchronous, and blended options.

• Inclusion: Focuses on assisting LEAs creating inclusive environments and instructional programs. It includes trainer resources on reading for students with disabilities, including dyslexia, and resources on inclusion beyond co-teaching.

• Autism Training: The Autism Circuit Academy (ACA) provides year-long professional development to enhance LEA capabilities. It offers training and support in eight evidence-based practices (EBPs) for educators working with students with autism.

• Tiered Interventions: Develops training and resources for evidence-based intervention practices, including a series of modules on Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) and evidence-based reading practices.

• Support for Significant Cognitive Disabilities: Updated online training resources, including literacy teaching for students with significant cognitive disabilities, are provided to enhance the capabilities of LEAs and families.

• Sensory Supports: Offers specialized support for infants, children, and youth with sensory impairments. This includes training in literacy for PreK teachers and SLPs working with students who are deaf or hard of hearing.

• Texas Lesson Study: An inquiry-based, collaborative professional development program where teachers develop and assess research-based lessons. Resources and lessons are available on the Texas Lesson Study website.

• Learning Acceleration Support Opportunities (LASO) Grant: Launched by the TEA in 2022, this grant focuses on strategic planning, instructional materials, teacher pipelines, extended learning time, and innovative school models. The LASO Cycle II grant, launched in 2023, emphasizes three strategies: instructional materials, extended learning time, and innovative school models.

• High-Quality Instructional Materials (HQIM): In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the TEA developed HQIM guides for special education, integrating Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) in inclusive settings.

• Dyslexia Monitoring A state-mandated monitoring process for dyslexia.

• Special Education Technical Assistance: A team dedicated to supporting LEAs in compliance and best practices for educating students with disabilities. A unified Content Management System (CMS) and Learning Management System (LMS) centralizes and analyzes technical assistance resources and courses.

• Strategy Initiative Outcomes: Tracks outcomes of various initiatives, including certification changes and implementation of legislative requirements, to ensure fidelity in implementation.

In conclusion, these practices demonstrate a comprehensive approach to supporting diverse educational needs, emphasizing inclusive and specialized training, professional development, and resource allocation to support improved reading proficiency.

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.

TEA aims to enhance reading proficiency among grades 4, 8, and high school students with disabilities through several strategic initiatives. These initiatives are designed to impact various levels: program/district policies, teacher/provider practices, parent/caregiver outcomes, and child outcomes:

• Infrastructure Changes and Statewide Technical Assistance (TA): TEA is improving its infrastructure to better support special education services. This includes providing high-quality TA and resources statewide, enhancing oversight, and engaging more effectively with special education programs.

• Differentiated Monitoring and Support System: This system by the Department of Review and Supports targets all LEAs in Texas. It focuses on improving compliance and performance across the state.

• Redesign of TA Networks and Increased TA Staff: By expanding TA staff and redesigning networks, TEA aims to bolster agency-wide initiatives, particularly those related to reading outcomes.

• Metrics and Measures: Implementation of new metrics and measures in project plans are designed to predict student outcomes more accurately. These include assessing the effectiveness of resource utilization, engagement levels in implementation, stakeholder knowledge, and practitioner preparedness.

• Leading by Convening Principles: Through these principles, ESC leaders are expected to optimize resource allocation, enhance engagement in evidence-based practices, and improve stakeholder and practitioner knowledge. This two-way engagement is crucial for achieving the SSIP's short-term and long-term goals.

Preliminary results show high engagement levels and positive impacts on implementation activities, short-term goals, and reading proficiency, all contributing to the SiMR. This summary indicates TEA's comprehensive approach and commitment toward improving reading proficiency.

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

To monitor fidelity of implementation, data were collected from various sources. These sources include both formative metrics and summative metrics from each of the 10 Networks but most notably intensive supports and dyslexia monitoring. The Intensive Supports project identifies LEAs that require intensive intervention to participate in the intensive support process aimed at improving the implementation of best practices in special education and increase LEA access to technical assistance (TA). The Dyslexia Monitoring project was designed to develop a monitoring process for dyslexia to support and testing to improve access to support reading performance across the Texas.

Additionally, outcomes from other strategic initiatives were tracked. These initiatives may involve changes in certification, utilization of financial resources such as grant allocations, and the implementation of mandatory trainings, staffing changes, or the adoption of new materials or procedures. Initiative owners collect these data, ensuring the implementation aligns with the intended goals. The special education policy team then consolidates this information for reporting purposes, ensuring comprehensive assessment of practice change.

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.

Data supporting the use of evidence-based practices were based on the analysis of student reading outcomes. The data were examined to establish baseline reading level for special education students in grades 4, 8, and high school from the Texas Performance Reporting System (TPRS) and the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR). The baselines reading assessment results are in the SSIP document on the TEA website: https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/state-systemic-improvement-plan%20This%20information%20helps%20in%20evaluating%20the%20effectiveness%20of%20current%20practices%20and%20guiding%20future%20decisions.

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 has developed a plan for the next reporting period, focusing on enhancing literacy and dyslexia support through evidence-based practices:

• Engagement in Literacy Topics and Activities: TEA will continue monthly TEA/ESC Zoom meetings and other opportunities to increase technical capacity and expand support, particularly for supporting dyslexia programs and improving reading proficiency among students with disabilities.

• Utilization of Texas SPED Support Website: The website (https://spedsupport.tea.texas.gov/) offers extensive technical assistance (TA) and support. It features a learning library with online courses, workshops, events, and conferences, designed for the professional development of educators at various levels.

• Enhancement of General Supervision for Dyslexia: Monitoring activities will focus on expanding data collection and compliance for students with dyslexia. This compliance includes mandatory dyslexia screening for kindergarten and first-grade students and the analysis of screening data to improve LEA dyslexia programs. Additionally, the collection of dyslexia data for unscreened children is expected to help identify and overcome barriers to screening, so that literacy support can be provided as needed.

• Project Monitoring and Family Engagement: There will be an emphasis on monitoring student progress, engaging families, and practitioners, and developing dashboards for tracking the effectiveness of reading improvement strategies.

TEA's initiatives aim to improve literacy and reading instruction for students who receive special education, especially student with dyslexia.

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)
YES

If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.

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

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

Historically, Texas has solicited stakeholder engagement by using the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model. This input is gathered through a variety of methods including surveys, public forums, and various 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 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, 20 ESCs, related service and support staff, and other state agencies. They participate in four meetings per year, where they review data and making recommendations to the TEA to improve special education policies, procedures, and practices from the state to the local levels.

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

The Special Education Directors panel is a select group of Special Education Directors who work with TEA throughout the year. They are nominated to participate on this panel by their regional Education Service Center (ESC) Special Education Directors. The purpose is to provide feedback and input on TEA initiatives and projects related to special education, including the SPP/APR. Presenting to this panel provides an opportunity to capture the current needs in the field from the perspective of an LEA Special Education Director. Additionally, the panel allows TEA staff to the opportunity to gather stakeholder input and the time to collaborate with LEA Special Education Directors currently in the field. The panel meets both in person and virtually.

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/APR, the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) serves as the external workgroup tasked with advisement on topics such as SPP/APR Indicators areas of slippage, Indicators 8 and 14 results and outreach, sampling plans, potential legal rule changes and legislative updates, state assessment participation, and Indicator 17: SSIP.

This group includes approximately 15 members representing key perspectives or roles to leverage diverse perspectives. The diverse nature of this group represents parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and/or campus administrators, ESCs, higher education institutions, advocacy and professional groups, other related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups whose missions include the education of students with disabilities.

New members are added to fill voids in certain key perspectives. The TCISC engages in meetings quarterly 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. Most members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The CAC meets quarterly, at a minimum. Agendas are publicly posted, and public comment is encouraged.

The CAC is the state advisory panel required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to advise the 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. In 2023 topics for discussion included: TEA Updates, Legislative updates, Special Education Funding, 504 Data, Digital Curriculum Committee Reports, Teacher Vacancy Task Force updates and Updates on Recommendations and/or Proposed Bills.

Additionally, the CAC also advises TEA on standards related to significant disproportionality determination and is required by state statute to submit a report to the legislature biennially with recommended changes to state law and agency rules relating to special education.
The meeting dates, agenda and minutes are published on the following website: https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/programs-and-services/continuing-advisory-committee-for-special-education-cac-meeting-dates-agendas-and-minutes. Members of the committee are appointed for staggered four-year terms with the terms of eight or nine members expiring on February 1 of each odd-numbered year.

There are 11 special education directors specifically selected to provide feedback and support for the State. Many of the special education directors are also parents of students in the State's public school system. They meet quarterly. In 2023 the Special Education Directors provided input and support concerning the content of and outreach for the Parent Engagement survey (Indicator 8), the Differentiated Monitoring & Support (DMS) system, Legislative Updates, initiatives the state is working on such as the Special Education Diagnostic and an Administrator Toolkit, Legislative Implementation, the SSIP), a new website to house all Special Education Technical Support (Texas SPED Support), and student participation in the State's alternate assessment.

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

The State implemented strategies to engage stakeholders because they are integral to improvement efforts in each strategy and activity. Since the launch of the ten networks, stakeholder engagement is gauged using project success metrics like participation, feedback, and needs assessments through various tools (e.g., surveys, TA ratings, coaching follow-ups). However, key recommendation will be implemented regarding the 10 networks. Beyond these metrics, additional questions in the SPPI 8 survey inform needs statewide. During the LEAs' cyclical desk review process, TEA conducts surveys with stakeholders such as parents/families and administrators for additional insights on program and service implementation.

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

NO

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

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

In FFY 2023, TEA will continue to measure and analyze progress toward achieving the SIMR. The activities include the utilization of the new statewide Texas Research Portal (https://txresearchportal.com/), which will provide a platform for comprehensive data analysis and resource development. Data will also be disaggregated by key demographics, geography, and administrative units to assess progress and focus areas.

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 had during the pandemic with regards to disruptions to structured routines and in fundamental education for elementary school children.

The Supplemental Special Education Services (SSES) program is a one-time $1,500 online grant for parents/guardians of eligible students served by special education and who are enrolled in a Texas public school. Parents/guardians of eligible students can use the online accounts to shop the marketplace to obtain educational materials and resources such as textbooks, curriculum, or technology devices and/or services such as additional speech therapy, tutoring, or other specific services. For more information about this resource, see https://sses.tea.texas.gov/.

For additional information about SPPI 17, please visit the TEA website at https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/state-performance-plan-indicators.

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

17 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:

Susan Bineham

Title:

SPP/APR Coordinator

Email:

susan.bineham@tea.texas.gov

Phone:

512-463-9051

Submitted on:

04/22/24 10:39:45 AM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

Texas
2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)

Percentage (%)	Determination
82.50%	Meets Requirements

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

Section	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	20	14	70.00%
Compliance	20	19	95.00%

(1) For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part B."

2024 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment (2)	Grade 4	99%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8	99%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	23%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	85%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	26%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	85%	1

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 4	99%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8	98%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	49%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	84%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	19%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	90%	1

(2) Statewide assessments include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment.

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	15	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma**	49	0

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

2024 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator (3)	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021 (4)	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	96.28%	NO	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	98.04%	YES	2
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	98.59%	YES	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	100.00%		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	100.00%		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	100.00%		2
Longstanding Noncompliance			1
Programmatic Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	Yes, 2 to 4 years		

(3) The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2024_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

(4) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are >=5% and <10% for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, and >=90% and <95% for Indicators 11, 12, and 13.

Data Rubric

Texas

FFY 2022 APR (1)

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data

APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1

APR Score Calculation

Subtotal	21
Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2022 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	26

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

618 Data (2)

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 8/30/23	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 1/10/24	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/15/23	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/3/23	1	1	1	3

618 Score Calculation

Subtotal	21
Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	26.00

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

Indicator Calculation

A. APR Grand Total	26
B. 618 Grand Total	26.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	52.00
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
Denominator	52.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) =	1.0000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	100.00

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

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2024 Submission

SPP/APR Data

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

Part B 618 Data

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

618 Data Collection	ED*Facts* Files/ E*MAPS* Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	C002 & C089	8/30/2023
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	2/21/2024
Part B Exiting	C009	2/21/2024
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	2/21/2024
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	1/10/2024
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in E*MAPS*	11/15/2023
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in E*MAPS*	5/3/2023

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

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

Dispute Resolution IDEA Part B

Texas School Year: 2022-23

A zero count should be used when there were no events or occurrences to report in the specific category for the given reporting period. Check "Missing' if the state did not collect or could not report a count for the specific category. Please provide an explanation for the missing data in the comment box at the top of the page.

Section A: Written, Signed Complaints

(1) Total number of written signed complaints filed.	979
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued.	549
(1.1) (a) Reports with findings of noncompliance	298
(1.1) (b) Reports within timelines	536
(1.1) (c) Reports within extended timelines	13
(1.2) Complaints pending.	12
(1.2) (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing.	12
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	418

Section B: Mediation Requests

(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes.	414
(2.1) Mediations held.	243
(2.1) (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints.	153
(2.1) (a) (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints.	86
(2.1) (b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints.	90
(2.1) (b) (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints.	60
(2.2) Mediations pending.	127
(2.3) Mediations withdrawn or not held.	44

Section C: Due Process Complaints

(3) Total number of due process complaints filed.	388
(3.1) Resolution meetings.	109
(3.1) (a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings.	36
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated.	14
(3.2) (a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited).	4
(3.2) (b) Decisions within extended timeline.	10
(3.3) Due process complaints pending.	122
(3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing).	252

Section D: Expedited Due Process Complaints (Related to Disciplinary Decision)

(4) Total number of expedited due process complaints filed.	49
(4.1) Expedited resolution meetings.	23
(4.1) (a) Expedited written settlement agreements.	11
(4.2) Expedited hearings fully adjudicated.	4
(4.2) (a) Change of placement ordered	0
(4.3) Expedited due process complaints pending.	3
(4.4) Expedited due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	42

State Comments:

Errors:
Please note that the data entered result in the following relationships which violate edit checks:

State error comments:

This report shows the most recent data that was entered by: Texas
These data were extracted on the close date:11/15/2023

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2024 will be posted in June 2024. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

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

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

Final Determination Letter

June 21, 2024

Honorable Mike Morath
Commissioner of Education
Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, TX 78701

Dear Commissioner Morath:

I am writing to advise you of the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) 2024 determination under Section 616 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Department has determined that Texas meets the requirements and purposes of Part B of the IDEA. This determination is based on the totality of Texas' data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2022 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

Texas' 2024 determination is based on the data reflected in its "2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix" (RDA Matrix). The RDA Matrix is individualized for each State and Entity and consists of:

(1) a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors;

(2) a Results Matrix that includes scoring on Results Elements;

(3) a Compliance Score and a Results Score;

(4) an RDA Percentage based on both the Compliance Score and the Results Score; and

(5) the State's or Entity's Determination.

The RDA Matrix is further explained in a document, entitled "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part B" (HTDMD).

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making determinations in 2024, as it did for Part B determinations in 2014-2023. (The specifics of the determination procedures and criteria are set forth in the HTDMD document and reflected in the RDA Matrix for Texas).

In making Part B determinations in 2024, OSEP continued to use results data related to:

(1) the participation and performance of CWD on the most recently administered (school year 2021-2022) National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), as applicable (For the 2024 determinations, OSEP using results data on the participation and performance of children with disabilities on the NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. OSEP used the available NAEP data for Puerto Rico in making Puerto Rico's 2024 determination as it did for Puerto Rico's 2023 determination. OSEP did not use NAEP data in making the BIE's 2024 determination because the NAEP data available for the BIE were not comparable to the NAEP data available for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico; specifically, the most recently administered NAEP for the BIE is 2019, whereas the most recently administered NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico is 2022.)

(2) the percentage of CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma; and

(3) the percentage of CWD who dropped out.

For the 2024 IDEA Part B determinations, OSEP also considered participation of CWD on Statewide assessments (which include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment). While the participation rates of CWD on Statewide assessments were a factor in each State or Entity's 2024 Part B Results Matrix, no State or Entity received a Needs Intervention determination in 2024 due solely to this criterion. However, this criterion will be fully incorporated beginning with the 2025 determinations.

You may access the results of OSEP's review of Texas' SPP/APR and other relevant data by accessing the E*MAPS* SPP/APR reporting tool using your Texas-specific log-on information at https://emaps.ed.gov/suite/. When you access Texas' SPP/APR on the site, you will find, in applicable Indicators 1 through 17, the OSEP Response to the indicator and any actions that Texas is required to take. The actions that Texas is required to take are in the "Required Actions" section of the indicator.

It is important for you to review the Introduction to the SPP/APR, which may also include language in the "OSEP Response" and/or "Required Actions" sections.

You will also find the following important documents in the Determinations Enclosures section:

(1) Texas' RDA Matrix;

(2) the HTDMD link;

(3) "2024 Data Rubric Part B," which shows how OSEP calculated Texas' "Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data" score in the Compliance Matrix; and

(4) "Dispute Resolution 2022-2023," which includes the IDEA Section 618 data that OSEP used to calculate the Texas' "Timely State Complaint Decisions" and "Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions" scores in the Compliance Matrix.

As noted above, Texas' 2024 determination is Meets Requirements. A State's or Entity's 2024 RDA Determination is Meets Requirements if the RDA Percentage is at least 80%, unless OSEP has imposed programmatic Specific Conditions on the State's or Entity's last three IDEA Part B grant awards (for FFYs 2021, 2022, and 2023), and those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2024 determination.

IDEA determinations provide an opportunity for all stakeholders to examine State data as that data relate to improving outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. The Department encourages stakeholders to review State SPP/APR data and other available data as part of the focus on improving equitable outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. Key areas the Department encourages State and local personnel to review are access to high-quality intervention and instruction; effective implementation of individualized family service plans (IFSPs) and individualized education programs (IEPs), using data to drive decision-making, supporting strong relationship building with families, and actively addressing educator and other personnel shortages.

For 2025 and beyond, the Department is considering three criteria related to IDEA Part B determinations as part of the Department's continued efforts to incorporate equity and improve results for CWD. First, the Department is considering as a factor OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). This factor would be reflected in the determination for each State and Entity through the "longstanding noncompliance" section of the Compliance Matrix beginning with the 2025 determinations. In implementing this factor, the Department is also considering beginning in 2025 whether a State or Entity that would otherwise receive a score of Meets Requirements would not be able to receive a determination of Meets Requirements if the State or Entity had OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). Second, the Department is considering as potential additional factors the improvement in proficiency rates of CWD on Statewide assessments. Third, the Department is considering whether and how to continue including in its determinations criteria the participation and proficiency of CWD on the NAEP.

For the FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission due on February 1, 2025, OSEP is providing the following information about the IDEA Section 618 data. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part B data submitted as of the due date will be used for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR and the 2025 IDEA Part B Results Matrix and States and Entities will not be able to resubmit their IDEA Section 618 data after the due date. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part B data will automatically be prepopulated in the SPP/APR reporting platform for Part B SPP/APR Indicators 3, 5, and 6 (as they have in the past). Under EDFacts Modernization, States and Entities are expected to submit high-quality IDEA Section 618 Part B data that can be published and used by the Department as of the due date. States and Entities are expected to conduct data quality reviews prior to the applicable due date. OSEP expects States and Entities to take one of the following actions for all business rules that are triggered in the EDPass or EMAPS system prior to the applicable due date: 1) revise the uploaded data to address the edit; or 2) provide a data note addressing why the data submission triggered the business rule. States and Entities will be unable to submit the IDEA Section 618 Part B data without taking one of these two actions. There will not be a resubmission period for the IDEA Section 618 Part B data.

As a reminder, Texas must report annually to the public, by posting on the State educational agency's (SEA's) website, the performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in Texas on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after Texas' submission of its FFY 2022 SPP/APR. In addition, Texas must:

(1) review LEA performance against targets in the State's SPP/APR;

(2) determine if each LEA "meets the requirements" of Part B, or "needs assistance," "needs intervention," or "needs substantial intervention" in implementing Part B of the IDEA;

(3) take appropriate enforcement action; and

(4) inform each LEA of its determination.

Further, Texas must make its SPP/APR available to the public by posting it on the SEA's website. Within the upcoming weeks, OSEP will be finalizing a State Profile that:

(1) includes Texas' determination letter and SPP/APR, OSEP attachments, and all State or Entity attachments that are accessible in accordance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; and

(2) will be accessible to the public via the ed.gov website.

OSEP appreciates Texas' efforts to improve results for children and youth with disabilities and looks forward to working with Texas over the next year as we continue our important work of improving the lives of children with disabilities and their families. Please contact your OSEP State Lead if you have any questions, would like to discuss this further, or want to request technical assistance.

Sincerely,

Valerie C. Williams
Director
Office of Special Education Programs

cc: Texas Director of Special Education

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.

101   Part B