Fidelity of Implementation Toolkit

Stronger Connections Grant

TEA
Texas Education Agency

Table of Contents

TEA
Texas Education Agency

Fidelity of Implementation Rubric

Fidelity of Implementation (FOI) Toolkit Overview

The Fidelity of Implementation (FOI) Toolkit provides SCG awardees with a structured process to assess progress toward grant goals and ensure alignment with the expectations outlined in the SCG performance measures. It is designed to support campus and district leadership in conducting meaningful, evidence-based evaluations of implementation quality and impact.

Performance Measures Assessed

The FOI process evaluates six key performance areas:

- ***Grant Management*** *– Effective stewardship of SCG funds, including timely spending, alignment with deliverables, and collaborative budget oversight.*
- ***Training & Professional Development*** *– Strategic capacity building through participation in technical assistance and integration of training content into practice.*
- ***Data Collection & Use*** *– Consistent and accurate data reporting that informs decision-making and supports continuous improvement.*
- ***Student Support Framework (SSF)*** *– Implementation fidelity of the SSF, including integration into campus systems and alignment with student needs.*
- ***SMART Goal Progress*** *– Evidence of progress toward locally defined SMART goals that address identified needs and align with grant benchmarks.*
- ***Sustainability*** *– Development of long-term strategies and partnerships to sustain and scale grant-supported practices beyond the funding period.*

Evaluation Process

- ***Quarterly Self-Evaluation****: LEA leadership—including campus administrators, district leaders, and business office representatives—meet quarterly to review each performance measure and complete the self-assessment using the rubric criteria.*
- ***Survey Submission****: Upon completion, the LEA submits a SmartSheets survey documenting ratings, narrative reflections, and supporting evidence.*
- ***ESC Check-Ins****: Regional ESC SCG leads will schedule brief virtual check-ins with the LEA's SCG project director or designee to review FOI ratings, discuss successes and challenges, and identify needed supports. TEA program staff will participate in these check-ins on a rotating basis to gather insights and provide guidance.*
- ***Data Visualization & Support****: Data from FOI submissions will be compiled into a dashboard to help stakeholders monitor trends, assess implementation health, and deliver timely, targeted support.*

Compliance

Application assurances state that awardees must provide timely response to requests from TEA for information and data regarding program development, implementation, and performance and evaluation measures. While awardees must submit quarterly FOI surveys to remain in compliance with grant assurances, this tool was designed for district leadership to perform honest evaluations of their grant work. Ratings lower than "meets expectation" will **not** be penalized. This FOI tool is not in any way tied to funding. Ratings of a 1 or 2 mean there is room for growth and may also indicate a gap in regional or state level supports. The information you submit via the FOI tool is valuable and essential to the efficacy of this work.

We look forward to showcasing regional and statewide trends found in FOI data and following up with additional wraparound supports as needed.

TEA
Texas Education Agency

Performance Measure #1

Performance Measure 1: Grant Management
This performance measure ensures that grantees are:
1. On track to fully expend their Stronger Connections Grant (SCG) funds in alignment with the approved grant goals and deliverables.
2. Effectively linking expenditures to the intended activities and outcomes of the grant.
3. In compliance with all applicable state and federal reporting requirements.

Guiding Questions:
Spending & Alignment
- How are SCG funds being tracked to ensure alignment with approved grant goals and deliverables?

Drawdowns & Fiscal Health
- Are quarterly drawdowns occurring consistently, and what internal controls support this practice?

Strategic Use of Funds
- What evidence shows that the use of funds is directly impacting student outcomes or program effectiveness?

Campus-Level Impact
- How are campus-specific needs being identified and addressed through SCG funding?
- What mechanisms ensure campus leadership is engaged in budget decisions?

> **Example Artifacts:**
>
> Budget workbooks
>
> Expenditure Reports
>
> Agendas
>
> Meeting notes/minutes
>
> Vendor Partnerships
>
> Capacity Building Programs

Performance Measure #1 Rubric Criteria:

1 - Needs Improvement	2 - Progressing	3 - Meets Expectation	4 - Exemplary
The LEA demonstrates limited alignment between grant management practices and expected standards. Indicators may include one or more of the following: • The LEA is not meeting quarterly budget targets, with expenditures deviating by more	The LEA demonstrates partial alignment between grant management practices and expected standards. Indicators may include one or more of the following: • The LEA is slightly off track in meeting quarterly budget targets, with expenditures	The LEA demonstrates consistent alignment between grant management practices and expected standards. Indicators may include one or more of the following: • The LEA is on track to expend approximately 50% (±5%) of SCG funds by September 30,	The LEA demonstrates exceptional alignment between grant management practices and expected standards. All "Meets Expectation" criteria are fulfilled, plus one or more of the following: • The LEA provides clear evidence of sustainable use of grant funding, such

than 10% (over or under) from projected amounts. • Budget planning and oversight are siloed, lacking meaningful collaboration among campus leadership, district leadership, and the business office. • Projected costs are misaligned with approved grant deliverables, indicating a disconnect between financial planning and programmatic goals.	deviating by up to 10% (either overspending or underspending) from projected amounts. • Budget planning and oversight are emerging, with initial efforts to coordinate among campus leadership, district leadership, and the business office. • Financial planning is generally aligned with approved grant deliverables, though some adjustments may be needed to strengthen the connection between expenditures and programmatic goals.	2025 and 75% (±5%) of SCG funds by December 31, 2025, indicating sound fiscal planning and adherence to budget targets. • Budget planning and oversight are coordinated across campus leadership, district leadership, and the business office, promoting shared accountability and transparency. • All expenditures are clearly aligned with approved grant deliverables and goals, with documentation available to justify spending decisions. • The LEA maintains a structured budget tracking process each quarter and, in some cases, each month, with drawdowns accurately recorded and submitted through Expenditure Reporting.	as through innovative partnerships with external organizations or strategic internal capacity-building efforts. • The LEA has identified and/or secured additional funding sources to support the continuation or expansion of grant-related work beyond the grant period. • Grant management practices have been shared with other districts or recognized by external partners as a model for effective stewardship and sustainability.

Performance Measure #2

Performance Measure 2: Training and Professional Development
This performance measure ensures that grantees are:
1. Actively building organizational capacity by engaging with appropriate technical assistance providers.
2. Participating in both mandatory and recommended trainings that support the effective implementation of the Student Support Framework.
3. Advancing progress toward the grant's stated deliverables through strategic professional development efforts.

Guiding Questions:

Participation & Completion
- What TCSS and ESC trainings have been completed this quarter, and which staff members are still pending completion?
- How is training participation being monitored and documented?

Content Dissemination & Integration
- How has the content from SSF and SST trainings been shared with campus staff and core teams?
- What evidence shows that training content has been integrated into campus practices and systems?

Strategic Alignment & Access
- What additional ESC or locally selected vendor trainings are available that align with identified program needs or implementation gaps?
- How are training opportunities selected to support strategic goals for student support?

Feedback & Evaluation
- What mechanisms are in place to collect timely feedback from participants on training quality and relevance?
- How is staff feedback used to assess understanding and readiness to implement learned practices?

Implementation & Calibration
- What tools (e.g., rubrics, protocols, guiding documents) are being used to calibrate expectations and ensure consistent implementation across stakeholders?
- Which practices have been embedded, replaced, or supplemented as a result of training, and what steps have been taken to implement those changes?

Example Artifacts:

Verification of training

Documented feedback

Nonapproved vendor documentation

Description of trainings that meet identified needs

Demonstration of teachers and other school staff receiving SSF and SST best practices (outside of the individuals who attended the Training of-Trainer sessions)

Texas Education Agency

Performance Measure #2 Rubric Criteria:

1 - Needs Improvement	2 - Progressing	3 - Meets Expectation	4 - Exemplary
The LEA demonstrates limited alignment between training and professional development practices and expected standards. Indicators may include one or more of the following: • Staff participation in required TCSS or regional ESC trainings is incomplete or undocumented, indicating a lack of system-wide engagement in foundational professional development. • The LEA has not maintained documentation demonstrating that a selected vendor aligns with the goals and outcomes of the SCG, which may result in noncompliance with local implementation protocols. • Training oversight and planning are fragmented, lacking coordination between district leadership, campus teams, and student support personnel.	The LEA demonstrates partial alignment between training and professional development practices and expected standards. Indicators may include one or more of the following: • Staff participation in required TCSS or regional ESC trainings is incomplete, but outstanding trainings are scheduled and documented for completion. • Feedback on TCSS or other professional development activities has not yet been submitted to training partners, though a plan to collect and share feedback is in place. • Training oversight is emerging, with initial coordination efforts between district leadership, campus teams, and student support personnel underway.	The LEA demonstrates consistent alignment between training and professional development practices and expected standards. Indicators may include one or more of the following: • Staff participation in required TCSS and regional ESC trainings is complete and documented, reflecting system-wide engagement in foundational professional development. • The LEA shares timely feedback with TCSS and other professional development partners, supporting continuous improvement and responsiveness. • Training content—such as SSF and SST lever practices—is disseminated beyond initial participants through structured formats (e.g., PLCs, staff meetings), promoting schoolwide integration. • The LEA engages in additional	The LEA demonstrates strong alignment between training and professional development practices and expected standards, with evidence of strategic planning and system-wide implementation. Indicators may include one or more of the following: • Staff participation in required TCSS and regional ESC trainings is complete, documented, and supported by internal systems that promote ongoing engagement and accountability. • The LEA consistently provides timely, actionable feedback to TCSS and professional development partners, contributing to continuous improvement efforts. • Training content is systematically integrated across campuses through coordinated efforts such as PLCs, staff meetings, and

		professional development aligned to SCG goals, including offerings from regional ESCs and locally selected technical assistance providers. .	coaching cycles, ensuring broad dissemination and application. • The LEA has developed and implemented a clear strategy to scale training practices to campuses beyond those directly supported by SCG funding, demonstrating sustainability and district-wide impact. • Training oversight is proactive and collaborative, with strong coordination between district leadership, campus teams, and student support personnel.

TEA
Texas Education Agency

Performance Measure #3

Performance Measure 3: Data Collection and Use
This performance measure ensures that grantees are:
1. Consistently submitting required data using the tools and timelines established by the Texas Center for Student Supports (TCSS) and the Texas Education Agency (TEA).
2. Demonstrating the ability to analyze data in real time to inform decision-making.
3. Translating data insights into actionable steps that strengthen implementation and improve student outcomes.

Guiding Questions:

System Integration & Daily Use
- How have participating campuses incorporated the provided or locally developed data collection protocols and tools into their regular routines, and what practices support consistent quarterly reporting?
- What barriers, if any, are impacting consistent and effective use of these systems?

Timeliness & Accuracy of Reporting
- Is the LEA on track to meet upcoming deadlines for submitting required data (e.g., fidelity of implementation, student support referrals, climate surveys, diagnostic assessments)?
- What internal processes ensure timely and accurate data submission?

Strategic Data Partnerships
- Does the LEA have partnerships with external vendors that require data submissions?
- What types of progress or outcomes are being measured, and how are these data points aligned with grant goals?

Data-Informed Planning & Sustainability
- How is SCG-related data being used to inform planning and decision-making at the campus and district levels?
- What evidence shows that data is being leveraged to support sustainable practices beyond the life of the grant?

Example Artifacts:

Verification of training attendance

Data entries in locally selected tracking tool

Data submissions in TEA Qualtrics survey

Climate survey results

Virtual FOI check in attendance

FOI submission reports

Other data sources as applicable

Performance Measure #3 Rubric Criteria:

1 - Needs Improvement	2 - Progressing	3 - Meets Expectation	4 - Exemplary
The LEA demonstrates limited alignment between data collection practices and expected standards. Indicators may include one or more of the following: • Required staff have not completed training on SCG data collection protocols or tools. • One or more FOI submissions are missing or incomplete. • Data submissions to TCSS, regional ESCs, or TEA are outstanding or consistently late. • Staff are not consistently using approved tools or protocols for tracking nonacademic needs.	The LEA demonstrates partial alignment between data collection practices and expected standards. Indicators may include one or more of the following: • Required data trainings are incomplete, but outstanding trainings are scheduled. • Data submissions are occurring but show a pattern of delays or require correction. • Staff are beginning to use data tools, but usage is inconsistent across campuses or roles.	The LEA demonstrates consistent alignment between data collection practices and expected standards. Indicators may include one or more of the following: • All required staff have completed training on SCG data protocols and tools. • FOI submissions are completed quarterly, with appropriate personnel present and materials prepared. • Data entry timelines are consistently met, as outlined in the SCG Year-at-a-Glance (YAG). • Climate surveys and other required data tools are implemented according to TCSS guidance. • Advisory committees review FOI submissions and provide input on data-informed planning.	The LEA demonstrates strong alignment between data collection practices and expected standards, with evidence of strategic planning and system-wide implementation. All "Meets Expectations" criteria are fulfilled, plus one or more of the following: • The LEA has developed internal systems that embed SCG data collection into school routines and culture. • The LEA uses climate, FOI, and nonacademic needs data to develop action plans and inform continuous improvement. • Data is used strategically to identify trends, evaluate impact, and guide decision-making across campuses.

TEA
Texas Education Agency ®

Performance Measure #4

Performance Measure 4: Student Support Framework

This performance measure ensures that grantees are:

1. Effectively integrating and sustaining the Student Support Framework (SSF) and Student Support Team (SST) process to identify and address nonacademic student needs in alignment with TCSS parameters
2. Implementing the Parent and Family Engagement Playbook to foster meaningful collaboration with families.
3. Establishing and utilizing local advisory committees to guide and support implementation efforts.

Guiding Questions

Framework Integration & Staff Readiness
- How has the Student Support Framework (SSF) been embedded into campus practices to support student needs?
- Which staff members still require SSF training, and how is training completion being tracked?

Team Structure & Function
- How was the Student Support Team (SST) established, and who are its members?
- Have team roles been clearly defined, and have all members completed the required TIER and SST trainings?

Meeting Cadence & Effectiveness
- What is the frequency and structure of SST meetings, and how is consistency maintained across campuses?
- What tools or protocols (e.g., TCSS resources and forms) are used to guide decision-making, and how effective have they been?

Family Engagement & Advisory Input
- To what extent has the TCSS Parent and Family Engagement Playbook been implemented, and what successes or challenges have emerged?
- How has the Local Advisory Committee been established and engaged, and what contributions has it made to program planning or implementation?

Example Artifacts:

Verification of training

Evaluation tools/rubrics

Satisfaction surveys

Progress monitoring tools for SSTs

Agendas/minutes/notes

Texas Education Agency

Performance Measure #4 Rubric Criteria:

1 - Needs Improvement	2 - Progressing	3 - Meets Expectation	4 - Exemplary
The LEA demonstrates limited alignment between SSF implementation and expected standards. Indicators may include one or more of the following: • Required SSF, SST, or PFE trainings are incomplete or undocumented. • Mandatory components of SSF implementation are missing or not in use. • Advisory committees are not engaged or lack opportunities to provide input. • Referral systems for nonacademic needs are unclear or underutilized.	The LEA demonstrates partial alignment between SSF implementation and expected standards. Indicators may include one or more of the following: • Required trainings are incomplete, but scheduled for completion. • Advisory committees are established but not yet fully engaged or supported. • Referral systems are in place but not consistently used or understood by staff.	The LEA demonstrates consistent alignment between SSF implementation and expected standards. Indicators may include one or more of the following: • All required SSF, SST, and PFE trainings are completed, with follow-up support provided. • SSF practices are integrated into campus routines, with scaffolded training opportunities throughout the year. • Referral pathways for nonacademic needs are clearly defined and used to support both individual and systemic needs. • Advisory committees operate according to TCSS guidance, with clear roles, meeting schedules, and opportunities for feedback. • Staff have regular opportunities to reflect, problem-solve, and improve SSF implementation.	The LEA demonstrates strong alignment between SSF implementation and expected standards, with evidence of strategic planning and system-wide implementation. All "Meets Expectations" criteria are fulfilled, plus one or more of the following: • The LEA has been recognized by TCSS, TEA, or regional ESCs for exemplary SSF implementation. • SSF practices have received positive recognition from community stakeholders or external partners. • SSF implementation has been scaled to additional campuses or integrated into broader district initiatives.

TEA
Texas Education Agency®

Performance Measure #5

Performance Measure 5: SMART Goals and Benchmarks
This performance measure ensures that grantees are:
1. Tracking progress toward SMART goals identified in their SCG application.
2. Using benchmarks to monitor implementation fidelity and impact.
3. Aligning goal-setting and progress monitoring with identified local needs and grant deliverables

Guiding Questions:

Goal Alignment & Recalibration
- How often does the team revisit SMART goals and benchmarks to ensure alignment with the original intent of the grant?
- What adjustments have been made based on implementation data or evolving needs?

Evidence of Impact
- What indicators suggest progress toward grant outcomes, and where is impact most visible?
- How is progress being documented and communicated to stakeholders?

Challenges & Support Needs
- What implementation challenges have emerged, and what strategies have been used to address them?
- What additional support is needed from the ESC, TCSS, or TEA to overcome current or anticipated barriers?

Peer Learning & Knowledge Sharing
- What promising practices or successes could be shared with other SCG awardees to support collective learning?

> **Example Artifacts:**
>
> Various data sources aligned to SMART goals
>
> Data visualizations
>
> FOI check in attendance and notes
>
> Advisory attendance/minutes/notes
>
> Intervention plans
>
> Evidence of additional support

Performance Measure #5 Rubric Criteria:

1 - Needs Improvement	2 - Progressing	3 - Meets Expectation	4 - Exemplary
The LEA demonstrates limited alignment between SMART goal practices and expected standards. Indicators may include one or more of the following: • Goals lack clear measurement criteria or progress	The LEA demonstrates partial alignment between SMART goal practices and expected standards. Indicators may include one or more of the following: • Leadership is aware of goals but lacks full understanding	The LEA demonstrates consistent alignment between SMART goal practices and expected standards. Indicators may include one or more of the following: • District and campus leadership, teachers, and	The LEA demonstrates strong alignment between SMART goal practices and expected standards, with evidence of strategic planning and system-wide implementation. All "Meets Expectations" criteria are fulfilled, plus one or more of the

tracking. • Quarterly progress updates are not shared with stakeholders. • Off-track goals lack documented plans for intervention or support.	of benchmarks or progress indicators. • Stakeholders have limited or delayed access to goal-related data. • Some goals are off-track, with initial plans for support under development.	advisory committees understand and engage with SCG goals. • Goals are supported by valid data sources and accurately measure student impact. • Progress is reviewed quarterly with relevant stakeholders, and input is used to refine goals. • Off-track goals are addressed through documented next steps, interventions, and supports.	following: • One or more goals have been significantly exceeded ahead of schedule, demonstrating exceptional progress and impact. • Goal-setting and progress monitoring practices have been shared across campuses or with other SCG awardees. • The LEA uses goal data to inform broader strategic planning and continuous improvement efforts.

TEA
Texas Education Agency®

Performance Measure #6

Performance Measure 6: Sustainability
This performance measure ensures that grantees are:
1. Embedding sustainability strategies into programmatic planning and decision-making.
2. Building internal capacity to maintain grant-supported initiatives beyond the funding period.
3. Exploring partnerships and funding opportunities to extend the impact of grant activities.

Guiding Questions:
Long-Term Vision & Planning
- What is the desired long-term impact of this work (e.g., 5–10 years), and how is that vision shaping current planning?
- What elements of the program are being prioritized for sustainability?

Barriers & Mitigation Strategies
- What current or future barriers to sustainability have been identified, and what strategies are in place to address them?

Funding & Resource Continuity
- Which components of the work could continue with no funding, partial funding, or alternative funding sources?
- What steps are being taken to secure additional resources or integrate practices into existing systems?

Example Artifacts:

Verification of training

Nonacademic Student Support data tracking entries

Evaluation tools/rubrics

Satisfaction surveys

Progress monitoring tools for SSTs

Agendas/minutes/notes

Performance Measure #6 Rubric Criteria:

1 - Needs Improvement	2 - Progressing	3 - Meets Expectation	4 - Exemplary
The LEA demonstrates limited alignment between sustainability planning and expected standards. Indicators may include one or more of the following: • Sustainability is not integrated into program discussions or decision-making. • Required TASBO sustainability webinars have not been attended.	The LEA demonstrates partial alignment between sustainability planning and expected standards. Indicators may include one or more of the following: • Areas of potential scalability or sustainability have been identified but not yet implemented. • Initial discussions about long-term planning have	The LEA demonstrates consistent alignment between sustainability planning and expected standards. Indicators may include one or more of the following: • District and campus leadership, teachers, and advisory committees meet regularly to discuss SCG progress, challenges, and long-term planning.	The LEA demonstrates strong alignment between sustainability planning and expected standards, with evidence of strategic planning and system-wide implementation. All "Meets Expectations" criteria are fulfilled, plus one or more of the following: • Sustainability practices have been scaled across campuses or shared with other SCG

• No clear plans exist for continuing SCG-supported practices beyond the grant period.	occurred, but strategies are not yet formalized.	• Budget discussions include considerations for sustaining key practices beyond the grant period. • TASBO consulting services are utilized when needed to support sustainability planning. • The LEA can identify at least one practice that demonstrates scalability and one that demonstrates sustainability beyond September 30, 2026.	awardees. • The LEA's sustainability strategies have been recognized or adopted by other districts or partners. • Long-term planning is embedded in district systems and informs broader strategic initiatives.

Frequently Asked Questions (updated 3/17/2025)

1. **Purpose of FOI Tool**
   a. Is use of this tool required?
      Yes. Per the SCG program guidelines, awardees must "provide timely response to requests from TEA for information and data regarding program development, implementation, and performance and evaluation measures."

   b. Can our district create our own evaluation tool?
      Your district may choose to implement additional evaluation tools. Please be mindful of any administrative burden additional tools may place on program staff at participating campuses. Use of this tool is required even if the awardee has another evaluation system in place.

   c. Why are awardees required to participate in FOIs?
      The FOI is intentionally designed to encourage self-reflection and drive continuous improvement among grantees. In addition to these developmental goals, data collected from the FOI tool will provide valuable insights into regional and statewide trends in grant implementation progress and sustainability efforts. It also helps identify additional supports needed at the regional ESC, TCSS, and TEA levels.

   d. Will we be able to view the statewide FOI data?
      Yes! Data collected will be made available to your regional ESC SCG leads to use during your follow up FOI check-in.

2. **Logistics**
   a. Who from the district completes the FOI rubric?
      Campus leadership, district leadership, and the business office should be present during your in-person evaluation. Please prioritize everyone's attendance!

   b. How are adviosry committees involved?
      Advisory committees do not need to be involved in the FOI rubric completion, but upon submission of the FOI surveys, committees should have opportunities to review ratings and narratives and discuss.

   c. Where do we document our ratings?
      You may print a copy of this toolkit and circle ratings/take notes on the page.
      You may also choose to download a copy and highlight ratings and make comments for notetaking. We recommend establishing a routine that meets your needs, allows everyone to collaborate, and can be saved and referenced in the future.

   d. Where do we keep artifacts and how many do we need?
      Artifacts are documentation types you would already be using as part of the grant implementation (ex. Attendance records and minutes). Maintain your artifacts locally in whatever way works best for you, ensuring you can easily reference and display them virtually during advisory meetings, leadership meetings, and FOI check-ins. There is no set number required.

e. Where do we submit our FOI survey?
    Please use the link emailed to you by TEA. A new link is emailed each quarter. You will not be able to use a previous link for a new quarter's submission. The FOI link will always be a SmartSheets link. No special access is needed.

f. Explanation of FOI quarters:
    In order to remain as streamlined as possible, beginning June 2024 we will refer to FOI quarters and budget quarters as written below:
    > Quarter One- July 1 to September 30
    > Quarter Two- October 1 to December 31
    > Quarter Three- January 1 to March 31
    > Quarter Four- April 1 to June 30

3. **Performance Measures**

    a. What if I rate in-between scores?
        Above all else, the rubric exists to provide awardees with a tool to help facilitate progress monitoring and discussion of grant deliverables. Leadership should use their best professional judgement when it comes to selecting a rubric rating. Ratings should be able to be justified through local documentation of artifacts and in discussion at ESC virtual check-ins.

    b. What if the criteria doesn't apply to us yet?
        In the final year of the grant cycle, all awardees are expected to address each rubric criterion. If a criterion seems inapplicable, be prepared to explain your rationale to your ESC and document it in your narrative. Ratings should reflect your current implementation status, acknowledging that relevance may shift over time. At this stage, grantees should actively engage with all rubric components. Variations in ratings from quarter to quarter are acceptable and should be explained in your narrative.

    c. What if we rate at a 1 or 2?
        Narrative responses and check-in conversations are held in a higher regard than just the numeric score you choose. The 1-4 scale helps the TEA quantify overall trends, but the system is rooted in support. Low scores indicate areas of growth and should be followed up with tailored supports for that awardee.

    d. Why did Performace Measure #3 change?
        A Case Management System (CMS) is not an integrated support through the Texas Center for Student Supports at this time. Instead, the TEA team has created an optional local tracking tool for LEAs who need it, resources for those LEAs using a locally selected CMS, and a required data collection survey instrument for all SCG awardees to utlize quarterly to submit aggregate data of nonacademic needs. PM #3 reflects those updates. For more information on this update, please reach out to your ESC SCG lead.

    e. Why did Perforamce Measure #1 change?
        Due to reporting requirements from the United States Departnment of Education (USDE), we are shifting the way budgets/expenditures are reported within the FOI survey. Additional information was provided to your districts in February/March 2025. While districts are still expected to calculate whether they are on track with spending (per PM #1 criteria), the FOI tool will no longer ask LEAs to enter their projected and actual expenditures per budget object code per quarter.

    f.   Where do we submit the nonacademic needs data collection for PM #3?
All SCG awardees are required to submit campus-level Qualtrics surveys for their student support referrals. The submissions for this report occur quarterly and are always aligned to the FOI submission windows. Your FOI survey will have you certify that you have submitted the Qualtrics surveys. Because of the nature of the data collected, we are not able to integrate the nonacademic needs data collection into the same SmartSheets FOI collection. The Qualtrics report will be emailed with the FOI submission link. You will receive a new link each quarter.

4. Deadlines

    a.   When do we complete the FOI rubric?
Complete the FOI rubric with your teams shortly before the FOI submission window opens.

    b.   When do we submit the SmartSheets FOI survey?
The following submission windows are estimates for SY 25-26:
Quarter One: submit the FOI survey October 1st - 10th
Quarter Two: submit the FOI survey January 5th – 14th
Quarter Three: submit the FOI survey April 1st - 10th
Quarter Four: submit the FOI survey May 20th – June 12th

    c.   When do we meet with our ESC SCG Lead?
ESC FOI check-ins will be scheduled after the FOI submission window closes, depending on when the awardee submitted their survey and the scheduling availability of the district and the ESC lead.

    d.   What if we miss a FOI check-in?
FOI check-ins are required to ensure awardees have ample opportunities to discuss goal progress, deliverables progress, challenges/successes, and any additional support requests. Missing FOI survey submissions and check-ins will result in lower FOI scores and missed opportunities for in-time supports.

5. Check-in Process

    a.   When do FOI check-ins happen?
Quarterly. In school year 2025-2026, check-ins will take place October 2025 (Q1), January/February 2026 (Q2), April 2026 (Q3), and July 2026 (Q4).

    b.   Who facilitates the FOI check-in process?
Regional ESC SCG Leads will facilitate the check-in process. In most cases, it will be a 30 to 60-minute virtual call.

    c.   Who from the district should attend?
We recommend between 1-3 representatives from the district attend. Best practice would be one district leader with oversight of the program, one campus leader at a participating school, and someome from the business office. More representatives are welcome to attend, especially if there are other leaders at participating campuses.

    d.   Will the TEA participate?
Yes. The TEA program team intends to join virtual calls thoroughout the grant cycle so that all 99 awardees have at least one virtual check-in call with the TEA present. The program team at TEA looks forward to learning from the field!