FFY 2019 Indicator B-17/C-11 Annual Performance Report (APR) Optional Template

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). (Please limit your response to 785 characters).

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) identified the following SiMR:

Increase the reading proficiency rate for all children with disabilities in grades 3-8 against grade level and alternate achievement standards, with or without accommodations.

The SiMR is measured annually using the State's results-driven accountability (RDA) system, reading Indicator 1(ii). This indicator is similar to Part B Indicator 3C of the State Performance Plan. However, the RDA Indicator 1(ii) assesses students in grades 3-8 and does not include students with IEPs in high school. The State's ability to achieve the SiMR is underpinned and guided by the theory of action framework provided in the next section.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission?

No

If "Yes", provide an explanation for the change(s), including the role of stakeholders in decision-making. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

The TEA´s theory of action was initially developed in 2015 and was revised last year in 2019-2020 school year to highlight four critical improvement strategies:

? Resource allocation to support reading outcomes,

? Expand initiatives and opportunities to support reading outcomes,

? Communicate standards and expectations to teachers and instructional support personnel to support improved reading outcomes, and

? Collaborate with institutions, organizations, agencies and other stakeholders to support positive reading outcomes.

The four improvement strategies are connected to deliverables produced at the state, regional, LEA, and campus levels. Both the improvement strategies and the deliverables coalesce to increase stakeholder expectations, build capacity through increased access to resources and knowledge of the science of teaching reading, and provide reading interventions for students with disabilities who receive special education in Texas to achieve the SiMR.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Progress toward the SiMR

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

Baseline Data: 39.6%

Has the SiMR target changed since the last SSIP submission? No

FFY 2018 Target: 65.0%   **FFY 2019 Target**: 70.0%

FFY 2018 Data: 44.8%   **FFY 2019 Data:**   ND

Was the State's FFY 2019 Target Met? No

Did slippage[1] occur? No

If applicable, describe the reasons for slippage. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) identified the following SiMR:
• Increase the reading proficiency rate for all children with disabilities in grades 3-8 against grade level and alternate achievement standards, with or without accommodations.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and school closures the state assessment was not administered during the 2019-2020 school year. Therefore there were no results to report or compare to prior years.

---

[1] The definition of slippage: *A worsening from the previous data AND a failure to meet the target.* The worsening also needs to meet certain thresholds to be considered slippage:
1. For a "large" percentage (10% or above), it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 1.0 percentage point. For example:
   a. It is not slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator X are 32% and the FFY 2018 data were 32.9%.
   b. It is slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator X are 32% and the FFY 2018 data were 33.1%.
2. For a "small" percentage (less than 10%), it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 0.1 percentage point. For example:
   a. It is not slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator Y are 5.1% and the FFY 2018 data were 5%.
   b. It is slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator Y are 5.1% and the FFY 2018 data were 4.9%.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

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

If "Yes", describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.
(Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space)*.*

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and school closures the state assessment and other locally developed assessment measures were not administered during the 2019-2020 school year and no additional data was available. Therefore there were no results to report or compare to prior years.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Did the State identify any data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period?   No

If "Yes", describe any data quality issues specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space).

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period?   Yes

If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space).

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) identified the following SiMR:
? Increase the reading proficiency rate for all children with disabilities in grades 3-8 against grade level and alternate achievement standards, with or without accommodations.

1) Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and school closures the state assessment was not administered during the 2019-2020 school year. Therefore there were no results to report or compare to prior years to address the TEA's SiMR.

2) On March 11, 2020 the World Health Organization (WHO) declared the global spread of the novel coronavirus (COVID-19) a pandemic. Days later the Governor of Texas, Greg Abbott, declared a state of disaster in Texas on March 13, 2020, and on March 16, 2020 Governor Abbott waived the STAAR testing requirement for Texas public school. Then on March 19, 2020 Governor Abbott issued an executive order requiring all schools in Texas to temporarily close. The next day former U.S. Secretary of Education Betsy DeVos announced [that] "students impacted by school closures due to the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic can bypass standardized testing for the 2019-2020 school year.'' Although the actions taken by the Texas governor and former U.S. Secretary of Education protected the health and safety needs of student and school personnel in Texas, the implications of bypassing standardized testing for the 2019-2020 school years meant that statewide reading assessment data could not be collected or reported, thus impacting the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator.

3) TEA is engaging during the 2020-2021 school year with Stakeholders to ensure future SSIP data sources may include other formative and summative data that would not be solely reliable on one comprehensive statewide data source such as state-wide student assessment in assigning the SiMR specific to this indicator.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Section B: Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission?   No

If "Yes", please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action
(Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).
Although there have been no revisions since last year during the 2019-2020 school year, the State would take this opportunity to highlight updates made and identify four critical improvement strategies that are still being developed or implemented due to COVID-19 access barriers and delays.

Improvement Strategy 1: Resource Allocation to Support Reading Outcomes

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

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

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

The improvement strategies are connected to deliverables produced at the state, regional, LEA, and campus levels. Both the improvement strategies and the deliverables coalesce to increase stakeholder expectations, build capacity through increased access to resources and knowledge of the science of teaching reading, and provide reading interventions for students with disabilities who receive special education in Texas to achieve the SiMR.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Did the State implement any <u>new</u> (previously or newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period?   No

If "Yes", describe each <u>new</u> (previously or newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space)*.

As previously discussed improvement strategies were not actualized or implemented to completion due to the COVID-19 pandemic, school, business closures, and the state assessment was not administered during the 2019-2020 school year.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy that the State <u>continued</u> to implement in the reporting period, including the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space).

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Provide a description of how the State evaluated outcomes for each improvement strategy and how the evaluation data supports the decision to continue implementing the strategy. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):

Reading Academies

Notably, implementation of Senate Bill (SB) 925 and 972 began in June 2016. Both bills established the literacy achievement academies targeting kindergarten through third grade teachers, the reading to learn academies focusing on fourth and fifth grade teachers. They provide high-quality professional development to public school teachers who instruct students in reading. In June of 2019, House Bill 3 (HB 3) was passed by the Texas Legislature. Per HB 3, all K-3 teachers and principals must attend a teacher literacy achievement academy by the 2021-2022 school year. Despite inability to provide face-to-face training, all Academies went forward in Summer 2020 virtually.

Additional Implementation Progress Update

Through introduction and carry-through of Leading by Convening frameworks, opportunities were identified, and commitments were made to build a deeper and more collaborative relationship between the TEA and the ECSs as an investment for improving outcomes to achieve the SiMR. Many ESCs adapted core engagement principles to achieve goals outlined in specific statewide networks. COVID-19 LEA closures and diminished access provided unique opportunities to engage with the ESCs with many advances to collaborative partnerships and deeper development for technical assistance driven initiative activities.

Intended Outputs that have been Accomplished as a Result of the Implementation Activities

While there was a minor drop in reading proficiency scores for students with disabilities in 2018-2019, with no ability to determine implementation progress in 2019-2020 due to no assessment data, TEA anticipates changes to the SiMR target and possibly other SSIP focused activities and measurements defined by stakeholders for the next reporting period for Indicator 17. The State is currently engaging stakeholders for purpose of determining identified needs that will continue to focus efforts and write the narrative in achieving outcomes for students with disabilities in reading.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space)**:**

The TEA´s continuing and planned infrastructure changes and the delivery of quality statewide TA and resources are designed to improve the services and supports needed to increase reading proficiency levels for students in grades 3-8 with disabilities who receive special education. TEA is currently (2020-2021) undergoing a Departmental audit specific to the monitoring divisions regarding its differentiated monitoring system and activities to increase its ability and efforts to provide oversight and targeted engagement over special education programs.

Additionally, the TEA has committed to a number of other studies and surveys aimed at accountability for agency alignment and responsiveness to the needs in the State in reaching its stated goals specific to students with disabilities and in particular to reading outcomes that are being leveraged during the Spring and Summer 2021.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Did the State implement any <u>new</u> (previously or newly identified) evidence-based practices?

No

If "Yes", describe the selection process for the <u>new</u> (previously or newly identified) evidence-based practices. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

Previously discussed evidenced practices were not actualized or implemented to completion due to the COVID-19 pandemic, school, business closures, and the state assessment was not administered during the 2019-2020 school year.

Continued efforts in 2020-2021 school year and beyond to create a parsimonious monitoring, review, and support system that integrates the federal SPP/APR system with the State's new RDA system (i.e., integrating federal and state rules and regulations for special education) are ongoing. This integration will streamline multiple accountability practices and prioritize essential data sources while taking into consideration the policy priorities of the TEA and internal and external stakeholder feedback (e.g., parents, regional ESCs, LEAs, TEA personnel, and other community members). Part and parcel to the new RDA system is the development, testing, and refinement of a predictive risk assessment index. This risk assessment index leverages a machine learning approach and longitudinal data over a minimum of three years to predict the factors that affect special education programs the most. The reporting protocol will be used to identify strengths (best practices) and weaknesses (identified needs) and drive LEA′s overall continuous improvement planning and development.

Continued activities include exploratory data analysis (EDA) that dis-aggregates and analyzes the relationship among state assessment reading results and student grade level, socioeconomic status, disability, race, gender/sex, geographic location, and other school level or societal factors. Data analysis will also focus on examining outlier LEAs with higher or lower reading proficiency rates.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Provide a summary of the <u>continued</u> evidence-based practices and how the evidence-based practices are intended to impact the SiMR. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

RDA Reading Indicator 1(ii): All children with disabilities will receive access to quality, evidence-based reading practices and appropriate educational services to increase grades 3-8 reading proficiency
Guided by the theory of action, the State's emphasis on increased grades 3-8 reading proficiency rates through evidence-based practices is reflected in the four coherent improvement strategies Tiered Interventions using Evidence-Based Research (TIER) Network (University of Texas): TIER provides a set of 10 modules (i.e., on-demand and face-to-face training) related to best practices for MTSS, including evidence-based reading practices.
Inclusion in Texas network Investment: 90% of participants in the professional development demonstrate their competency on evidence-based strategies provided during a competency-based exit survey that tests understanding of content.
Texas Statewide Leadership for Autism Training (TSLAT)Increase LEAs' knowledge, understanding, and implementation of evidence-based practices (e.g., training, TA, and resources) that ensure the academic, functional, and behavioral needs of students with autism are met.
Tiered Interventions using Evidence-based Research (TIER) Develop a comprehensive and coherent training and resources for evidence-based intervention practices across the state.

Describe the data collected to evaluate and monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space)*:*

Data were collected on the improvement strategies to establish baseline data and to formatively assess progress of each activity (for data to assess progress toward the SiMR). Different data were collected for the different improvement strategies:
Improvement Strategy 1: Resource Allocation
• Data Source: Fiscal and Grant Divisions
• Collection Procedure: Supported by budget, grant quarterly reports
• Timeline: Annual allocations
Improvement Strategy 2: Expand Initiatives and Opportunities
• Data Source: Ten Networks and ESC SECIPs
• Collection Procedure: Self-reported by grantee, data collected via the eGrant online application
• Timeline: Networks report metric quarterly to the Initiatives Lead at TEA and annually during the summer
Improvement Strategy 3: Communicate Standards and Expectations to Teachers and Instructional Support Personnel
• Data Source: Grant compliance data, personnel participation and outcomes
• Collection Procedure: LEA provides compliance assurances in grant funding application, TEA division led initiative outputs reports
• Timeline: Annual during the summer, annual- event driven
Improvement Strategy 4: Collaborate with Institutions, Organizations, Agencies, and Other Stakeholders
•   Data Source: ESC Liaison Grants (specific to reading), monitoring data– Review and Support
•   Collection Procedure: Reported via Qualtrics survey platform; reported via secure LEA accessed data platform
•   Timeline: Liaisons report progress quarterly, triannual monitoring reporting by Review and Support

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Describe the components (professional development activities, policies/procedures revisions, and/or practices, etc.) implemented during the reporting period to support the knowledge and use of selected evidence-based practices. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

Continued the ESC Special Education Liaison Grant Initiative and expanded the number of liaison positions to support ESCs providing TA, professional development training, and supports for special education teachers. These funds are provided to assist each ESC with three primary deliverables:

• Ensure LEAs have access to high quality TA and support, professional development, and other services regarding state and federal rules and regulations
• Support state projects and activities necessary to implement the SPP, SSIP, and assist LEAs in improving results for students with disabilities
• Assist TEA with carrying out its responsibilities by serving as statewide leads and/or members for certain IDEA-related functions/projects

Continued implementation of Senate Bill (SB) 925 and 972 that began in June 2016 establishing the literacy achievement academies targeting kindergarten through third grade teachers, and the reading to learn academies focusing on fourth and fifth grade teachers. These provide high-quality professional development to public school teachers who instruct students in reading. All K-3 teachers and principals must attend a teacher literacy achievement academy by the 2021-2022 school year. These academies were held virtually in 2020 and continue.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.
(Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):

Stakeholder input has been the cornerstone of the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP). The TCIP's reliance on stakeholder input was critical to establishing both the SSIP and the SiMR. Input continues to be gathered through a variety of statewide methods, including surveys, public forums, public hearings, and stakeholder meetings. Geographic and ethnic diversity approach toward obtaining stakeholder input is utilized as a longstanding policy. Key stakeholder roles follow a recruitment plan based on a variety of input needs. Key roles on all advisory or informal workgroups include parents, teachers, and campus and LEA administrators. Members of the stakeholder groups are typically represented by LEA and campus administrators, special education directors, special education teachers, general education teachers, parents, higher education institutes, advocacy agencies, professional groups, ESCs, related state agencies, related service providers, evaluation personnel, and other stakeholder groups.

Stakeholders have been informed in many ways of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP. In 2019-2020, the State instituted the new special education differentiated monitoring, review, and support system (i.e., DMS system). State assessment for students in special education is integral to this system. One requirement of this system is for all LEAs in Texas to annually complete an online self-assessment, where they evaluate and rate their special education programs by identifying areas of both compliance and student performance needing improvement. This new system also includes a six-year monitoring cycle, where LEAs participate in desk reviews and on-site visits. The DMS system also includes surveys and interviews designed to engage parents/family members, administrators, general education, special education teachers and other LEA staff in the monitoring process. Each year of the six-year cycle is partitioned into three groups. Stakeholders have been informed about the State's commitment to improve special education reading proficiency rates.

Enhanced updates to the statewide parent survey are underway and tied to the DMS cycle to increase awareness and participation.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities?

Yes

If "Yes", describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.
(Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space)*:*

TEA recently re-engaged (Fall 2020) with its primary stakeholder group tasked with SPP and SSIP target setting and improvement strategy input on general supervision and student outcomes as COVID 19 continued to grip the nation and impact our students and educational systems. TEA prioritized the SPP needs for increased targets for the next 6 year SPP cycle, but also began discussions about SSIP data deficiencies due to COVID-19 in 2020 and possible solutions for SSIP continuations. Although no specific expressed concerns were made regarding SSIP area of focus, discussion on how to measure outcomes differently was begun. Texas stakeholders adhere to the belief that quality over quantity should be the focus for selecting improvement strategies thought to ensure positive reading outcomes.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

If applicable, describe the action(s) that the State implemented to address any FFY 2018 SPP/APR required OSEP response. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):

Not applicable based on FFY 2018 SPP/APR required OSEP response specific to SSIP.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.