

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2024**

Texas



PART B DUE February 2, 2026

**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 ensuring that children with disabilities (CWD) receive a high-quality education that prepares them for success. TEA's Office of Special Populations and Student Supports (OSPSS) works to improve outcomes for CWD through monitoring, technical assistance, professional learning, and stakeholder engagement. Texas received a "Meets Requirements" determination from the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) for federal fiscal year (FFY) 2023, demonstrating the state's commitment to Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) compliance and continuous improvement.

The FFY 2024 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) reflects TEA's progress in ensuring compliance with IDEA Part B and improving special education services across Texas' 1,212 local educational agencies (LEAs). The report includes 18 indicators covering Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE), Disproportionate Representation, Child Find, Effective Transition, and General Supervision.

Key Highlight

- SPPI 11 (Timely Initial Evaluations) has seen a year-over-year increase in compliance since FFY 2021, even with a rise in the number of children referred for special education evaluations between FFY 2021 and FFY 2023. This steady improvement reflects stronger Child Find efforts, increased evaluator training, and enhanced monitoring of compliance timelines.

TEA's monitoring system ensures that over 300 LEAs are reviewed annually through cyclical, targeted, intensive monitoring, and other ongoing monitoring activities. TEA also engages stakeholders, including parents, educators, and advocacy groups, to help set targets, analyze data, and develop improvement strategies.

This report demonstrates TEA's commitment to ensuring timely evaluations, improving compliance, and supporting LEAs in delivering high-quality services for CWD across Texas. The FFY 2024 SPP/APR report will be publicly available at:

<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report>.

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 Reports: <https://tea.texas.gov/reports-and-data/data-submission/state-performance-plan>
- SPP Indicator Reports at the LEA, Regional, and State Levels: <https://rptsrv1.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

1,212

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). Include a description of all the mechanisms the State uses to identify and verify correction of noncompliance and improve results. This should include, but not be limited to, State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which the State is able to determine compliance and/or issue written findings of noncompliance. The State should include the following elements:

Describe the process the State uses to select LEAs for monitoring, the schedule, and number of LEAs monitored per year.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) monitors over 300 local educational agencies (LEAs) annually through its Differentiated Monitoring and Support (DMS) system. The DMS includes three primary types of monitoring: cyclical monitoring, targeted monitoring, and intensive support. TEA employs a data-driven, risk-based approach to determine which LEAs require more intensive monitoring and technical assistance.

Monitoring Schedule and Selection Process

TEA operates on a six-year cyclical monitoring schedule, ensuring a balanced and representative statewide distribution across regional education service centers (ESCs) and different district types. All LEAs are assigned to one of six monitoring cycles through a randomized process, which ensures equitable distribution. The monitoring schedule is updated twice per year during the DMS Data Validation process in the summer and fall to account for LEAs that may open, close, or consolidate.

Within each monitoring year, LEAs are divided into three groups for staggered reviews:

- Group 1: October–December
- Group 2: January–March
- Group 3: April–June

This staggered approach ensures that TEA can provide timely notification of noncompliance within three months of identification, in accordance with OSEP Memo 23-01.

Types of Monitoring and Selection Criteria

1. Cyclical Monitoring: Cyclical monitoring occurs based on the six-year monitoring schedule. LEAs assigned to the current monitoring cycle are scheduled for specific monitoring activities during the DMS Summer Data Validation process, which occurs in early August. Specific monitoring activities are based on the LEA's Results-Driven Accountability (RDA) determination level (DL) from the prior year.

LEAs receive different levels of monitoring based on their RDA determination level:

- Meets Requirements (DL 1) or Needs Assistance (DL 2): Comprehensive student file reviews.
- Needs Intervention (DL 3) or Needs Substantial Intervention (DL 4): Comprehensive student file reviews and on-site visits.

For example, during the 2024-25 school year, Cycle 6 LEAs were selected for cyclical monitoring based on their 2023 RDA determination levels.

2. Targeted Monitoring: Targeted monitoring is assigned to LEAs that are not in the current cyclical monitoring cycle (off-cycle LEAs). Selection occurs during the DMS Fall Data Validation process, which takes place in early November. Eligibility for targeted monitoring is based on an LEA's 2024 RDA determination level and Significant Disproportionality (SD) status. LEAs receive different levels of monitoring based on the following criteria:

- RDA DL 3 or 4: Targeted student file reviews.
- RDA DL 2 and SD Year 3 in one area: Targeted student file reviews.
- RDA DL 2 and SD Year 3 in two or more areas (without a prior year targeted on-site visit): Targeted student file reviews and on-site visits.

3. Intensive Support Monitoring: These LEAs undergo both student file reviews and on-site visits. The selection for intensive support monitoring is based on the following criteria:

- The LEA is not in the current cyclical monitoring cycle (Cycle 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5).
- The LEA has a 2024 RDA determination level of 3 or 4.
- The LEA is in Significant Disproportionality (SD) Year 3 status.

Additional and Ongoing Monitoring Activities

TEA also conducts ongoing monitoring for nonpublic schools, off-campus placements, residential facilities (RFs), and dispute resolution processes:

- TEA monitors LEA placements in private settings to ensure compliance with Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) requirements. More details are available at:

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

- TEA monitors four state schools that provide educational services to children with individualized education programs (IEPs): Texas School for the Deaf, Texas School for the Blind and Visually Impaired, Texas Juvenile Justice Department, and the Windham Prison System.

- Under 19 TAC §97.1072, TEA monitors LEAs that serve students with IEPs who reside in residential facilities (RFs) to ensure compliance with Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) requirements.

Monitoring Noncompliance Through the Correspondence and Dispute Resolution Management System (CDRMS)

TEA tracks noncompliance findings using the Correspondence and Dispute Resolution Management System (CDRMS), which supports:

- Special education complaint tracking, corrective action plans (CAPs), and LEA correspondence.
- Electronic docketing and record retention for due process hearings and mediations.
- State-sponsored facilitations for resolving disputes involving children with disabilities (CWD).

TEA also monitors LEA noncompliance through the ASCEND platform in the Texas Education Agency Login (TEAL) system. The system documents:

- The date of noncompliance notification.
- The required correction due date.
- The date noncompliance is resolved.

LEAs that fail to correct noncompliance within one year receive escalated oversight, including additional interventions and sanctions. Further details on interventions and sanctions can be found in 19 TAC §89.1076.

Fiscal Monitoring and Compliance

TEA ensures that LEAs comply with federal fiscal requirements, including Maintenance of Effort (MOE) and excess cost provisions. The annual IDEA-B MOE review evaluates whether LEAs meet at least one of four required fiscal tests. TEA provides compliance reports and tools through the Grants and Federal Fiscal Compliance (GFFC) TEAL application (for additional information, see:

<https://tea.texas.gov/finance-and-grants/grants/federal-fiscal-compliance-and-reporting/idea-fiscal-compliance/idea-b-lea-maintenance-of-effort>).

Summary of TEA's Monitoring Process

TEA's monitoring system ensures that approximately 300 LEAs are reviewed annually through a structured, data-driven approach that differentiates the type and intensity of monitoring based on LEA performance and compliance indicators. The system allows TEA to focus resources on LEAs with the greatest needs, ensuring targeted support for improving outcomes for CWD.

For further details, refer to the TEA Differentiated Monitoring and Support Guide at:

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

Describe how student files are chosen, including the number of student files that are selected, as part of the State's process for determining an LEA's compliance with IDEA requirements and verifying the LEA's correction of any identified noncompliance.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) selects student files to monitor local educational agency (LEA) compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and to verify the correction of identified noncompliance. TEA employs a stratified random sampling method to ensure fair representation across grade levels while maintaining consistency in compliance evaluations across LEAs of different sizes.

LEA Selection for Monitoring (Prerequisite for student file selection):

TEA identifies LEAs for monitoring through the Differentiated Monitoring and Support (DMS) Data Validation process. Each year, approximately 300 LEAs are selected for review based on the following monitoring types:

- Cyclical Monitoring: LEAs are selected based on a six-year monitoring cycle. Approximately 200 LEAs undergo cyclical monitoring annually. LEAs are assigned to either a folder review and policy review or a folder review, policy review, and on-site review.
- Targeted Monitoring: LEAs are selected based on LEA Determination results and LEA Significant Disproportionality status. Targeted monitoring occurs independently from cyclical monitoring.
- Intensive Support Monitoring: LEAs requiring substantial intervention are selected based on LEA Determination results and LEA Significant Disproportionality status. These LEAs engage in structured, sustained support activities.

Student File Selection Process:

Once an LEA is selected for monitoring, TEA determines the number of student files to be reviewed based on the LEA's total special education population. The sample is stratified to ensure a proportional distribution of elementary (K-5) and secondary (6-12) students. TEA applies a randomized selection process to ensure that each student receiving special education services has an equal chance of selection.

Student File Sample Sizes:

TEA uses pre-calculated sample size tables based on the special education population in the LEA. The required number of student files varies by monitoring type. For cyclical monitoring, the following sample size table is used:

Population Size	Sample Size
1-9	Census
10-31	10
32-45	16
46-67	18
68-109	20
110-228	22
>= 229	24

The sample size table is used to determine the number of student files for targeted monitoring and intensive support.

Population Size	Sample Size
1-3	Census
4-6	4
7-11	6
12-19	8
20-33	10
34-65	12
66-225	14
>=226	16

Backup Samples for File Replacements:

To account for missing files or student attrition, TEA generates three equivalent random samples per LEA:

- Primary Sample – Initial set of files for review.
- Secondary Sample – Used when a primary sample file is unavailable.
- Tertiary Sample – Additional backup to replace unavailable files.

On-Site Review Sample Selection:

For LEAs selected for an on-site review, a smaller subset of student files is reviewed. This sample is drawn from the files used in the cyclical or targeted monitoring process.

Special Education Population	On-Site Review Sample Size

2-24 students	2
46-228	4
229 or more	6

In addition, monitoring personnel may request discretionary sampling pulls for additional children with individualized education programs (IEPs) at residential facilities (RF) and children with IEPs attending a campus in the Texas Virtual School Network (TXVSN).

Ensuring Fair and Equitable Monitoring:

TEA maintains consistency by using an 80% confidence level and a $\pm 13\%$ margin of error across all LEAs. This ensures:

- Equitable review across LEAs of different sizes – Small LEAs are not overburdened, and large LEAs receive adequate review.
- Statistical reliability – Sample sizes are designed to minimize bias while maintaining feasibility.
- Operational feasibility – The approach ensures that monitoring nearly 300 LEAs annually remains manageable.

All children with IEPs in an LEA have an equal likelihood of selection. The selected student files reflect the grade-level distribution of the special education population at an LEA.

For more details on TEA's student file selection process, refer to Appendix D: Special Education Sampling Methods in the Differentiated Monitoring and Support Guide:

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

<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/dms-guide-2024-2025.pdf>

Describe the data system(s) the State uses to collect monitoring and SPP/APR data, and the period from which records are reviewed.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) utilizes multiple secure data systems to collect, manage, and monitor information required for the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR). These systems support both compliance and performance monitoring across local educational agencies (LEAs) and provide critical data for federal reporting and general supervision activities.

Primary Data Systems and Their Functions

TEA collects monitoring and SPP/APR data through several integrated platforms, each serving a specific purpose in tracking, managing, and verifying LEA compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

1. Ascend Application (Texas Education Agency Login (TEAL) System): This system supports cyclical and targeted monitoring activities, including desk reviews, policy reviews, and onsite reviews. It organizes LEA monitoring assignments based on their designated monitoring group and ensures timely completion of required activities.

2. Texas Student Data System (TSDS): TSDS serves as the primary platform for collecting student-level data related to key performance indicators in the SPP/APR. TEA collects data through specific modules, including:

- Child Find Collection: Gathers data for State Performance Plan Indicator (SPPI) 11 (Child Find) and SPPI 12 (Early Childhood Transition). LEAs must submit Child Find data by the last Thursday in July each year.
- SPPI 14 (Post-School Outcomes Survey): Collects student and parent contact information for follow-up surveys measuring post-secondary engagement. Data from TSDS is integrated with the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) to enhance accuracy.
- Residential Facility (RF) Tracker: Monitors special education services provided to children with individualized education programs (IEPs) residing in residential facilities within an LEA's jurisdiction.

3. State Performance Plan (SPP) Application (TEAL System): This system serves as the central reporting platform for SPPI 7 (Preschool Outcomes) and SPPI 13 (Secondary Transition). LEAs are required to submit student-level data annually to verify compliance with federal reporting requirements.

4. Correspondence and Dispute Resolution Management System (CDRMS): This platform tracks dispute resolution activities related to SPPI 15 (Mediation) and SPPI 16 (Resolution Sessions). It manages formal complaints, due process hearings, and resolution sessions, ensuring that compliance issues are documented and addressed within federally required timelines.

5. Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS): PEIMS collects a broad range of educational data used for monitoring both compliance and performance indicators. Data submitted through PEIMS includes:

- Graduation Rates (SPPI 1)
- Dropout Rates (SPPI 2)
- Suspension and Expulsion Data (SPPI 4A and 4B)
- Educational Environments (SPPI 5 and 6)

- Parent Involvement (SPPI 8)
- Disproportionate Representation (SPPI 9 and 10)

6. Consolidated Accountability File (CAF): This system supports performance calculations for SPPI 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D (Participation and Performance on State Assessments) and SPPI 17 (State Systemic Improvement Plan -SSIP Reading Achievement).

7. Texas Education Directory (AskTED): Provides official LEA directory information, which is used for data validation and monitoring assignments.

8. Consolidated Entitlements Management System (CEMS): Tracks fiscal agent and shared service arrangement (SSA) data, ensuring that funding allocations align with monitoring requirements.

9. Educator Certification Online System for Educators (ECOS for Educators): Verifies educator certification information for special education monitoring.

10. Accountability Application (TEAL System): Provides secure access to accountability reports related to state and federal performance monitoring, including the Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) and other compliance data sources.

Review Period for Data Collection

For the FFY 2024 SPP/APR submission, TEA primarily reviewed data from July 1, 2024, to June 30, 2025. However, for indicators requiring lagged data, such as SPPI 1 (Graduation Rates), SPPI 2 (Dropout Rates), and SPPI 4 (Suspensions and Expulsions), TEA reviewed data from July 1, 2023, to June 30, 2024.

Additionally, for SPPI 18 (Timely Correction of Noncompliance), TEA reviewed noncompliance findings identified from July 1, 2023, to June 30, 2024, and verified corrections made no later than one year from notification, covering the period from July 1, 2024, to June 30, 2025.

TEA's integrated data systems ensure accurate and timely monitoring of LEA compliance and performance under IDEA. These systems track, manage, and validate federally required data while facilitating targeted monitoring, dispute resolution, and programmatic improvement efforts across Texas LEAs.

For more information on TEA's data collection and monitoring processes, visit the Differentiated Monitoring and Support (DMS) webpage:

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

Describe how the State issues findings: by number of instances or by LEAs.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) issues findings of noncompliance at the local educational agency (LEA) level, rather than by the number of individual instances of noncompliance. This approach aligns with guidance from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) and ensures that findings are reported based on the specific regulation or requirement that has been violated, rather than counting each occurrence separately.

When TEA identifies multiple incidents of noncompliance related to the same standard during monitoring activities, they are consolidated into a single finding of noncompliance for the LEA. This method allows TEA to focus on system-level improvements rather than isolated cases. By issuing findings at the LEA level, TEA ensures that corrective actions address broader compliance concerns and improve overall program implementation.

If applicable, describe the adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction).

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) allows local educational agencies (LEAs) to correct noncompliance before an official finding is issued through a pre-finding correction process. This process occurs during the clarification period, which takes place within three months before a finding would be issued. If TEA verifies that an LEA meets specific criteria during this period, the case is considered pre-finding correction, and no formal finding of noncompliance is issued.

To qualify for pre-finding correction, the LEA must demonstrate the following:

- Full Compliance with Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Requirements – Through the State's review of updated data, the LEA has achieved 100 percent compliance with the regulatory requirement through updated evidence, such as revised policies and procedures, staff training, and self-monitoring activities.
- Correction of Child-Specific Noncompliance – If applicable, the LEA has corrected each instance of child-specific noncompliance unless the child is no longer within the LEA's jurisdiction.
- No Overlapping Corrective Actions – The identified noncompliance is not already subject to a corrective action plan (CAP) under a TEA complaint investigation or due process hearing decision.

If TEA verifies these criteria, the noncompliance is resolved without an official finding, aligning with OSEP Memo 23-01, Section B-11.

State Performance Plan (SPP) Clarification Process

TEA tracks and verifies child-specific corrections through the State Performance Plan Indicators (SPPI) Verification of Child-Specific Corrections spreadsheet, which is used to document whether LEAs have met compliance requirements during the clarification process. LEAs may participate in the clarification process for pre-finding correction under the following conditions:

- Timely Data Submission – The LEA must submit required data on time. Late submissions or extension requests disqualify the LEA from the clarification process for that indicator.

- **Technical Issues** – If an LEA experiences a verified technical issue with a TEA data collection system that prevents timely submission, the LEA must notify TEA before the deadline. Approved technical issues allow continued participation in the clarification process.
- **Exemptions** – LEAs that do not serve students in the relevant grade or age range for a specific indicator are exempt from submission requirements and the clarification process.

Resources for LEAs in the Clarification Process

TEA provides guidance and training for LEAs participating in pre-finding correction:

- **SPPI Clarification Process One-Pager:**
<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/sppi-clarification-one-pager-e2025.pdf>
- **SPPI Clarification External Training Deck:**
<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/sppi-clarification-training-deck-e2025.pdf>
- **LEA Data Submission Extension Request (SY 2024-25):**
<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/lea-data-submission-extension-requests-0.pdf>
- **SPPI Clarification Process Participation Considerations:**
<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/sppi-clarification-process-participation-considerations-e2025.pdf>

By allowing pre-finding correction, TEA provides LEAs an opportunity to resolve noncompliance proactively, reinforcing system-level improvements without formal findings when corrective actions are completed within the clarification period.

Describe the State's system of graduated and progressive sanctions to ensure the correction of identified noncompliance and to address areas in need of improvement, used as necessary and consistent with IDEA Part B's enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) employs a tiered system of sanctions to ensure the correction of identified noncompliance and to address areas in need of improvement. This system follows a graduated and progressive approach, with increasingly stringent sanctions based on the severity, persistence, or recurrence of noncompliance. TEA's approach aligns with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B's enforcement provisions, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

Levels of Sanctions

TEA applies graduated levels of enforcement actions to local educational agencies (LEAs) based on the extent of noncompliance and the LEA's ability to correct deficiencies.

- **Low-Level Sanctions** involve initial or minor noncompliance and focus on corrective action through support and guidance. TEA may require technical assistance and guidance, a corrective action plan (CAP), or increased monitoring and reporting requirements.
- **Intermediate Sanctions** apply to persistent or more serious noncompliance and involve additional oversight and structured intervention. TEA may require mandatory training for staff, on-site visits and individualized education program (IEP) folder reviews, or redirection of funds to address noncompliance.
- **High-Level Sanctions** apply to significant, ongoing, or repeated noncompliance and may involve state intervention. TEA may appoint a special monitor or manager, substantially withhold or recover funds, refer the LEA for further enforcement action, or withhold federal IDEA funds.

Factors Considered in Applying Sanctions

TEA considers several factors when determining the appropriate level of sanction:

- Nature and extent of the noncompliance
- Impact on students with disabilities
- History of compliance
- Efforts made to correct issues
- Capacity of the LEA to implement corrective actions

Alignment with Federal Requirements

The sanction system is designed to align with:

- IDEA Part B enforcement provisions
- OMB Uniform Guidance requirements
- Applicable State rules and regulations

Due Process and Appeal Rights

TEA ensures that its sanction system includes procedural safeguards for LEAs. The process includes formal notification of noncompliance findings, opportunities for LEAs to correct issues before escalating enforcement actions, and procedures for appealing sanction determinations when applicable.

Focus on Continuous Improvement

While sanctions are used when necessary, the primary goal is to support continuous improvement in special education services and compliance. The system emphasizes technical assistance, guidance, and support to address the root causes of noncompliance. TEA's graduated and progressive approach allows it to respond appropriately to different levels of noncompliance while working collaboratively with LEAs to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Describe how the State makes annual determinations of LEA performance, including the criteria the State uses and the schedule for notifying LEAs of their determinations. If the determinations are made public, include a web link for the most recent determinations.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) makes annual determinations of local educational agency (LEA) performance under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). These determinations assess how well LEAs implement federal IDEA requirements and ensure compliance.

TEA assigns LEAs one of four determination levels (DLs):

- Meets Requirements (DL1)
- Needs Assistance (DL2)
- Needs Intervention (DL3)
- Needs Substantial Intervention (DL4)

Criteria for LEA Determinations

TEA uses multiple data sources to evaluate LEA performance, including:

- Results-Driven Accountability (RDA): Measures LEA performance on special education indicators related to academic achievement, post-secondary readiness, and disproportionality analysis. TEA publishes RDA reports at: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/results-driven-accountability-rda>
- Federally Required Elements (FREs): Includes IDEA compliance indicators such as State Performance Plan Indicator (SPPI) 4b, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, timely data submission, uncorrected noncompliance beyond one year, and financial audit compliance related to IDEA, Part B.

Performance Level (PL) Calculation

TEA assigns performance levels (PLs) to standardize comparisons across multiple measures. The raw data for each indicator is converted into categorical PLs using percentile-based cut points. PL values are ranked as follows:

- PL 0 (Best Performance)
- PL 1 (Above-Average Performance)
- PL 2 (Below-Average Performance)
- PL 3 (Worst Performance)

In some cases, PL 4 is also used. This classification ensures that performance indicators with different scoring conventions can be interpreted consistently when assigning determinations.

Method for Assigning LEA Determinations

TEA determines an LEA's DL through a three-step process:

- Step 1 – Calculating PL Means: The PL mean for each LEA is calculated as the sum of all PL values divided by the total number of PL assignments. This metric provides an overall measure of special education performance.
- Step 2 – Identifying Percentile-Based Cut Points: The PL Mean is used to establish cut points: the 99th percentile (top 1% of LEAs), the 95th percentile (next 4%), and the 80th percentile (next 15%). The remaining 80% fall below the 80th percentile.
- Step 3 – Assigning Determination Levels: LEAs receive DL1, DL2, DL3, or DL4 based on their percentile ranking. LEAs below the 80th percentile receive Meets Requirements (DL1), those between the 80th and 95th percentile receive Needs Assistance (DL2), those between the 95th and 99th percentile receive Needs Intervention (DL3), and those at or above the 99th percentile receive Needs Substantial Intervention (DL4).

Schedule for LEA Determinations

TEA follows a structured schedule to issue and publicly release LEA determinations.

- TAA 10 Business-Day Review Window: TEA issues a "To the Administrator Addressed" (TAA) correspondence informing LEAs of a 10-business-day review window to examine their confidential RDA data. LEAs can review their data and submit correction requests before determinations are finalized.
- TAA Special Education Determinations Issued: After the review period, TEA sends official notification via TAA correspondence titled "RDA Determinations and Monitoring," informing LEAs that their determinations are finalized and publicly available.
- Public Posting of LEA Determinations: TEA posts regional and statewide LEA determination reports online at: <https://tea.texas.gov/reports-and-data/school-performance/results-driven-accountability-data-and-reports>. Users can search for LEA determination reports by district name or county-district number (CDN).
- LEA Determinations in the Ascend Application: TEA makes determinations available in the Ascend Texas Application, a secure platform within the Texas Education Agency Login (TEAL) that supports LEAs in data collection and monitoring activities.

Ongoing Support and Guidance

TEA provides multiple resources to help LEAs understand and navigate their annual determinations.

- TEA/ESC Zoom Calls: TEA collaborates with regional education service centers (ESCs) to provide updates on determination results during ESC Zoom meetings.
- TEA/LEA Webinars: Regular webinars provide guidance on determination processes and timelines. These sessions are recorded and available at: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/tea-special-education-webinars-and-newsletters>

• **Technical Documentation:** The 2024 RDA Special Education Determination Level Framework explains the methodology and statewide distribution of determinations. This document is available at: <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/rda-dl-framework-sped-0.pdf>

Summary

TEA's annual determination process provides a standardized, data-driven approach to assessing LEA performance. By combining federal compliance indicators and performance metrics, TEA ensures that LEAs receive clear, actionable feedback to support continuous improvement in special education services.

Provide the web link to information about the State's general supervision policies, procedures, and process that is made available to the public.

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

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.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) has established a comprehensive assistance (TA) system that leverages regional education service centers (ESCs), targeted grant programs, statewide initiatives, interagency collaborations, and digital platforms to enhance special education services and promote continuous improvement.

Regional Education Service Centers (ESCs)

TEA coordinates with 20 regional ESCs to provide professional development, training, and implementation support to LEAs, families, and community stakeholders. ESCs serve as the primary conduit for technical assistance by:

- Developing annual Special Education Continuous Improvement Plans (SECIPs) aligned with state-level performance targets.
- Providing universal, targeted, and intensive technical assistance to LEAs based on their needs.
- Offering training sessions, guidance, and individualized coaching to improve Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) implementation.
- Reporting formative data and annual summative data quarterly to TEA on high-leverage regional activities.

ESCs work in close collaboration with TEA staff, identifying scalable best practices and targeted areas for improvement in special education services.

Statewide Technical Assistance Grants and Programs

TEA directs Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B discretionary funds to statewide technical assistance grants that support specific areas of need in special education. The structure of these grants changed after the first 2 months of this State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) reporting period and is outlined below. Although these targeted initiatives still develop resources and professional development for Texas educators, the focus of this new grant structure is now on training, follow up coaching, and direct support to LEAs.

- **Child Find and Early to Exit Individualized Education Program (IEP) Supports:** Provides resources, training, and coaching on Child Find practices, comprehensive evaluations, IEP development, Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) Committee processes and procedures, early childhood special education (ECSE), and activities related to secondary transition to ensure children with disabilities receive appropriate, high-quality services and meet their post-secondary outcomes.
- **Autism Supports:** Provides evidence-based training, follow-up coaching, technical assistance, and instructional resources to support educators serving students with autism and their parents.
- **Complex Needs Content Support:** Provides the tools and supports necessary to equip educators and parents to implement instructional practices, interventions, assistive technology, and other high-yield strategies that are proven to be effective in meeting the diverse academic and functional needs of students with significant cognitive disabilities and complex access needs.
- **Special Education Specialized Supports:** Provides funds to support programs for students who have sensory impairments, including visual, auditory, and tactile needs and resources and professional development to increase the pool of qualified individuals who work with these children (e.g., interpreters, teachers of students who are deaf/hard of hearing, teachers of students who have visual impairments, certified orientation and mobility specialists).
- **Small and Rural Schools (SRS):** Provides specialized support for LEAs in small and rural communities to ensure equitable access to special education services.
- **Dyslexia Technical Assistance:** Supports LEAs, educators, and families with training, resources, and a dedicated dyslexia helpline to improve instruction for students with dyslexia.
- **Meaningful Access Supports:** Supports LEAs and educators with professional learning and coaching in the areas of Universal Design for Learning (UDL), Co-teaching, Specifically Designed Instruction (SDI), and effective implementation of high-quality instructional materials.
- **The Tiered Interventions using Evidence-Based Research (TIER) Grant** provides training and coaching on evidence-based intervention practices within an multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) framework. TIER has:
 - o 234 certified trainers across ESCs and LEAs who deliver MTSS training.
 - o Trained 2,952 educators in person during the 2024-2025 school year.
 - o Delivered 22,528 online self-paced learning courses on MTSS to educators across the state during the 2024-2025 school year

These grants ensure that critical areas of need receive targeted, sustained support, while ESCs help implement these initiatives statewide.

Interagency Collaboration and Partnerships

TEA collaborates with institutes of higher education, state agencies, and stakeholder organizations to enhance technical assistance delivery and resource-sharing. These partnerships:

- Expand specialized expertise and promote best practices in special education.
- Support innovative TA models that align with federal and state priorities.
- Foster stakeholder engagement through advisory councils and community partnerships.

By integrating statewide expertise and local implementation support, TEA ensures that technical assistance is both high-quality and accessible to all LEAs.

Digital Platforms for Technical Assistance

To maximize accessibility and efficiency, TEA maintains centralized digital platforms for special education technical assistance:

- Texas SPED Support (<https://spedsupport.tea.texas.gov/>): Serves as the primary repository for special education resources (e.g., tools/templates, videos, state guidance) and professional development (e.g., asynchronous and synchronous trainings, conferences) for administrators, educators, and support staff. Includes Texas AT Support, which is a vast library of assistive technology that includes guides on selecting the right tools, training materials for students and staff, and examples of best practices. Additionally, Texas SPED Support includes an internal report mechanism that allows TEA to view real time user data to assist in focused outreach of our offerings.
- SPEDTex (<https://www.spedtex.org/>): SPEDTex (Special Education Information Center, available in English and Spanish, serves as a centralized, statewide resource designed to support families and educators of students receiving special education services in Texas. SPEDTex provides live support via phone, email, and online chat with special education experts and has curated content on topics such as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), IEPs, and parent rights.
- Results Driven Accountability (RDA) Documentation (<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/review-and-support/rda-documentation>): Offers guidance on monitoring and compliance requirements for LEAs.

These platforms consolidate TA resources, allowing LEAs, educators, and families to quickly access critical information and training opportunities.

Data-Driven Continuous Improvement

TEA's technical assistance system is rooted in continuous improvement. Grantees and ESCs submit regular performance reports and respond to an annual needs assessment survey, allowing TEA to:

- Monitor TA effectiveness and identify best practices.
- Adjust TA strategies based on LEA needs and performance trends.
- Ensure resources are allocated efficiently to maximize impact.

By using data-driven decision-making, TEA ensures that technical assistance remains responsive, effective, and aligned with special education priorities.

Summary

TEA's technical assistance system integrates regional support, targeted grant programs, interagency collaboration, and digital platforms to provide timely, high-quality, and evidence-based support to LEAs. By leveraging diverse institutional partnerships and continuously refining its TA delivery, TEA ensures that LEAs have the resources, training, and guidance necessary to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

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.

The Texas Education Agency's (TEA) professional development (PD) initiatives are delivered through regional education service centers (ESCs), statewide training programs, online learning platforms, and targeted grant-funded projects.

Educator Certification and Continuing Professional Education

Texas educators must complete state certification requirements and participate in continuing professional education (CPE) to maintain their certification.

- Educators with a standard certificate must renew their certification every 5 years by completing the required number of CPE hours.
- CPE providers must be approved and registered with the State Board for Educator Certification and TEA to ensure high-quality training aligned with student achievement goals.
- TEA offers PD through ESCs, institutes of higher education, local educational agencies (LEAs), and online learning platforms such as TEALearn (<https://register.tealearn.com>).

TEA provides additional resources through the Texas Educators website (<https://tea.texas.gov/texas-educators>) and ESC regional websites (<https://tea.texas.gov/about-tea/other-services/education-service-centers>).

Statewide Professional Development Initiatives

TEA leverages ESCs and statewide technical assistance grants to deliver targeted PD programs. The train-the-trainer model is a key component, where ESCs receive training from TEA and statewide grantees and then train local educational agency (LEA) staff while providing follow-up coaching to ensure fidelity of implementation of skills learned.

- Standards-Based Individualized Education Program (SB IEP) Process Training: Offered in synchronous, asynchronous, and blended formats, this training provides educators with an understanding of the SB IEP process for gathering student data, including the full and individual evaluation, to write the student's present levels of academic achievement and functional performance statement, to draft measurable annual goals with short-term objectives/benchmarks, if appropriate, and to create a data collection system for monitoring progress of the annual goals. A condensed version is available for administrators, and deeper practice sessions are available for services providers (e.g., speech-language pathologists, counselors, occupational therapists, physical therapists).
- Autism Circuit Academy: A comprehensive PD program designed to help Texas educators acquire and effectively implement evidence-based practices (EBPs) for teaching students with autism through coaching and follow-up support. For grant year 2024–25, a total of 53 participants completed the Level 1 course, and 11 participants completed the Level 2 course.
- Supporting Students with Complex Access Needs: A coaching-based PD for educators working with students with significant cognitive disabilities. Training topics include:
 - o Building a Foundation for Supporting Students with Complex Access Needs
 - o A Step Toward IEP Quality and Rigor
 - o Rubric of effective practices
 - o Connecting Instruction and Communication for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities

- o Teaching Literacy to Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities
- Student-Centered Transition Training: TEA offers transition-focused training with follow up coaching support, including:
 - o Writing Appropriate Measurable Postsecondary Goals
 - o Conducting Necessary Transition Assessments
 - o Coordinating Activities for Transition Planning
 - o Required training for Transition and Employment Designees to ensure each LEA has a trained staff member to support student transition needs.

Dyslexia and Assistive Technology Professional Development: A dyslexia-focused PD through the Texas Dyslexia Academy, which consists of six modules:

- Dyslexia Foundations
- The Dyslexia Handbook
- Considerations for Emergent Bilingual Students
- IDEA and Dyslexia
- Screening for Dyslexia
- Dysgraphia

To support educators with assistive technology (AT) integration, TEA provides Texas AT Support (<https://at.tea.texas.gov/>), a library of essential tools and support for educators, including guides on selecting the right tools, training materials for both students and staff, and examples of best practices.

Meaningful Access Training

TEA has developed statewide professional learning programs to increase educator knowledge of meaningful access and inclusive practices. These include:

- Universal Design for Learning (UDL)
- Specially Designed Instruction
- Collaboration and Flexible Grouping for Students with IEPs

Additionally, TEA launched the Strategic Integration Liaisons (SIL) Initiative in 2022 to support systems level change at the district level through effective implementation of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) and Meaningful Access for CWD. The SIL project completed a two-year pilot in July 2024, and continued through the 2024–25 school year, expanding to 24 liaisons statewide to provide coaching, technical assistance, and professional development for LEA leadership teams.

The Tiered Interventions using Evidence-Based Research (TIER) Grant provides training and coaching on EBP within an MTSS framework. TIER has:

- 234 certified trainers across ESCs and LEAs who deliver MTSS training.
- Trained 2,952 educators in person during the 2024-2025 school year.
- Delivered 22,528 online self-paced learning courses on MTSS during the 2024-2025 school year

Statewide Learning Platforms and Digital Resources

TEA offers PD resources through centralized digital platforms, including:

- Texas SPED Support (<https://spedsupport.tea.texas.gov/>): Texas SPED Support serves as the primary repository for special education resources (e.g., tools/templates, videos, state guidance) and PD (e.g., asynchronous and synchronous trainings, conferences) for administrators, educators, and support staff. Includes Texas AT Support, which is a library of assistive technology that includes guides on selecting the right tools, training materials for students and staff, and examples of best practices. Additionally, Texas SPED Support includes an internal report mechanism that allows TEA to view real time user data to assist in focused outreach of our offerings.
- SPEDTex (<https://www.spedtex.org/>): (Special Education Information Center), available in English and Spanish, serves as a centralized, statewide resource designed to support families and educators of students receiving special education services. SPEDTex provides live support via phone, email, and online chat with special education experts and has curated content on topics such as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), IEPs, and parent rights.

Data-Driven Continuous Improvement in Professional Development

TEA ensures PD is data-driven and continuously refined based on feedback from ESCs, LEAs, and educators.

TEA allocates IDEA Part B discretionary funds to statewide technical assistance grants that support specific areas of need in special education. The structure of these grants changed after the first 2 months of this SPP/APR reporting period. While these targeted initiatives still develop resources and PD, the focus of this new structure prioritizes training, follow-up coaching, and direct support to LEAs. ESCs and grantees submit quarterly and annual performance reports to TEA, which helps:

- Monitor the effectiveness of training programs.
- Adjust training content and delivery methods based on educator needs.
- Expand successful PD initiatives statewide.

By maintaining a responsive, evidence-based approach, TEA ensures that educators receive relevant training that leads to improved student outcomes.

Summary

Through certification requirements, ESC training, statewide grants, online learning platforms, and targeted PD initiatives, TEA ensures that educators have access to the tools, resources, and training necessary to improve outcomes for children with disabilities across Texas.

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.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) has established a comprehensive stakeholder engagement system that ensures broad, diverse, and continuous input into special education planning, implementation, and evaluation. This system follows the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model, which integrates annual feedback from stakeholders to improve special education services at the local, regional, and state levels. TEA collects stakeholder input through surveys, public forums, stakeholder meetings, and advisory committees, ensuring that diverse perspectives inform state priorities and decisions.

Stakeholder engagement includes parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, Education Service Centers (ESCs), institutions of higher education, parent-support and advocacy groups, related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. TEA systematically reviews stakeholder group membership and seeks recommendations from internal and external entities to fill vacancies, ensuring statewide geographic and demographic representation.

Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC)

The Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) is an external advisory workgroup that provides guidance on key special education issues in Texas. The purpose of this committee is to facilitate ongoing stakeholder input into the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP). The committee currently consists of 12 members, including two parents.

The TCISC:

- Provides guidance on setting and revising State Performance Plan (SPP) indicator targets.
- Reviews and analyzes the Annual Performance Report (APR), the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and progress on SPP indicator targets.
- Discusses statewide monitoring and general supervision activities and provides feedback to TEA to guide improvement efforts.
- Engages in discussions related to compliance and performance monitoring in Texas.

The TCISC meets quarterly to ensure that a broad range of perspectives are considered in decision-making processes related to improving results for children with disabilities (CWD) and their families.

Special Education Directors Panel

TEA also engages local special education directors through the Special Education Directors Panel, which serves as a direct feedback mechanism between local educational agencies (LEAs) and TEA. This panel includes special education directors from various LEA types, sizes, and geographic regions, ensuring representation from across Texas. Six of the panel's 11 members are parents.

The purpose of this panel is to provide feedback on TEA initiatives and special education projects. TEA works closely with ESCs, which nominate LEA special education directors from their region to serve on the panel. This structure ensures that TEA captures first-hand input from LEA leaders regarding challenges, implementation issues, and areas of need.

The Special Education Directors Panel meets virtually four times per year allowing for ongoing and accessible engagement.

Special Education Director Huddle

The TEA engages ESC special education directors through weekly meetings designed to foster collaboration and dialogue. These directors represent a diverse range of LEAs across Texas, varying in type and size. The meetings serve as a platform for discussing TEA initiatives and special education projects, ensuring that TEA receives direct, informed input. This engagement helps identify potential challenges and considerations relevant to the stakeholder groups these projects aim to support.

Texas Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) for Special Education is the state advisory panel required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The CAC consists of 17 members appointed by the Office of the Governor, each serving staggered four-year terms, with the terms of eight or nine members expiring every two years. The committee currently consists of 11 members, including three parents.

The CAC plays a critical role in identifying and addressing unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities across Texas. It provides advisory input on IDEA-related issues, data reporting, compliance requirements, and policy development.

The CAC meets at least quarterly in public meetings, allowing for transparency and engagement with broader stakeholder groups. The responsibilities of the CAC include:

- Advising TEA on unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities.
- Providing public comments on proposed state rules and regulations related to special education.
- Assisting TEA in developing data reporting systems, including reports to the U.S. Secretary of Education under IDEA.
- Recommending corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring reports.
- Advising TEA on coordinating services across agencies for children with disabilities.

Additionally, the CAC plays a key role in reviewing policies related to significant disproportionality and must submit a biennial report to the Texas Legislature recommending changes to state laws and the TEA rules related to special education.

Meeting dates, agendas, and minutes for the CAC are publicly available on the Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education webpage:

<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>.

Expanding Opportunities for Parent and Community Engagement

TEA is committed to ensuring parents and families are actively engaged in special education planning and decision-making. TEA partners with parent organizations, advocacy groups, and community stakeholders to provide training, outreach, and resources to empower parents as key partners in the educational process.

TEA facilitates public input sessions, statewide surveys, and stakeholder advisory meetings to gather feedback from families on special education policies, practices, and improvement strategies. This engagement helps ensure that Texas parents play an active role in shaping IDEA implementation and improving outcomes for CWD.

Summary

TEA's stakeholder engagement system ensures ongoing, structured opportunities for input from parents, educators, and community members. Through advisory groups such as the TCISC, Special Education Directors Panel, and the CAC, TEA gathers feedback, develops improvement strategies, and evaluates progress toward improving special education services. These mechanisms help strengthen IDEA implementation, enhance parent engagement, and drive continuous improvement across Texas.

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

YES

Number of Parent Members:

11

Parent Members Engagement:

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

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) for Special Education serves as the state advisory panel required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and consists of 17 members appointed by the Office of the Governor. Each member serves a staggered four-year term, with the terms of eight or nine members expiring every two years. Currently, three members are parents, and the Texas Education Agency (TEA) is actively seeking to fill the remaining parent vacancy to ensure continued parent representation.

In accordance with 20 U.S.C. §1416(a)(21)(D) and state regulations, the CAC must submit a biennial report to the Texas Legislature detailing recommended changes to state laws and agency rules related to special education. The CAC also conducts public meetings in compliance with Texas Open Meetings Act, allowing for public participation and commentary.

The CAC plays a critical role in ensuring parent voices are central to special education planning and decision-making. It helps identify unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities (CWD) and provides guidance on data reporting, corrective action plans, and policy implementation.

The CAC meets at least quarterly in public meetings and carries out the following key functions:

- Advises TEA on unmet needs in special education services across Texas.
- Reviews and comments publicly on proposed state regulations and rules related to the education of CWD.
- Assists TEA in developing evaluations and data reporting to the U.S. Secretary of Education under Section 1418 of IDEA.
- Guides TEA in developing corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring reports under IDEA.
- Provides recommendations on coordinating special education services across state agencies.

Additionally, the CAC advises TEA on standards for significant disproportionality determinations and is required by state law to submit a biennial report to the Texas Legislature with recommended changes to state law and agency rules affecting special education.

Parents serving on the CAC contribute significantly by analyzing data, evaluating progress, and providing firsthand insights and feedback to shape policies and improvement strategies for CWD. Their input ensures that state policies align with the real-world experiences of families and communities.

Meeting dates, agendas, and minutes for the CAC are publicly available on the Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education webpage:

<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>.

Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee

The Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) is an external advisory workgroup that provides input on key special education issues. The committee currently consists of 12 members, including two parents.

The TCISC plays a central role in reviewing special education progress and ensuring that improvement strategies align with the needs of families. The committee meets quarterly to analyze data and provide structured input to TEA on improving outcomes for CWD. The primary responsibilities of the TCISC include:

- Advising TEA on setting and revising indicator targets for the State Performance Plan (SPP).

- Reviewing and analyzing the Annual Performance Report (APR), the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and progress on SPP indicator targets, including slippage.
- Discussing statewide monitoring activities and providing feedback to assist in improvement planning.
- Engaging in discussions regarding general supervision activities in the state.

Parents on the TCISC are directly involved in analyzing data for each SPP/APR indicator, evaluating progress toward targets, and reviewing trends in historical performance and compliance. Their contributions ensure that data-driven decision-making reflects the lived experiences of families. They also provide valuable insights into data sources, collection methods, and the impact of special education services on student outcomes.

Special Education Directors Panel

The Special Education Directors Panel consists of local educational agency (LEA) special education directors, with six of its 11 members being parents. This ensures strong parent representation in discussions related to TEA's special education initiatives.

The panel provides feedback on TEA projects and initiatives to ensure that policy decisions reflect the needs of CWD and their families. Education Service Center (ESC) special education directors nominate LEA directors to serve on this panel, ensuring that the group represents diverse geographic regions and district types across Texas.

The panel meets four times per year virtually, allowing for continuous engagement and collaboration. Parents on the Special Education Directors Panel actively contribute by sharing their personal experiences and perspectives on special education services. Their input helps shape improvement strategies, guide decision-making, and ensure policies address the real challenges faced by families and LEAs.

Parent Engagement Across TEA's Initiatives

Beyond formal advisory committees, TEA actively engages individual parents, parent center staff, and parent advocacy groups in ongoing planning and improvement efforts. Parent voices are incorporated into every stage of the continuous improvement process, including:

- Setting and revising targets for SPP indicators based on family input.
- Analyzing data to identify trends and evaluate progress on IDEA implementation.
- Developing improvement strategies that align with the real-world needs of children and families.
- Evaluating progress through ongoing discussions, surveys, and public forums.

In addition, TEA provides families with opportunities to engage through the SPEDTex website (<https://www.spedtex.org>). Parents can volunteer to participate in focus groups and share feedback through their My SPEDTex Account. They can also complete an online survey to help improve the quality and relevance of resources and information shared with stakeholders.

TEA works closely with statewide and regional parent centers to ensure that families have access to the resources, training, and supports needed to advocate for their children. These collaborations help empower parents as equal partners in the special education process.

Summary

The active participation of parents in TEA's stakeholder engagement efforts ensures that family perspectives are at the center of special education decision-making. Through the CAC, TCISC, Special Education Directors Panel, and broader outreach efforts, TEA gathers critical feedback from parents to improve special education services across Texas. By involving parents in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress, TEA ensures that the voices of families are heard, valued, and reflected in policy decisions.

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.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) is committed to improving outcomes for children with disabilities (CWD) by increasing the capacity of diverse parent groups to support the development and implementation of effective strategies. To achieve this goal, TEA collaborates with regional education service centers (ESCs) and the Special Education Information Center (SPEDTex) to provide technical assistance (TA), resources, and meaningful engagement opportunities for parents.

ESCs play a critical role in TEA's special education TA infrastructure by delivering training and support to parents, local educational agencies (LEAs), and community stakeholders. Each ESC develops an annual Regional Special Education Continuous Improvement Plan (SECIP) aligned with the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These plans are based on data-driven needs assessments and describe improvement activities designed to address progress or slippage in key special education indicators.

Parent Engagement Through SPEDTex

TEA has designated SPEDTex as the primary statewide resource for educating and engaging parents. SPEDTex collaborates with families, educators, and advocacy groups to develop and deliver resources that support partnerships between schools, families, and communities.

The SPEDTex website (<https://www.spedtex.org/>), available in English and Spanish, serves as a centralized, mobile-friendly hub for parents and stakeholders, offering resources such as:

- Procedural Safeguards and the Parent's Guide to the Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) Process available in 34 languages, including American Sign Language (ASL).
- Personalized parent accounts allowing families to receive customized reminders, participate in focus groups, and access training opportunities in English and Spanish.

- A Resource Locator tool, parent training webinars, and special education process information, including laws, evaluation procedures, and dispute resolution guidance.

SPEDTex also provides direct support to parents through phone, email, and online chat in English and Spanish. In the past year, SPEDTex consultants responded to over 31,965 inquiries, reflecting the high demand for family engagement support.

To ensure widespread accessibility, every LEA and ESC in Texas is required to provide a direct link to the SPEDTex website on their official pages.

Expanding Parent Capacity Through Webinars and Training

TEA uses data from the SPEDTex Data Dashboard to determine training topics for statewide parent engagement. TEA provides:

- Statewide webinars covering Special Education Updates, Special Education Evaluations, Parent-Directed Special Education Services (PDSES), Understanding Your Child's Individualized Education Program (IEP) and the ARD Process, Navigating Special Education for Emergent Bilingual Families, and Transportation Planning for Students with Disabilities.
- Descriptions of the 13 disability categories under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to help parents understand eligibility criteria.
- A regularly updated Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section based on common parent inquiries.

In FFY 2024, over 120,000 families subscribed to the SPEDTex monthly newsletter, which highlights current trends, parent training opportunities, and important state updates.

Collecting Parent Feedback Through Surveys and Program Reviews

As part of the six-year monitoring cycle, TEA conducts special education program reviews in all LEAs, which include:

- Multilingual electronic surveys (available in Arabic, Chinese, Filipino, Vietnamese, Burmese, and other languages) to gather parent feedback on special education services.
- On-site stakeholder interviews, with translators available as needed.

Survey and interview responses inform TEA's ongoing improvement efforts by identifying areas of strength and areas for growth in LEA special education programs.

Improving Parent Involvement Survey Participation

To increase participation in the annual Parent Involvement Survey, TEA has implemented targeted strategies, including:

- Training and collaboration with district liaisons to streamline administration.
- SPEDTex-hosted instructional webinars for LEAs on how to conduct the Parent Involvement Survey.
- Frequent follow-up with LEAs, encouraging the use of the response rate dashboard for real-time tracking.
- Direct district communication, including phone and email reminders about survey completion deadlines.
- Engagement of ESC Special Education Directors to provide additional support for survey outreach.
- Direct family outreach, including personalized phone calls to parents in districts with low response rates.

These strategies are designed to enhance engagement and increase participation among historically underrepresented parent groups.

Building Parent Knowledge and Advocacy

To ensure that parents understand their rights and can effectively advocate for their child's education, TEA has launched several key initiatives:

- The My SPEDTex Portal, which provides timely, customized updates based on a child's annual ARD meeting and evaluation dates.
- SPEDTex Family Resource Sessions, which bring together parents, educators, and specialists to discuss special education policies and best practices.
- The School, Family, and Community Engagement Initiative, which provides training and coaching for families on how to navigate special education processes, participate in ARD meetings, and support transition planning for post-secondary success.

Summary

TEA's family engagement efforts ensure that diverse parent groups have access to the knowledge, resources, and support necessary to actively participate in the development and implementation of special education programs. Through a statewide network of ESCs, SPEDTex, and targeted training initiatives, TEA is committed to strengthening partnerships between families, schools, and communities to improve outcomes for CWD across Texas. For more information, visit: <https://www.spedtex.org/>.

Soliciting Public Input:

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

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) is committed to soliciting public input throughout the development of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR). Public input is essential for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. TEA actively engages multiple stakeholder groups, including the Texas Continuous Improvement Stakeholder Committee (TCISC), the Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) for Special Education, regional education service centers (ESCs), and the Special Education Directors panel to ensure diverse perspectives inform the development of special education policies and initiatives.

Texas Continuous Improvement Stakeholder Committee (TCISC)

The TCISC serves as an external workgroup that provides advisement on critical special education matters. One of its primary responsibilities is to review, analyze, and provide guidance on setting and revising indicator targets for the SPP.

During the past year, the TCISC met quarterly to:

- Review and analyze the Annual Performance Report (APR), the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and progress on indicator targets, including any slippage.
- Discuss statewide activities related to general supervision and compliance monitoring.
- Provide feedback to assist in improvement planning efforts and the development of evidence-based strategies to improve outcomes for children with disabilities (CWD).

The TCISC's recommendations supported TEA in refining improvement strategies aimed at enhancing the educational experience and performance of CWD across the state.

Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) for Special Education

The CAC, required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), serves as the state advisory panel for special education. The 17-member committee is appointed by the Office of the Governor, with members serving staggered four-year terms. The CAC's role is to advise TEA on policies, unmet needs, and special education program implementation in Texas.

During the past year, the CAC met quarterly in public meetings to:

- Advise TEA on unmet needs within special education services across the state.
- Provide public comments on proposed state rules and regulations affecting CWD.
- Offer guidance on data evaluations, reporting, and state-level corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring findings.
- Recommend policy improvements for coordinating services for CWD statewide.

TEA ensures public transparency by publishing CAC meeting dates, agendas, and minutes on its 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>.

Regional Education Service Centers (ESCs) and Local Engagement

Each ESC develops an annual Regional Special Education Continuous Improvement Plan (SECIP), which identifies regionally developed improvement activities to support special education programs. The SECIP aligns with the SSIP and leverages data analysis at the regional and LEA level to define measurable goals and strategies.

ESCs report quarterly on their progress, outlining:

- Key activities implemented to address state targets.
- Challenges and successes in regional and local service delivery.
- Capacity-building efforts for educators, service providers, and families.

ESCs also play a critical role in facilitating public engagement, hosting family training sessions, stakeholder feedback meetings, and regional summits to inform and engage parents and educators in special education decision-making.

Special Education Directors Panel

The Special Education Directors panel consists of local educational agency (LEA) special education directors, with members nominated by ESC special education directors from their respective regions. This panel provides state-level insight on the real-time challenges and needs of special education programs.

During the past year, the Special Education Directors panel met quarterly with TEA to:

- Provide direct feedback on special education policies and initiatives.
- Discuss the impact of state-level decisions on LEA implementation.
- Review and refine TEA's special education strategies based on local needs.

By engaging with LEA leadership, TEA ensures that SPP/APR target-setting and policy development reflect on-the-ground realities and support meaningful improvement for CWD across all school districts in Texas.

Public Engagement Process and Transparency

In addition to stakeholder committees, TEA actively solicits public input through various mechanisms, including:

- Public comment periods on proposed rule changes and SPP/APR indicators.
- Statewide surveys to collect feedback from parents, educators, and advocacy organizations.
- Virtual and in-person public forums to share updates, gather community perspectives, and discuss improvement strategies.
- Annual reports detailing progress on special education initiatives and data analysis findings.

TEA ensures broad accessibility by making public meeting materials, policy updates, and survey results available online.

Summary

TEA's structured, multi-layered approach to soliciting public input ensures that SPP/APR target-setting, data analysis, improvement planning, and progress evaluation are informed by a diverse range of voices. Through regular engagement with CAC, TCISC, ESCs, the Special Education Directors

panel, and public outreach initiatives, TEA creates a transparent, inclusive, and data-driven framework that supports the continuous improvement of special education services for CWD across Texas.

For more information, visit:

<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>.

Making Results Available to the Public:

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

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) is committed to transparency and public engagement in the development and evaluation of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR). To ensure that stakeholders have access to the results of target setting, data analysis, improvement strategies, and evaluations, TEA uses a variety of communication mechanisms and a regular timeline for disseminating information.

TEA annually releases the SPP/APR for the current six-year cycle, providing detailed reports on the state's performance and progress toward meeting established targets. These reports are made publicly available on TEA's State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report webpage (<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report>). In accordance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) 2004 Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), TEA also produces an annual State Performance Plan Indicator Report for each local educational agency (LEA), comparing their performance to state targets. These LEA-specific reports are accessible through TEA's State Performance Plan Indicators Report webpage (<https://rptsrv1.tea.texas.gov/idea/index.html>).

TEA's Special Populations Systemwide Integration Division hosts regular webinars and Zoom meetings for LEAs and education service centers (ESCs) throughout the year (often monthly). The meetings provide information on special education in Texas, including updates on target setting, data analysis, improvement strategies, and evaluations. Webinar recordings are posted on the TEA Special Education Webinars and Newsletters webpage (<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/tea-special-education-webinars-and-newsletters>).

TEA publishes a monthly Special Education newsletter, available by subscription, which provides timely information, important dates, and new resources. The newsletters are archived on TEA's Special Education Webinars and Newsletters webpage (<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/tea-special-education-webinars-and-newsletters>).

To the Administrator Addressed (TAA) correspondence serves as the TEA official key communication channel to the public. TAAs are published throughout the year (often every Thursday but also as needed for time sensitive information) and serve as essential updates for LEAs, regional ESCs, and other stakeholders. The TEA communications are disseminated on the TEA website and through listserv announcements, ensuring that the public, including parents, LEAs, and ESCs, receive relevant and timely information. TAAs can be found on TEA's "To The Administrator Addressed Correspondence" website (<https://tea.texas.gov/about-tea/news-and-multimedia/correspondence>).

TEA is responsive to inquiries from the public, addressing questions and concerns via phone calls, emails, and Public Information Requests (PIRs). This direct engagement allows stakeholders to seek clarification and provide feedback on the SPP/APR process and results.

The entirety of these communication mechanisms supports a consistent timeline for sharing information throughout the year, demonstrating TEA's commitment to making the results of target setting, data analysis, improvement strategies, and evaluations readily available to the public. This approach fosters transparency, accountability, ongoing collaboration, and trust with stakeholders for children with disabilities (CWD).

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2023 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 2023 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 2023 APR in 2025, is available.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) is committed to transparency and public accountability regarding the performance of local educational agencies (LEAs) in meeting state targets for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B programs. In compliance with 34 CFR § 300.602(b)(1)(i)(A), TEA reported on the FFY 2023 performance of each LEA against the targets established in the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) within 120 days of submitting its FFY 2023 SPP/APR to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).

To facilitate public access to this information, TEA developed an interactive report generator, available on the State Performance Plan Indicator Reports website (<https://rptsrv1.tea.texas.gov/idea/index.html>). The FFY 2023 LEA performance reports were published on this platform on April 29, 2025, ensuring compliance with the 120-day post-submission deadline on February 1, 2025. Members of the public can generate customized reports by selecting the relevant school year, report format (PDF or HTML), report level (State, Region, or District), and then entering the specific LEA name or its unique six-digit county-district number (CDN) assigned by TEA from the Texas Education Directory (AskTED).

TEA submitted its FFY 2023 SPP/APR for IDEA Part B state formula grant programs to OSEP through the Education Monitoring and Planning System (EMAPS) by February 1, 2025. The complete FFY 2023 SPP/APR, along with archived SPP/APRs for the current six-year cycle, are publicly available on TEA's State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report webpage (<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report>). It is important to note that the state maintained the original targets for the current six-year cycle, as submitted with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR on February 1, 2022.

By providing easily accessible, transparent, and timely information on LEA performance in relation to state targets, TEA demonstrates its commitment to public accountability and engagement in the continuous improvement of services and outcomes for students with disabilities across Texas.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Intro - OSEP Response

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 2024 SPP/APR, use data from 2023-2024), 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	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target >=	90.00%	44.77%	45.00%	46.00%	47.00%
Data	77.92%	44.77%	46.27%	49.34%	50.89%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target >=	48.00%	50.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) has established a comprehensive stakeholder engagement system that ensures broad, diverse, and continuous input into special education planning, implementation, and evaluation. This system follows the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model, which integrates annual feedback from stakeholders to improve special education services at the local, regional, and state levels. TEA collects stakeholder input through surveys, public forums, stakeholder meetings, and advisory committees, ensuring that diverse perspectives inform state priorities and decisions.

Stakeholder engagement includes parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, Education Service Centers (ESCs), institutions of higher education, parent-support and advocacy groups, related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. TEA systematically reviews stakeholder group membership and seeks recommendations from internal and external entities to fill vacancies, ensuring statewide geographic and demographic representation.

Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC)

The Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) is an external advisory workgroup that provides guidance on key special education issues in Texas. The purpose of this committee is to facilitate ongoing stakeholder input into the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP). The committee currently consists of 12 members, including two parents.

The TCISC:

- Provides guidance on setting and revising State Performance Plan (SPP) indicator targets.
- Reviews and analyzes the Annual Performance Report (APR), the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and progress on SPP indicator targets.
- Discusses statewide monitoring and general supervision activities and provides feedback to TEA to guide improvement efforts.
- Engages in discussions related to compliance and performance monitoring in Texas.

The TCISC meets quarterly to ensure that a broad range of perspectives are considered in decision-making processes related to improving results for children with disabilities (CWD) and their families.

Special Education Directors Panel

TEA also engages local special education directors through the Special Education Directors Panel, which serves as a direct feedback mechanism between local educational agencies (LEAs) and TEA. This panel includes special education directors from various LEA types, sizes, and geographic regions, ensuring representation from across Texas. Six of the panel's 11 members are parents.

The purpose of this panel is to provide feedback on TEA initiatives and special education projects. TEA works closely with ESCs, which nominate LEA special education directors from their region to serve on the panel. This structure ensures that TEA captures first-hand input from LEA leaders regarding challenges, implementation issues, and areas of need.

The Special Education Directors Panel meets virtually four times per year allowing for ongoing and accessible engagement.

Special Education Director Huddle

The TEA engages ESC special education directors through weekly meetings designed to foster collaboration and dialogue. These directors represent a diverse range of LEAs across Texas, varying in type and size. The meetings serve as a platform for discussing TEA initiatives and special education projects, ensuring that TEA receives direct, informed input. This engagement helps identify potential challenges and considerations relevant to the stakeholder groups these projects aim to support.

Texas Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) for Special Education is the state advisory panel required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The CAC consists of 17 members appointed by the Office of the Governor, each serving staggered four-year terms, with the terms of eight or nine members expiring every two years. The committee currently consists of 11 members, including three parents.

The CAC plays a critical role in identifying and addressing unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities across Texas. It provides advisory input on IDEA-related issues, data reporting, compliance requirements, and policy development.

The CAC meets at least quarterly in public meetings, allowing for transparency and engagement with broader stakeholder groups. The responsibilities of the CAC include:

- Advising TEA on unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities.
- Providing public comments on proposed state rules and regulations related to special education.
- Assisting TEA in developing data reporting systems, including reports to the U.S. Secretary of Education under IDEA.
- Recommending corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring reports.
- Advising TEA on coordinating services across agencies for children with disabilities.

Additionally, the CAC plays a key role in reviewing policies related to significant disproportionality and must submit a biennial report to the Texas Legislature recommending changes to state laws and the TEA rules related to special education.

Meeting dates, agendas, and minutes for the CAC are publicly available on the Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education webpage: <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>.

Expanding Opportunities for Parent and Community Engagement

TEA is committed to ensuring parents and families are actively engaged in special education planning and decision-making. TEA partners with parent organizations, advocacy groups, and community stakeholders to provide training, outreach, and resources to empower parents as key partners in the educational process.

TEA facilitates public input sessions, statewide surveys, and stakeholder advisory meetings to gather feedback from families on special education policies, practices, and improvement strategies. This engagement helps ensure that Texas parents play an active role in shaping IDEA implementation and improving outcomes for CWD.

Summary

TEA's stakeholder engagement system ensures ongoing, structured opportunities for input from parents, educators, and community members. Through advisory groups such as the TCISC, Special Education Directors Panel, and the CAC, TEA gathers feedback, develops improvement strategies, and evaluates progress toward improving special education services. These mechanisms help strengthen IDEA implementation, enhance parent engagement, and drive continuous improvement across Texas.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	19,653

Source	Date	Description	Data
(EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)			
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	16,286
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	151
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	5,329

FFY 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
19,653	41,419	50.89%	48.00%	47.45%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Slippage may be attributed to statewide policy changes that affected local educational agency (LEA) implementation of graduation requirements for students receiving special education services. Following amendments adopted in November 2023, the Texas Education Agency released updated guidance to support LEAs in applying revised graduation requirements; however, the timing of dissemination and variation in local training may have contributed to inconsistent implementation. Additionally, amendments to the Commissioner's Rules proposed in fall 2024 may have influenced LEA understanding and application of graduation pathways. These overlapping policy shifts potentially created transitional inconsistencies across LEAs in applying new or revised graduation requirements statewide and may have contributed to the observed slippage. Regional data do not indicate that particular regions or groups of LEAs contributed more heavily to the decrease in the percentage of youth with IEPs who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma in any generalizable pattern; rather, the differences were generally dispersed across all areas of the state and among LEA types.

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://texas-sos.appianportalsgov.com/rules-and-meetings?chapter=74&interface=VIEW_TAC&part=2&subchapter=B&title=19)

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 local educational agency (LEA) is required.

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

Special Education Services: For students receiving special education services, 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://texas-sos.appianportalsgov.com/rules-and-meetings?\\$locale=en_US&interface=VIEW_TAC_SUMMARY&queryAsDate=11%2F14%2F2025&recordId=221435](https://texas-sos.appianportalsgov.com/rules-and-meetings?$locale=en_US&interface=VIEW_TAC_SUMMARY&queryAsDate=11%2F14%2F2025&recordId=221435)

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 additional information about this indicator, visit the following Texas Education Agency (TEA) webpage:

<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/graduation-rate>

For additional information about the state graduation requirements, visit the following TEA webpage:

<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 2024 SPP/APR, use data from 2023-2024), 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	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target <=	1.80%	13.41%	13.00%	12.00%	11.00%
Data	1.85%	13.41%	16.03%	15.23%	14.07%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target <=	10.00%	9.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) has established a comprehensive stakeholder engagement system that ensures broad, diverse, and continuous input into special education planning, implementation, and evaluation. This system follows the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model, which integrates annual feedback from stakeholders to improve special education services at the local, regional, and state levels. TEA collects stakeholder input through surveys, public forums, stakeholder meetings, and advisory committees, ensuring that diverse perspectives inform state priorities and decisions.

Stakeholder engagement includes parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, Education Service Centers (ESCs), institutions of higher education, parent-support and advocacy groups, related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. TEA systematically reviews stakeholder group membership and seeks recommendations from internal and external entities to fill vacancies, ensuring statewide geographic and demographic representation.

Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC)

The Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) is an external advisory workgroup that provides guidance on key special education issues in Texas. The purpose of this committee is to facilitate ongoing stakeholder input into the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP). The committee currently consists of 12 members, including two parents.

The TCISC:

- Provides guidance on setting and revising State Performance Plan (SPP) indicator targets.
- Reviews and analyzes the Annual Performance Report (APR), the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and progress on SPP indicator targets.
- Discusses statewide monitoring and general supervision activities and provides feedback to TEA to guide improvement efforts.
- Engages in discussions related to compliance and performance monitoring in Texas.

The TCISC meets quarterly to ensure that a broad range of perspectives are considered in decision-making processes related to improving results for children with disabilities (CWD) and their families.

Special Education Directors Panel

TEA also engages local special education directors through the Special Education Directors Panel, which serves as a direct feedback mechanism between local educational agencies (LEAs) and TEA. This panel includes special education directors from various LEA types, sizes, and geographic regions, ensuring representation from across Texas. Six of the panel's 11 members are parents.

The purpose of this panel is to provide feedback on TEA initiatives and special education projects. TEA works closely with ESCs, which nominate LEA special education directors from their region to serve on the panel. This structure ensures that TEA captures first-hand input from LEA leaders regarding challenges, implementation issues, and areas of need.

The Special Education Directors Panel meets virtually four times per year allowing for ongoing and accessible engagement.

Special Education Director Huddle

The TEA engages ESC special education directors through weekly meetings designed to foster collaboration and dialogue. These directors represent a diverse range of LEAs across Texas, varying in type and size. The meetings serve as a platform for discussing TEA initiatives and special education projects, ensuring that TEA receives direct, informed input. This engagement helps identify potential challenges and considerations relevant to the stakeholder groups these projects aim to support.

Texas Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) for Special Education is the state advisory panel required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The CAC consists of 17 members appointed by the Office of the Governor, each serving staggered four-year terms, with the terms of eight or nine members expiring every two years. The committee currently consists of 11 members, including three parents.

The CAC plays a critical role in identifying and addressing unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities across Texas. It provides advisory input on IDEA-related issues, data reporting, compliance requirements, and policy development.

The CAC meets at least quarterly in public meetings, allowing for transparency and engagement with broader stakeholder groups. The responsibilities of the CAC include:

- Advising TEA on unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities.
- Providing public comments on proposed state rules and regulations related to special education.
- Assisting TEA in developing data reporting systems, including reports to the U.S. Secretary of Education under IDEA.
- Recommending corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring reports.
- Advising TEA on coordinating services across agencies for children with disabilities.

Additionally, the CAC plays a key role in reviewing policies related to significant disproportionality and must submit a biennial report to the Texas Legislature recommending changes to state laws and the TEA rules related to special education.

Meeting dates, agendas, and minutes for the CAC are publicly available on the Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education webpage:

<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>.

Expanding Opportunities for Parent and Community Engagement

TEA is committed to ensuring parents and families are actively engaged in special education planning and decision-making. TEA partners with parent organizations, advocacy groups, and community stakeholders to provide training, outreach, and resources to empower parents as key partners in the educational process.

TEA facilitates public input sessions, statewide surveys, and stakeholder advisory meetings to gather feedback from families on special education policies, practices, and improvement strategies. This engagement helps ensure that Texas parents play an active role in shaping IDEA implementation and improving outcomes for CWD.

Summary

TEA's stakeholder engagement system ensures ongoing, structured opportunities for input from parents, educators, and community members. Through advisory groups such as the TCISC, Special Education Directors Panel, and the CAC, TEA gathers feedback, develops improvement strategies, and evaluates progress toward improving special education services. These mechanisms help strengthen IDEA implementation, enhance parent engagement, and drive continuous improvement across Texas.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	19,653

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	16,286
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	151
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	5,329

FFY 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
5,329	41,419	14.07%	10.00%	12.87%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

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 ExitWithdrawType 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 ExitWithdrawType data element is defined by the codes from the ExitWithdrawType C162 code table.

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

This definition aligns with the U.S. Department of Education's EDPass, FS032 - Dropouts File Specifications (SY 2023-2024). 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 additional information about this indicator, visit the following The Texas Education Agency (TEA) webpage:

<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/dropout-rate>

For the TWEDS ExitWithdrawType E1001 data element, refer to the following link:

<https://tealprod.tea.state.tx.us/TWEDSAPI/28/453/0/DataComponents/DataElements/List/10418>

To access the TWEDS ExitWithdrawType C162 code table, visit:

<https://tealprod.tea.state.tx.us/TWEDSAPI/28/453/0/Descriptors/List/3239>

For the FS032 Dropouts File Specifications (SY 2023-2024), please go to:

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 C.F.R. §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	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) has established a comprehensive stakeholder engagement system that ensures broad, diverse, and continuous input into special education planning, implementation, and evaluation. This system follows the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model, which integrates annual feedback from stakeholders to improve special education services at the local, regional, and state levels. TEA collects stakeholder input through surveys, public forums, stakeholder meetings, and advisory committees, ensuring that diverse perspectives inform state priorities and decisions.

Stakeholder engagement includes parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, Education Service Centers (ESCs), institutions of higher education, parent-support and advocacy groups, related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. TEA systematically reviews stakeholder group membership and seeks recommendations from internal and external entities to fill vacancies, ensuring statewide geographic and demographic representation.

Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC)

The Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) is an external advisory workgroup that provides guidance on key special education issues in Texas. The purpose of this committee is to facilitate ongoing stakeholder input into the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP). The committee currently consists of 12 members, including two parents.

The TCISC:

- Provides guidance on setting and revising State Performance Plan (SPP) indicator targets.
- Reviews and analyzes the Annual Performance Report (APR), the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and progress on SPP indicator targets.
- Discusses statewide monitoring and general supervision activities and provides feedback to TEA to guide improvement efforts.
- Engages in discussions related to compliance and performance monitoring in Texas.

The TCISC meets quarterly to ensure that a broad range of perspectives are considered in decision-making processes related to improving results for children with disabilities (CWD) and their families.

Special Education Directors Panel

TEA also engages local special education directors through the Special Education Directors Panel, which serves as a direct feedback mechanism between local educational agencies (LEAs) and TEA. This panel includes special education directors from various LEA types, sizes, and geographic regions, ensuring representation from across Texas. Six of the panel's 11 members are parents.

The purpose of this panel is to provide feedback on TEA initiatives and special education projects. TEA works closely with ESCs, which nominate LEA special education directors from their region to serve on the panel. This structure ensures that TEA captures first-hand input from LEA leaders regarding challenges, implementation issues, and areas of need.

The Special Education Directors Panel meets virtually four times per year allowing for ongoing and accessible engagement.

Special Education Director Huddle

The TEA engages ESC special education directors through weekly meetings designed to foster collaboration and dialogue. These directors represent a diverse range of LEAs across Texas, varying in type and size. The meetings serve as a platform for discussing TEA initiatives and special education projects, ensuring that TEA receives direct, informed input. This engagement helps identify potential challenges and considerations relevant to the stakeholder groups these projects aim to support.

Texas Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) for Special Education is the state advisory panel required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The CAC consists of 17 members appointed by the Office of the Governor, each serving staggered four-year terms, with the terms of eight or nine members expiring every two years. The committee currently consists of 11 members, including three parents.

The CAC plays a critical role in identifying and addressing unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities across Texas. It provides advisory input on IDEA-related issues, data reporting, compliance requirements, and policy development.

The CAC meets at least quarterly in public meetings, allowing for transparency and engagement with broader stakeholder groups. The responsibilities of the CAC include:

- Advising TEA on unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities.
- Providing public comments on proposed state rules and regulations related to special education.
- Assisting TEA in developing data reporting systems, including reports to the U.S. Secretary of Education under IDEA.
- Recommending corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring reports.
- Advising TEA on coordinating services across agencies for children with disabilities.

Additionally, the CAC plays a key role in reviewing policies related to significant disproportionality and must submit a biennial report to the Texas Legislature recommending changes to state laws and the TEA rules related to special education.

Meeting dates, agendas, and minutes for the CAC are publicly available on the Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education webpage:

<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>.

Expanding Opportunities for Parent and Community Engagement

TEA is committed to ensuring parents and families are actively engaged in special education planning and decision-making. TEA partners with parent organizations, advocacy groups, and community stakeholders to provide training, outreach, and resources to empower parents as key partners in the educational process.

TEA facilitates public input sessions, statewide surveys, and stakeholder advisory meetings to gather feedback from families on special education policies, practices, and improvement strategies. This engagement helps ensure that Texas parents play an active role in shaping IDEA implementation and improving outcomes for CWD.

Summary

TEA's stakeholder engagement system ensures ongoing, structured opportunities for input from parents, educators, and community members. Through advisory groups such as the TCISC, Special Education Directors Panel, and the CAC, TEA gathers feedback, develops improvement strategies, and evaluates progress toward improving special education services. These mechanisms help strengthen IDEA implementation, enhance parent engagement, and drive continuous improvement across Texas.

FFY 2024 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2024-25 Assessment Participation in Reading/Language Arts (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 882, 883)

Date:

01/07/2026

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	88,191	58,852	95,800
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	9,030	5,121	7,222
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	71,781	47,888	70,892
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	6,668	4,906	4,924

Data Source:

SY 2024-25 Assessment Participation in Mathematics (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 880, 881)

Date:

01/07/2026

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	87,979	64,671	71,916
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	9,099	6,665	7,645
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	71,605	52,167	57,031
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	6,666	4,907	4,932

(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 2024 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	87,479	88,191	99.17%	95.00%	99.19%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	57,915	58,852	98.40%	95.00%	98.41%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	83,038	95,800	86.77%	95.00%	86.68%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	87,370	87,979	99.29%	95.00%	99.31%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	63,739	64,671	98.44%	95.00%	98.56%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	69,608	71,916	96.44%	95.00%	96.79%	Met target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) is committed to maintaining transparency in student assessments by providing publicly accessible reporting resources:

(1)(a) the number of children with disabilities participating in regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments:

Texas Performance Reporting System (TAPR) 2024-25 STAAR Participation - Additional Student Groups State Report

https://rptsrv1.tea.texas.gov/cgi/sas/broker?_service=marykay&_program=perfrep.perfmast.sas&_debug=0&ccyy=2025&lev=S&prgopt=reports/tapr/part_addsg.sas

(1)(b) the number of children with disabilities participating in alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards:

2025 Federal Report Card – State

Select "Part (xi): STAAR Alternate 2 Participation" from the TABLE OF CONTENTS menu

https://rptsrv1.tea.texas.gov/cgi/sas/broker?_service=marykay&_program=perfrep.perfmast.sas&_debug=0&frc=yes&ccyy=2025&lev=S&prgopt=reports%2Ffrc%2Ffrc.sas

(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:

2025 Federal Report Card – State

This section provides information on student achievement on the STAAR (State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness) performance for mathematics, reading/ELA, and science by grade level and proficiency level for the 2024-25 school year. These results include all students tested, regardless of whether they were in the accountability subset. (CWD: children with disability; CWOD: children without disability; EL: English learner).

https://rptsrv1.tea.texas.gov/cgi/sas/broker?_service=marykay&_program=perfrep.perfmast.sas&_debug=0&frc=yes&ccyy=2025&lev=S&prgopt=reports%2Ffrc%2Ffrc.sas

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For additional information about this indicator, visit the following The Texas Education Agency (TEA) webpage:

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

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

OSEP's response to the State's FFY 2022 SPP/APR required the State to provide OSEP with 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). The State provided the required information.

Response to actions required in FFY 2023 SPP/APR

In response to the required actions outlined in the 2024 determination letter, the State of Texas is providing evidence of compliance with 34 CFR § 300.160(f) regarding the public reporting of statewide assessment participation for children with disabilities. Below is the requested information, along with instructions for accessing the publicly reported data.

- Date of State's 2024 determination letter receipt: June 21, 2024
- Date of FFY 2022 compliance web link provision to OSEP: September 18, 2024 26 Part B
- Number of days from receipt of determination letter to web link provision: 89 The State now publicly reports on the Texas Education Agency (TEA) website the performance and the participation of children with disabilities on both the statewide assessment and the statewide assessment with accommodations with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children.

1. The publicly accessible web link for assessment data is the Texas Performance Reporting System (TPRS):

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

- a. State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) Performance - Additional Student Groups [accountability subset]
 - i. All special education students (column: "Special Ed")
 - ii. Special education students with accommodations (column: "Special Ed With Accom")
 - iii. Special education students without accommodations (column: "Special Ed Without Accom")
 - b. STAAR Performance (All Students) - Additional Student Groups [all tests]
 - i. All special education students (column: "Special Ed")
 - ii. Special education students with accommodations (column: "Special Ed With Accom")
 - iii. Special education students without accommodations (column: "Special Ed Without Accom")
 - c. STAAR Participation - Additional Student Groups [accountability subset]
 - i. All special education students (column: "Special Ed")
 - ii. Special education students with accommodations (column: "Special Ed With Accom")
 - iii. Special education students without accommodations (column: "Special Ed Without Accom")
- 2. The frequency with which assessment data are publicly reports is annually on the TPRS web portal.
 - 3. The detail data are publicly reported is at the campus, district, region, and statewide levels for tested subjects.

3A - OSEP Response

3A - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	11.83%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	10.04%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	10.49%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	13.25%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	10.96%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	10.28%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	30.00%	40.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	30.00%	40.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	30.00%	40.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	30.00%	40.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	30.00%	40.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	30.00%	40.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) has established a comprehensive stakeholder engagement system that ensures broad, diverse, and continuous input into special education planning, implementation, and evaluation. This system follows the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model, which integrates annual feedback from stakeholders to improve special education services at the local, regional, and state levels. TEA collects stakeholder input through surveys, public forums, stakeholder meetings, and advisory committees, ensuring that diverse perspectives inform state priorities and decisions.

Stakeholder engagement includes parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, Education Service Centers (ESCs), institutions of higher education, parent-support and advocacy groups, related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. TEA systematically reviews stakeholder group membership and seeks recommendations from internal and external entities to fill vacancies, ensuring statewide geographic and demographic representation.

Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC)

The Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) is an external advisory workgroup that provides guidance on key special education issues in Texas. The purpose of this committee is to facilitate ongoing stakeholder input into the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP). The committee currently consists of 12 members, including two parents.

The TCISC:

- Provides guidance on setting and revising State Performance Plan (SPP) indicator targets.
- Reviews and analyzes the Annual Performance Report (APR), the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and progress on SPP indicator targets.
- Discusses statewide monitoring and general supervision activities and provides feedback to TEA to guide improvement efforts.
- Engages in discussions related to compliance and performance monitoring in Texas.

The TCISC meets quarterly to ensure that a broad range of perspectives are considered in decision-making processes related to improving results for children with disabilities (CWD) and their families.

Special Education Directors Panel

TEA also engages local special education directors through the Special Education Directors Panel, which serves as a direct feedback mechanism between local educational agencies (LEAs) and TEA. This panel includes special education directors from various LEA types, sizes, and geographic regions, ensuring representation from across Texas. Six of the panel's 11 members are parents.

The purpose of this panel is to provide feedback on TEA initiatives and special education projects. TEA works closely with ESCs, which nominate LEA special education directors from their region to serve on the panel. This structure ensures that TEA captures first-hand input from LEA leaders regarding challenges, implementation issues, and areas of need.

The Special Education Directors Panel meets virtually four times per year allowing for ongoing and accessible engagement.

Special Education Director Huddle

The TEA engages ESC special education directors through weekly meetings designed to foster collaboration and dialogue. These directors represent a diverse range of LEAs across Texas, varying in type and size. The meetings serve as a platform for discussing TEA initiatives and special education projects, ensuring that TEA receives direct, informed input. This engagement helps identify potential challenges and considerations relevant to the stakeholder groups these projects aim to support.

Texas Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) for Special Education is the state advisory panel required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The CAC consists of 17 members appointed by the Office of the Governor, each serving staggered four-year terms, with the terms of eight or nine members expiring every two years. The committee currently consists of 11 members, including three parents.

The CAC plays a critical role in identifying and addressing unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities across Texas. It provides advisory input on IDEA-related issues, data reporting, compliance requirements, and policy development.

The CAC meets at least quarterly in public meetings, allowing for transparency and engagement with broader stakeholder groups. The responsibilities of the CAC include:

- Advising TEA on unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities.
- Providing public comments on proposed state rules and regulations related to special education.
- Assisting TEA in developing data reporting systems, including reports to the U.S. Secretary of Education under IDEA.
- Recommending corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring reports.
- Advising TEA on coordinating services across agencies for children with disabilities.

Additionally, the CAC plays a key role in reviewing policies related to significant disproportionality and must submit a biennial report to the Texas Legislature recommending changes to state laws and the TEA rules related to special education.

Meeting dates, agendas, and minutes for the CAC are publicly available on the Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education webpage:

<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>.

Expanding Opportunities for Parent and Community Engagement

TEA is committed to ensuring parents and families are actively engaged in special education planning and decision-making. TEA partners with parent organizations, advocacy groups, and community stakeholders to provide training, outreach, and resources to empower parents as key partners in the educational process.

TEA facilitates public input sessions, statewide surveys, and stakeholder advisory meetings to gather feedback from families on special education policies, practices, and improvement strategies. This engagement helps ensure that Texas parents play an active role in shaping IDEA implementation and improving outcomes for CWD.

Summary

TEA's stakeholder engagement system ensures ongoing, structured opportunities for input from parents, educators, and community members. Through advisory groups such as the TCISC, Special Education Directors Panel, and the CAC, TEA gathers feedback, develops improvement strategies, and evaluates progress toward improving special education services. These mechanisms help strengthen IDEA implementation, enhance parent engagement, and drive continuous improvement across Texas.

FFY 2024 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2024-25 Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 876, 877)

Date:

01/07/2026

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	80,811	53,009	78,114
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	5,885	2,767	2,620
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	11,092	6,006	7,406

Data Source:

SY 2024-25 Academic Achievement in Mathematics (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 874, 875)

Date:

01/07/2026

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	80,704	58,832	64,676
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	5,546	3,356	1,691
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	10,598	6,970	6,205

(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 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	16,977	80,811	17.81%	30.00%	21.01%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
B	Grade 8	8,773	53,009	15.93%	30.00%	16.55%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	10,026	78,114	14.03%	30.00%	12.84%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

Slippage in SPPI 3B may be associated with several potential contributing factors identified in national and state analyses. Pandemic era disruptions created foundational literacy gaps that continue to affect the current high school level cohort, mirroring patterns reported across states. Elevated chronic absenteeism among students with disabilities, identified nationally as a key factor in declining reading performance, may also have reduced opportunities for consistent instruction and intervention. In addition, ongoing shortages of special educators and intervention staff may have limited the availability and fidelity of intensive reading supports. Rising state proficiency targets, which increase sharply through 2025, further heightened the likelihood of slippage even when student performance remained stable.

FFY 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	16,144	80,704	17.76%	30.00%	20.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	10,326	58,832	15.75%	30.00%	17.55%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	7,896	64,676	9.77%	30.00%	12.21%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) is committed to maintaining transparency in student assessments by providing publicly accessible reporting resources:

(1)(a) the number of children with disabilities participating in regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments:

Texas Performance Reporting System (TAPR) 2024-25 STAAR Participation - Additional Student Groups State Report

https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/cgi/sas/broker?_service=marykay&_program=perf rept.perfmast.sas&_debug=0&ccyy=2025&lev=S&prgopt=reports/tapr/part_addsg.sas

(1)(b) the number of children with disabilities participating in alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards:

2025 Federal Report Card – State

Select "Part (xi): STAAR Alternate 2 Participation" from the TABLE OF CONTENTS menu

https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/cgi/sas/broker?_service=marykay&_program=perf rept.perfmast.sas&_debug=0&frc=yes&ccyy=2025&lev=S&prgopt=reports%2Ffrc%2Ffrc.sas

(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:

2025 Federal Report Card – State

This section provides information on student achievement on the STAAR (State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness) performance for mathematics, reading/ELA, and science by grade level and proficiency level for the 2024-25 school year. These results include all students tested, regardless of whether they were in the accountability subset. (CWD: children with disability; CWOD: children without disability; EL: English learner).
https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/cgi/sas/broker?_service=marykay&_program=perf rept.perfmast.sas&_debug=0&frc=yes&ccyy=2025&lev=S&prgopt=reports%2Ffrc%2Ffrc.sas

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For additional information about this indicator, visit the following The Texas Education Agency (TEA) webpage:

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

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs Against 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 EDEfacts 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	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	93.00%	93.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	96.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	96.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	96.00%	96.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) has established a comprehensive stakeholder engagement system that ensures broad, diverse, and continuous input into special education planning, implementation, and evaluation. This system follows the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model, which integrates annual feedback from stakeholders to improve special education services at the local, regional, and state levels. TEA collects stakeholder input through surveys, public forums, stakeholder meetings, and advisory committees, ensuring that diverse perspectives inform state priorities and decisions.

Stakeholder engagement includes parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, Education Service Centers (ESCs), institutions of higher education, parent-support and advocacy groups, related state agencies, and

other established stakeholder groups. TEA systematically reviews stakeholder group membership and seeks recommendations from internal and external entities to fill vacancies, ensuring statewide geographic and demographic representation.

Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC)

The Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) is an external advisory workgroup that provides guidance on key special education issues in Texas. The purpose of this committee is to facilitate ongoing stakeholder input into the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP). The committee currently consists of 12 members, including two parents.

The TCISC:

- Provides guidance on setting and revising State Performance Plan (SPP) indicator targets.
- Reviews and analyzes the Annual Performance Report (APR), the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and progress on SPP indicator targets.
- Discusses statewide monitoring and general supervision activities and provides feedback to TEA to guide improvement efforts.
- Engages in discussions related to compliance and performance monitoring in Texas.

The TCISC meets quarterly to ensure that a broad range of perspectives are considered in decision-making processes related to improving results for children with disabilities (CWD) and their families.

Special Education Directors Panel

TEA also engages local special education directors through the Special Education Directors Panel, which serves as a direct feedback mechanism between local educational agencies (LEAs) and TEA. This panel includes special education directors from various LEA types, sizes, and geographic regions, ensuring representation from across Texas. Six of the panel's 11 members are parents.

The purpose of this panel is to provide feedback on TEA initiatives and special education projects. TEA works closely with ESCs, which nominate LEA special education directors from their region to serve on the panel. This structure ensures that TEA captures first-hand input from LEA leaders regarding challenges, implementation issues, and areas of need.

The Special Education Directors Panel meets virtually four times per year allowing for ongoing and accessible engagement.

Special Education Director Huddle

The TEA engages ESC special education directors through weekly meetings designed to foster collaboration and dialogue. These directors represent a diverse range of LEAs across Texas, varying in type and size. The meetings serve as a platform for discussing TEA initiatives and special education projects, ensuring that TEA receives direct, informed input. This engagement helps identify potential challenges and considerations relevant to the stakeholder groups these projects aim to support.

Texas Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) for Special Education is the state advisory panel required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The CAC consists of 17 members appointed by the Office of the Governor, each serving staggered four-year terms, with the terms of eight or nine members expiring every two years. The committee currently consists of 11 members, including three parents.

The CAC plays a critical role in identifying and addressing unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities across Texas. It provides advisory input on IDEA-related issues, data reporting, compliance requirements, and policy development.

The CAC meets at least quarterly in public meetings, allowing for transparency and engagement with broader stakeholder groups. The responsibilities of the CAC include:

- Advising TEA on unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities.
- Providing public comments on proposed state rules and regulations related to special education.
- Assisting TEA in developing data reporting systems, including reports to the U.S. Secretary of Education under IDEA.
- Recommending corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring reports.
- Advising TEA on coordinating services across agencies for children with disabilities.

Additionally, the CAC plays a key role in reviewing policies related to significant disproportionality and must submit a biennial report to the Texas Legislature recommending changes to state laws and the TEA rules related to special education.

Meeting dates, agendas, and minutes for the CAC are publicly available on the Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education webpage:

<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>.

Expanding Opportunities for Parent and Community Engagement

TEA is committed to ensuring parents and families are actively engaged in special education planning and decision-making. TEA partners with parent organizations, advocacy groups, and community stakeholders to provide training, outreach, and resources to empower parents as key partners in the educational process.

TEA facilitates public input sessions, statewide surveys, and stakeholder advisory meetings to gather feedback from families on special education policies, practices, and improvement strategies. This engagement helps ensure that Texas parents play an active role in shaping IDEA implementation and improving outcomes for CWD.

Summary

TEA's stakeholder engagement system ensures ongoing, structured opportunities for input from parents, educators, and community members. Through advisory groups such as the TCISC, Special Education Directors Panel, and the CAC, TEA gathers feedback, develops improvement strategies, and evaluates progress toward improving special education services. These mechanisms help strengthen IDEA implementation, enhance parent engagement, and drive continuous improvement across Texas.

FFY 2024 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2024-25 Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 876, 877)

Date:

01/07/2026

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	6,668	4,906	4,924
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	5,731	4,415	4,524

Data Source:

SY 2024-25 Academic Achievement in Mathematics (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 874, 875)

Date:

01/07/2026

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	6,666	4,907	4,932
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	6,079	4,609	4,562

FFY 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	5,731	6,668	87.81%	93.00%	85.95%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	4,415	4,906	89.45%	95.00%	89.99%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	4,524	4,924	92.28%	95.00%	91.88%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Slippage in SPPI 3C may be linked to several potential contributing factors affecting students assessed on alternate standards. Staffing shortages, particularly among personnel trained to deliver specialized instructional supports to students with significant cognitive disabilities and complex access needs, may contribute to variability in student readiness. National research highlights challenges related to accessibility features, accommodation implementation, and ensuring appropriate participation in alternate assessments, all of which may influence proficiency outcomes. States have also reported that methodological or data system changes, such as enhanced validation, updated monitoring procedures, or recalibrated baselines, can

initially result in lower performance estimates even without true declines. Escalating proficiency targets in reading amplify these effects, making it more difficult to meet annual expectations.

FFY 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	6,079	6,666	92.07%	95.00%	91.19%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	4,609	4,907	94.63%	96.00%	93.93%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	4,562	4,932	92.72%	95.00%	92.50%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) is committed to maintaining transparency in student assessments by providing publicly accessible reporting resources:

(1)(a) the number of children with disabilities participating in regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments:

Texas Performance Reporting System (TAPR) 2024-25 STAAR Participation - Additional Student Groups State Report

https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/cgi/sas/broker?_service=marykay&_program=perf rept.perfmast.sas&_debug=0&ccyy=2025&lev=S&prgopt=reports/tapr/part_addsg.sas

(1)(b) the number of children with disabilities participating in alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards:

2025 Federal Report Card – State

Select "Part (xi): STAAR Alternate 2 Participation" from the TABLE OF CONTENTS menu

https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/cgi/sas/broker?_service=marykay&_program=perf rept.perfmast.sas&_debug=0&frc=yes&ccyy=2025&lev=S&prgopt=reports%2Ffrc%2Ffrc.sas

(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:

2025 Federal Report Card – State

This section provides information on student achievement on the STAAR (State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness) performance for mathematics, reading/ELA, and science by grade level and proficiency level for the 2024-25 school year. These results include all students tested, regardless of whether they were in the accountability subset. (CWD: children with disability; CWOD: children without disability; EL: English learner).

https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/cgi/sas/broker?_service=marykay&_program=perf rept.perfmast.sas&_debug=0&frc=yes&ccyy=2025&lev=S&prgopt=reports%2Ffrc%2Ffrc.sas

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For additional information about this indicator, visit the following The Texas Education Agency (TEA) webpage:

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

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates For Children with IEPs and All Students Against 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 EDEfacts 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 2024-2025 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2024-2025 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 2024-2025 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2024-2025 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	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	21.00	20.00
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	32.00	30.00
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	32.00	30.00
Math	A <=	Grade 4	19.00	18.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	29.00	28.00
Math	C <=	Grade HS	25.00	24.00

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) has established a comprehensive stakeholder engagement system that ensures broad, diverse, and continuous input into special education planning, implementation, and evaluation. This system follows the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model, which integrates annual feedback from stakeholders to improve special education services at the local, regional, and state levels. TEA collects stakeholder input through surveys, public forums, stakeholder meetings, and advisory committees, ensuring that diverse perspectives inform state priorities and decisions.

Stakeholder engagement includes parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, Education Service Centers (ESCs), institutions of higher education, parent-support and advocacy groups, related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. TEA systematically reviews stakeholder group membership and seeks recommendations from internal and external entities to fill vacancies, ensuring statewide geographic and demographic representation.

Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC)

The Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) is an external advisory workgroup that provides guidance on key special education issues in Texas. The purpose of this committee is to facilitate ongoing stakeholder input into the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP). The committee currently consists of 12 members, including two parents.

The TCISC:

- Provides guidance on setting and revising State Performance Plan (SPP) indicator targets.
- Reviews and analyzes the Annual Performance Report (APR), the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and progress on SPP indicator targets.
- Discusses statewide monitoring and general supervision activities and provides feedback to TEA to guide improvement efforts.
- Engages in discussions related to compliance and performance monitoring in Texas.

The TCISC meets quarterly to ensure that a broad range of perspectives are considered in decision-making processes related to improving results for children with disabilities (CWD) and their families.

Special Education Directors Panel

TEA also engages local special education directors through the Special Education Directors Panel, which serves as a direct feedback mechanism between local educational agencies (LEAs) and TEA. This panel includes special education directors from various LEA types, sizes, and geographic regions, ensuring representation from across Texas. Six of the panel's 11 members are parents.

The purpose of this panel is to provide feedback on TEA initiatives and special education projects. TEA works closely with ESCs, which nominate LEA special education directors from their region to serve on the panel. This structure ensures that TEA captures first-hand input from LEA leaders regarding challenges, implementation issues, and areas of need.

The Special Education Directors Panel meets virtually four times per year allowing for ongoing and accessible engagement.

Special Education Director Huddle

The TEA engages ESC special education directors through weekly meetings designed to foster collaboration and dialogue. These directors represent a diverse range of LEAs across Texas, varying in type and size. The meetings serve as a platform for discussing TEA initiatives and special education projects, ensuring that TEA receives direct, informed input. This engagement helps identify potential challenges and considerations relevant to the stakeholder groups these projects aim to support.

Texas Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) for Special Education is the state advisory panel required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The CAC consists of 17 members appointed by the Office of the Governor, each serving staggered four-year terms, with the terms of eight or nine members expiring every two years. The committee currently consists of 11 members, including three parents.

The CAC plays a critical role in identifying and addressing unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities across Texas. It provides advisory input on IDEA-related issues, data reporting, compliance requirements, and policy development.

The CAC meets at least quarterly in public meetings, allowing for transparency and engagement with broader stakeholder groups. The responsibilities of the CAC include:

- Advising TEA on unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities.
- Providing public comments on proposed state rules and regulations related to special education.
- Assisting TEA in developing data reporting systems, including reports to the U.S. Secretary of Education under IDEA.
- Recommending corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring reports.
- Advising TEA on coordinating services across agencies for children with disabilities.

Additionally, the CAC plays a key role in reviewing policies related to significant disproportionality and must submit a biennial report to the Texas Legislature recommending changes to state laws and the TEA rules related to special education.

Meeting dates, agendas, and minutes for the CAC are publicly available on the Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education webpage:

<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>.

Expanding Opportunities for Parent and Community Engagement

TEA is committed to ensuring parents and families are actively engaged in special education planning and decision-making. TEA partners with parent organizations, advocacy groups, and community stakeholders to provide training, outreach, and resources to empower parents as key partners in the educational process.

TEA facilitates public input sessions, statewide surveys, and stakeholder advisory meetings to gather feedback from families on special education policies, practices, and improvement strategies. This engagement helps ensure that Texas parents play an active role in shaping IDEA implementation and improving outcomes for CWD.

Summary

TEA's stakeholder engagement system ensures ongoing, structured opportunities for input from parents, educators, and community members. Through advisory groups such as the TCISC, Special Education Directors Panel, and the CAC, TEA gathers feedback, develops improvement strategies, and evaluates progress toward improving special education services. These mechanisms help strengthen IDEA implementation, enhance parent engagement, and drive continuous improvement across Texas.

FFY 2024 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2024-25 Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 876, 877)

Date:

01/07/2026

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	397,897	404,273	553,942
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	80,811	53,009	78,114
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	172,450	202,905	223,805
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	36,241	27,446	34,290
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	5,885	2,767	2,620
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	11,092	6,006	7,406

Data Source:

SY 2024-25 Academic Achievement in Mathematics (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 874, 875)

Date:

01/07/2026

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	396,477	505,623	473,574
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	80,704	58,832	64,676
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	143,278	235,540	147,905
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	34,749	31,204	25,168
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	5,546	3,356	1,691
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	10,598	6,970	6,205

(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 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	21.01%	52.45%	31.48	21.00	31.44	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	16.55%	56.98%	38.69	32.00	40.43	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	12.84%	46.59%	34.93	32.00	33.76	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Slippage in SPPI 3D may result from several potential contributing factors that widened the performance gap between students with disabilities and their peers. Pandemic-related foundational skill deficits and chronic absenteeism, specifically cited in national analyses as major drivers of eighth grade reading declines, likely contributed to slower academic recovery for students with disabilities. Persistent shortages in special education personnel and limited access to high quality, evidence based interventions may have further constrained progress. Assessment system updates and increased sensitivity in data reporting may also have accentuated disparities. Additionally, rising statewide targets in reading increased the difficulty of closing proficiency gaps during the reporting year.

FFY 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	20.00%	44.90%	25.94	19.00	24.90	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	17.55%	52.76%	33.53	29.00	35.20	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	12.21%	36.55%	24.99	25.00	24.34	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Slippage in SPPI 3D may result from several potential contributing factors that widened the performance gap between students with disabilities and their peers. Pandemic-related foundational skill deficits and chronic absenteeism, specifically cited in national analyses as major drivers of eighth grade math declines, likely contributed to slower academic recovery for students with disabilities. Persistent shortages in special education personnel and limited access to high quality, evidence based interventions may have further constrained progress. Assessment system updates and increased sensitivity in data reporting may also have accentuated disparities. Additionally, rising statewide targets in math increased the difficulty of closing proficiency gaps during the reporting year.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For additional information about this indicator, visit the following The Texas Education Agency (TEA) webpage:

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

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA).

The State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy. The State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period. If so, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

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 2024 SPP/APR, use data from 2023-2024), 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:

- Option 1: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- Option 2: 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.

If, under Option 1, the State uses a State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate for children with disabilities to compare to LEA-level long-term suspension and expulsion rates for the purpose of determining whether an LEA has a significant discrepancy, the State must provide the State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose long-term suspension/expulsion rate exceeds 2 percentage points above the State-level rate of 0.7%, the State must provide OSEP with the State-level rate of 0.7%).

If, under Option 2, the State uses a rate difference to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate difference used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs is 4 percentage points above the long-term suspension/expulsion rate for nondisabled children, the State must provide OSEP with the rate difference of 4 percentage points). Similarly, if, under Option 2, the State uses a rate ratio to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate ratio used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose ratio of its long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for children with IEPs to long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for nondisabled children is greater than 3.0, the State must provide OSEP with the rate ratio of 3.0).

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 2023-2024 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2023-2024 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2024-2025, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2023-2024 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 2024 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2023-2024 (which can be found in the FFY 2023 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 noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 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 2024 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2023), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	28.57%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target <=	0.00%	28.57%	24.00%	23.00%	22.00%
Data	0.00%	28.57%	Not Valid and Reliable	20.97%	15.12%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target <=	21.00%	20.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) has established a comprehensive stakeholder engagement system that ensures broad, diverse, and continuous input into special education planning, implementation, and evaluation. This system follows the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model, which integrates annual feedback from stakeholders to improve special education services at the local, regional, and state levels. TEA collects stakeholder input through surveys, public forums, stakeholder meetings, and advisory committees, ensuring that diverse perspectives inform state priorities and decisions.

Stakeholder engagement includes parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, Education Service Centers (ESCs), institutions of higher education, parent-support and advocacy groups, related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. TEA systematically reviews stakeholder group membership and seeks recommendations from internal and external entities to fill vacancies, ensuring statewide geographic and demographic representation.

Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC)

The Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) is an external advisory workgroup that provides guidance on key special education issues in Texas. The purpose of this committee is to facilitate ongoing stakeholder input into the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP). The committee currently consists of 12 members, including two parents.

The TCISC:

- Provides guidance on setting and revising State Performance Plan (SPP) indicator targets.
- Reviews and analyzes the Annual Performance Report (APR), the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and progress on SPP indicator targets.
- Discusses statewide monitoring and general supervision activities and provides feedback to TEA to guide improvement efforts.
- Engages in discussions related to compliance and performance monitoring in Texas.

The TCISC meets quarterly to ensure that a broad range of perspectives are considered in decision-making processes related to improving results for children with disabilities (CWD) and their families.

Special Education Directors Panel

TEA also engages local special education directors through the Special Education Directors Panel, which serves as a direct feedback mechanism between local educational agencies (LEAs) and TEA. This panel includes special education directors from various LEA types, sizes, and geographic regions, ensuring representation from across Texas. Six of the panel's 11 members are parents.

The purpose of this panel is to provide feedback on TEA initiatives and special education projects. TEA works closely with ESCs, which nominate LEA special education directors from their region to serve on the panel. This structure ensures that TEA captures first-hand input from LEA leaders regarding challenges, implementation issues, and areas of need.

The Special Education Directors Panel meets virtually four times per year allowing for ongoing and accessible engagement.

Special Education Director Huddle

The TEA engages ESC special education directors through weekly meetings designed to foster collaboration and dialogue. These directors represent a diverse range of LEAs across Texas, varying in type and size. The meetings serve as a platform for discussing TEA initiatives and special education projects, ensuring that TEA receives direct, informed input. This engagement helps identify potential challenges and considerations relevant to the stakeholder groups these projects aim to support.

Texas Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) for Special Education is the state advisory panel required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The CAC consists of 17 members appointed by the Office of the Governor, each serving staggered four-year terms, with the terms of eight or nine members expiring every two years. The committee currently consists of 11 members, including three parents.

The CAC plays a critical role in identifying and addressing unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities across Texas. It provides advisory input on IDEA-related issues, data reporting, compliance requirements, and policy development.

The CAC meets at least quarterly in public meetings, allowing for transparency and engagement with broader stakeholder groups. The responsibilities of the CAC include:

- Advising TEA on unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities.
- Providing public comments on proposed state rules and regulations related to special education.
- Assisting TEA in developing data reporting systems, including reports to the U.S. Secretary of Education under IDEA.
- Recommending corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring reports.
- Advising TEA on coordinating services across agencies for children with disabilities.

Additionally, the CAC plays a key role in reviewing policies related to significant disproportionality and must submit a biennial report to the Texas Legislature recommending changes to state laws and the TEA rules related to special education.

Meeting dates, agendas, and minutes for the CAC are publicly available on the Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education webpage:

<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>.

Expanding Opportunities for Parent and Community Engagement

TEA is committed to ensuring parents and families are actively engaged in special education planning and decision-making. TEA partners with parent organizations, advocacy groups, and community stakeholders to provide training, outreach, and resources to empower parents as key partners in the educational process.

TEA facilitates public input sessions, statewide surveys, and stakeholder advisory meetings to gather feedback from families on special education policies, practices, and improvement strategies. This engagement helps ensure that Texas parents play an active role in shaping IDEA implementation and improving outcomes for CWD.

Summary

TEA's stakeholder engagement system ensures ongoing, structured opportunities for input from parents, educators, and community members. Through advisory groups such as the TCISC, Special Education Directors Panel, and the CAC, TEA gathers feedback, develops improvement strategies, and evaluates progress toward improving special education services. These mechanisms help strengthen IDEA implementation, enhance parent engagement, and drive continuous improvement across Texas.

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

If yes, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA).

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) has adopted the following definitions for its minimum size requirements (MSR), which includes the minimum cell size (numerator) for rate 1 (target group) and rate 2 (comparison group) and minimum N-size (denominator) for rate 1 (target group) and rate 2 (comparison group):

For Rate 1 (Target Group: Children with Disabilities):

- Minimum Cell Size (10): Represents the number of children with disabilities (CWD), aged 3-21, who received out-of-school suspensions or expulsions totaling more than 10 cumulative days in the school year within an LEA
- Minimum N-Size (30): Represents the total enrollment of CWD, aged 3-21, in the local educational agency (LEA)

For Rate 2 (Comparison Group: Children without Disabilities):

- Minimum Cell Size (10): Represents the number of children without disabilities, aged 3-21, who received out-of-school suspensions or expulsions totaling more than 10 cumulative days in the school year within an LEA
- Minimum N-Size (30): Represents the total enrollment of children without disabilities, aged 3-21, in the LEA. The MSRs are applied before calculating the rate ratio for significant discrepancy.

If either the cell size or n-size falls below these standards for Rate 1 or Rate 2 for the target group or the comparison group, then the significant discrepancy analysis was not conducted for the LEA.

If yes, the State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) established MSR that includes a minimum cell size of 10 (numerator) and a minimum N-size (denominator) of 30 for analyzing significant discrepancy is supported by multiple rationales.

First, these thresholds align with federally established standards of reasonableness. While federal regulations do not explicitly set these minimums for significant discrepancy analyses, these same thresholds are deemed "presumptively reasonable" under 34 CFR §300.647(b)(1)(iv) for significant disproportionality calculations. This provides a strong precedent for their appropriateness in similar equity analyses under IDEA.

Second, these definitions were endorsed through stakeholder engagement. The TEA consulted with stakeholders who confirmed that these thresholds represent best practices for ensuring both statistical reliability and meaningful analysis while protecting student privacy. This stakeholder input was crucial in verifying that the chosen thresholds would serve the needs of all involved parties.

Third, these thresholds ensure appropriate identification of local educational agencies (LEAs) with significant discrepancy through multiple mechanisms. The cell size minimum of 10 provides enough cases to identify meaningful patterns while preventing identification based on isolated incidents. The n-size of 30 creates a sufficiently large denominator to generate stable rates and reliable comparisons. Additionally, these thresholds maintain consistency with other equity requirements under IDEA, allowing for coherent analysis across different equity indicators.

Fourth, these definitions strike a careful balance between competing needs. The thresholds are large enough to protect student privacy and prevent unreliable identifications based on small numbers, yet small enough to ensure that important patterns of significant discrepancy are not masked by overly restrictive minimums. This balance allows for meaningful analysis while preventing the statistical volatility from small numbers.

The TEA's adoption of these well-established standards enables reliable and consistent identification of significant discrepancy, supported by both statistical best practices and stakeholder input, while maintaining alignment with federal standards of reasonableness.

The above information regarding the Texas Education Agency's definition of "significant discrepancy" and its methodology, as well as the rationales for selection of minimum n and cell sizes, is intended to provide an explanation of the statistical reliability of the process.

It is not inherently unreasonable if less than 10% of total local educational agencies (LEAs) are included after applying the Minimum Size Requirement (MSR), given that a large number of LEAs report no CWD having long-term suspensions and/or expulsions. For example, for FFY 2024 (discipline data from the 2023-2024 school year), 855 or 75.6% of the 1,131 LEAs that were excluded from the Indicator 4A calculation by MSR reported 0 CWD having long-term suspensions and/or expulsions and thus would be excluded by any MSR definition.

Statistical Reliability: The MSR is designed to ensure statistical reliability and protect student privacy. By requiring at least 30 total students served in special education and at least 10 students with applicable suspension/expulsion codes, the methodology aims to prevent drawing conclusions from small, potentially unrepresentative samples.

Consideration of Local Context: By calculating rate ratios within each LEA, the method accounts for local factors. This approach may naturally result in fewer LEAs being flagged, as it compares CWD to their non-disabled peers in the same environment.

If yes, the State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period.
No
If yes, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n/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.
1,131

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
21	81	15.12%	21.00%	25.93%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The increase in the number of LEAs having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs is largely attributable to a statewide policy change that was enacted in September of 2023 regarding the removal of students from class for certain offenses, which likely contributed to an overall increase in out-of-school suspensions and expulsions among students with IEPs. At the same time, fluctuations in the state rate for Indicator 4A may be tied to volatility in small numbers, wherein small changes in the number of students counted can have pronounced impacts on percentage rates for students both with and without disabilities. For the 2023-2024 school year, half of LEAs identified with a significant discrepancy met cell size requirements by 5 or fewer students, and most rate ratios exceeding the state's threshold of 3.0

derived from a comparison of rates below 1%. Of the 21 LEAs found with a significant discrepancy, only 2 were repeat LEAs from FFY 2023; 19 of these LEAs were newly identified for FFY 2024, 5 of which were previously excluded due to not meeting minimum n/cell sizes.

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 Texas Education Agency (TEA) defines significant discrepancy as the result of a local educational agency (LEA) exceeding a rate ratio threshold of 3.0. This threshold is applied after calculating the ratio of out-of-school suspension or expulsion rates for CWD to those of children without disabilities, using data from students aged 3–21.

Minimum Size Requirements (MSRs):

To ensure reliable results, the TEA applies a minimum cell size of 10 (students in the numerator) and a minimum n-size of 30 (students in the denominator). LEAs that do not meet the MSRs for either rate are excluded because small sizes may lead to unreliable results.

- For rate 1, the cell size represents the number of CWD with more than 10 cumulative days of out-of-school suspensions or expulsions, and the n-size represents the total number of CWD
- For rate 2, the cell size represents the number of children without disabilities with more than 10 cumulative days of out-of-school suspensions or expulsions, and the n-size represents the total number of children without disabilities

Calculating the Rate Ratio:

If MSRs are met, the TEA calculates:

- Rate 1: The out-of-school suspension/expulsion rate for CWD (number of children with disabilities with more than 10 cumulative days of out-of-school suspensions/expulsions divided by the total number of CWD) • Rate 2: The out-of-school suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities (number of children without disabilities with more than 10 cumulative days of out-of-school suspensions/expulsions divided by the total number of children without disabilities)
- The rate ratio is then calculated by dividing rate 1 by rate 2

Determining Significant Discrepancy:

An LEA is identified as having significant discrepancy if their rate ratio exceeds 3.0. LEAs with a rate ratio of 3.0 or lower are not considered to have significant discrepancy.

Methodology:

The methodology for calculating significant discrepancy for SPPI 4A included the following eight steps:

1. Data Collection and Validation: Data collection occurred through the Public Education Information System (PEIMS) Summer Submission for the 2023-24 school year. LEAs "Completed" their data submission after clearing all fatal validation errors to ensure timely and accurate data by the submission deadline on June 20, 2024, at 11:59 PM.
2. SAS Programming and Documentation: SAS (Statistical Analysis System) was used to access, extract, clean, analyze, and report data results. SAS remains a critical tool for both preprocessing data and processing data because it automatically documents the analytical process by creating an audit trail and supporting knowledge transfer for quality assurance (QA) purposes.
3. Base Dataset Creation: A base dataset was created with students aged 3–21 years, including CWD and children without disabilities with and without out-of-school suspensions or expulsions exceeding 10 cumulative days. Age was determined using the official snapshot date (October 27, 2023), which is the last Friday in October. All analyses were conducted at the LEA level, with the total count of LEAs matching the total count reporting in the "Introduction of the prior FFY SPP/APR.
4. Data Preprocessing for Rate Calculations: Four variables were created based on a unique count of students at each LEA and were used for calculating the rates used in subsequent steps. The variables included the total number of CWD, the total number of CWD with more than 10 cumulative days of out-of-school suspensions/expulsions, the total number of children without disabilities, and the total number of children without disabilities with more than 10 cumulative days of out-of-school suspensions/expulsions at each LEA.
5. Minimum Size Requirements (MSR) Screening: The numerator (students with more than 10 cumulative days of out-of-school suspension/expulsion) required a minimum cell size of 10 for both special education and children without disabilities. The denominator (total number of students) required a minimum N-size of 30 for both special education and children without disabilities. LEAs not meeting these MSRs were excluded to ensure the results were based on reliable data.

45 Part B

6. Rate Calculation for LEAs: Data processing included calculating two distinct rates for each LEA. Rate 1 represented the target group of CWD and was calculated by dividing the number of CWD with more than 10 cumulative days of out-of-school suspensions/expulsions by the total number of CWD. Rate 2 represented the comparison group of children without disabilities and was calculated similarly: the number of children without disabilities with more than 10 cumulative days of out-of-school suspensions/expulsions divided by the total number of children without disabilities.
7. Calculating and Reporting Rate Ratios: For LEAs meeting MSR, one rate ratio was calculated by dividing Rate 1 by Rate 2. An LEA was identified and reported as having significant discrepancy if their rate ratio exceeded 3.0. However, if the rate ratio was less than or equal to 3.0, then the LEA was reported as not having significant discrepancy.
8. Quality Assurance and Verification: Quality assurance (QA) was conducted through parallel analyses by data analysts and independent reviewers to ensure accuracy, consistency, and adherence to established business rules and reporting standards (e.g., independent verification of rate calculations and cross-checking the exclusion of ineligible LEAs).

Assumptions:

This methodology assumed that: (a) all reported disciplinary incidents were accurately coded as out-of-school suspensions or expulsions by LEAs and (b) all LEAs consistently reported data according to state guidelines and standards.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For additional information about this indicator, visit the following Texas Education Agency (TEA) webpage:

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2024 using 2023-2024 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.

Local educational agencies (LEAs) were required to submit their local policies and operating procedures through the Texas Education Agency's (TEA's) Legal Framework. The Texas Legal Framework for the Child-Centered Special Education Process website (<https://fw.escapps.net/>) is maintained in collaboration with regional Education Service Centers to provide assistance to stakeholders such as local educational agencies (LEAs), advocates, and parents in learning about state and federal laws and regulations by providing rich resources regarding obligations and rights for the provision of a free and appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment to CWD. 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. For each of the 21 LEAs in which a significant discrepancy was identified, TEA required the identified LEA 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 to 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 2023

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

If procedures have been adopted that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), describe how, for instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023, the State verified: (1) that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements; and, (2) each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

The State has adopted procedures that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction); however, no noncompliance was identified for Indicator 4A in FFY 2023.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, by race and ethnicity, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA, by race and ethnicity).

The State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity. The State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period. If so, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

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 2024 SPP/APR, use data from 2023-2024), 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:

- Option 1: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- Option 2: 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.

If, under Option 1, the State uses a State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate for children with disabilities to compare to LEA-level long-term suspension and expulsion rates for the purpose of determining whether an LEA has a significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, the State must provide the State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose long-term suspension/expulsion rate exceeds 2 percentage points above the State-level rate of 0.7%, the State must provide OSEP with the State-level rate of 0.7%).

If, under Option 2, the State uses a rate difference to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate difference used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, is 4 percentage points above the long-term suspension/expulsion rate for nondisabled children, the State must provide OSEP with the rate difference of 4 percentage points). Similarly, if, under Option 2, the State uses a rate ratio to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate ratio used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose ratio of its long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for nondisabled children is greater than 3.0, the State must provide OSEP with the rate ratio of 3.0).

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 2023-2024 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2023-2024 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2024-2025, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2023-2024 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 2023 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2023-2024 (which can be found in the FFY 2023 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 noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 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 2024 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2023), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	Not Valid and Reliable	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

If yes, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities, by race and ethnicity, who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA).

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) has adopted the following definitions for its minimum size requirements (MSR), which includes the minimum cell size (numerator) for both rate 1 (target group) and rate 2 (comparison group) and minimum N-size (denominator) for both rate 1 (target group) and rate 2 (comparison group):

For Rate 1 (Target Group: Children with Disabilities by Racial or Ethnicity Group):

- Minimum Cell Size (10): Represents the number of children with disabilities (CWD), aged 3-21, in a particular race or ethnicity group, who received out-of-school suspensions or expulsions totaling more than 10 cumulative days in the school year within a local educational agency (LEA)
- Minimum N-Size (30): Represents the total enrollment of CWD, aged 3-21 in the same race or ethnicity group in the LEA

For Rate 2 (Comparison Group: Children without Disabilities):

- Minimum Cell Size (10): Represents the number of children without disabilities, aged 3-21, in all race or ethnicity groups, who received out-of-school suspensions or expulsions totaling more than 10 cumulative days in the school year at an LEA
- Minimum N-Size (30): Represents the total enrollment of children without disabilities, aged 3-21, in all race or ethnicity groups in the LEA

The MSRs are applied before calculating the rate ratio for significant discrepancy. If either the cell size or n-size falls below these standards for Rate 1 or Rate 2 for a particular race or ethnicity group, then the race or ethnicity group is excluded from the significant discrepancy analysis for the LEA.

If yes, the State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) established MSR that includes a minimum cell size of 10 (numerator) and a minimum N-size (denominator) of 30 for analyzing significant discrepancy is supported by multiple rationales.

First, these thresholds align with federally established standards of reasonableness. While federal regulations do not explicitly set these minimums for significant discrepancy analyses, these same thresholds are deemed "presumptively reasonable" under 34 CFR §300.647(b)(1)(iv) for significant disproportionality calculations. This provides a strong precedent for their appropriateness in similar equity analyses under IDEA.

Second, these definitions were endorsed through stakeholder engagement. The TEA consulted with stakeholders who confirmed that these thresholds represent best practices for ensuring both statistical reliability and meaningful analysis while protecting student privacy. This stakeholder input was crucial in verifying that the chosen thresholds would serve the needs of all involved parties.

Third, these MSRs ensure appropriate identification of local educational agencies (LEAs) with significant discrepancy through multiple mechanisms. The cell size minimum of 10 provides enough cases to identify meaningful patterns while preventing identification based on isolated incidents. The n-size of 30 creates a sufficiently large denominator to generate stable rates and reliable comparisons. Additionally, these MSRs maintain consistency with other equity requirements under IDEA, allowing for coherent analysis across different the equity requirements.

Fourth, these definitions strike a careful balance between competing needs. The thresholds are large enough to protect student privacy and prevent unreliable identifications based on small numbers, yet small enough to ensure that important patterns of significant discrepancy are not masked by overly restrictive minimums. This balance allows for meaningful analysis while preventing the statistical volatility from small numbers.

The TEA's adoption of these well-established standards enables reliable and consistent identification of significant discrepancy, supported by both statistical best practices and stakeholder input, while maintaining alignment with federal standards of reasonableness.

The above information regarding the Texas Education Agency's definition of "significant discrepancy" and its methodology, as well as the rationales for selection of minimum n and cell sizes, is intended to provide an explanation of the statistical reliability of the process.

It is not inherently unreasonable if less than 10% of total local educational agencies (LEAs) are included after applying the Minimum Size Requirement (MSR), given that a large number of LEAs report no CWD having long-term suspensions and/or expulsions. For example, for FFY 2024 (discipline data from the 2023-2024 school year), 855 or 73.6% of the 1,161 LEAs that were excluded from the Indicator 4B calculation by MSR reported 0 CWD in any race/ethnicity category having long-term suspensions and/or expulsions and thus would be excluded by any MSR definition.

Statistical Reliability: The MSR is designed to ensure statistical reliability and protect student privacy. By requiring at least 30 total students served in special education and at least 10 students with applicable suspension/expulsion codes, the methodology aims to prevent drawing conclusions from small, potentially unrepresentative samples.

Consideration of Local Context: By calculating rate ratios within each LEA, the method accounts for local factors. This approach may naturally result in fewer LEAs being flagged, as it compares CWD to their non-disabled peers in the same environment.

If yes, the State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period.

No

If yes, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/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.

1,161

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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
27	0	51	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

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

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) defines significant discrepancy for SPPI 4B as the result of a local educational agency (LEA) exceeding a rate ratio threshold of 3.0 for a race or ethnicity group. This threshold is applied after calculating the ratio of out-of-school suspension or expulsion rates for CWD from a race or ethnicity group to those of children without disabilities who are aged 3–21 years.

Minimum Size Requirements (MSRs): To ensure reliable results, the TEA applies a minimum cell size of 10 (children in the numerator) and a minimum n-size of 30 (children in the denominator). LEAs that do not meet the MSRs for either rate are excluded because small sizes may lead to unreliable results.

- For rate 1, the cell size represents the number of CWD in a particular race or ethnicity group with more than 10 cumulative days of out-of-school suspensions or expulsions, and the n-size represents the total number of CWD in the same race or ethnicity group
- For rate 2, the cell size represents the number of children without disabilities for all race or ethnicity groups with more than 10 cumulative days of out-of-school suspensions or expulsions, and the n-size represents the total number of children without disabilities

Calculating the Rate Ratio: If MSRs were met, the TEA calculated at least one rate ratio (or seven total for each LEA):

- **Rate 1:** The out-of-school suspension/expulsion rate for CWD in a particular race or ethnicity group (number of children with disabilities with more than 10 cumulative days of out-of-school suspensions/expulsions divided by the total number of CWD from the same race or ethnicity group)
- **Rate 2:** The out-of-school suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities (number of children without disabilities with more than 10 cumulative days of out-of-school suspensions/expulsions divided by the total number of children without disabilities)
- The rate ratio is then calculated by dividing rate 1 by rate 2

Determining Significant Discrepancy:

An LEA is identified as having significant discrepancy if their rate ratio for a particular race or ethnicity group (Hispanic/Latino, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, White, or two or more races) exceeds 3.0. LEAs with a rate ratio of 3.0 or lower are not considered to have significant discrepancy.

Methodology:

The methodology for calculating significant discrepancy for SPPI 4B included the following eight steps:

1. **Data Collection and Validation:** Data collection occurred through the Public Education Information System (PEIMS) Summer Submission for the 2022-23 school year. LEAs "Completed" their data submission after clearing all fatal validation errors to ensure timely and accurate data by the submission deadline on June 20, 2024, at 11:59 PM.
2. **SAS Programming and Documentation:** SAS (Statistical Analysis System) was used to access, extract, clean, analyze, and report data results. SAS remains a critical tool for both preprocessing data and processing data because it automatically documents the analytical process by creating an audit trail and supporting knowledge transfer for quality assurance (QA) purposes.
3. **Base Dataset Creation:** A base dataset was created with students aged 3–21 years by race or ethnicity group, including CWD and children without disabilities both with and without out-of-school suspensions or expulsions exceeding 10 cumulative days. Age was determined using the official snapshot date (October 27, 2023), which is defined as the last Friday in October. All analyses were conducted at the LEA level, with the total count of LEAs matching the total count reporting in the "Introduction of the prior federal fiscal year (FFY) State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR). There were seven total race or ethnicity groups, including Hispanic/Latino, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, White, and Two or more races.
4. **Data Preprocessing for Rate Calculations:** Sixteen variables were created based on a unique count of students within the requisite groups at each LEA. The variables included the total number of CWD by race or ethnicity (7), the total number of CWD with more than 10 cumulative days of out-of-school suspensions/expulsions by race or ethnicity (7), the total number of children without disabilities (1), and the total number of children without disabilities with more than 10 cumulative days of out-of-school suspensions/expulsions (1) at each LEA.
5. **Minimum Size Requirements (MSR) Screening:** The numerator (students with more than 10 cumulative days of out-of-school suspension/expulsion) required a minimum cell size of 10 for both CWD by race or ethnicity group and children without disabilities. The denominator (total number of students) required a minimum N-size of 30 for both CWD by race or ethnicity group and children without disabilities. LEAs not meeting these MSRs were excluded to ensure the results were based on reliable data.
6. **Rate Calculation for LEAs:** Data processing included calculating two distinct LEA rates for each race or ethnicity group. Rate 1 represented the target group and was calculated by dividing the number of CWD by a race or ethnicity group with more than 10 cumulative days of out-of-school suspensions/expulsions by the total number of CWD from the race or ethnicity group. Rate 2 represented the comparison group and was calculated similarly: the number of children without disabilities with more than 10 cumulative days of out-of-school suspensions/expulsions divided by the total number of children without disabilities.
7. **Calculating and Reporting Rate Ratios:** There are seven possible rate ratio calculations for each LEA. For LEAs meeting MSR for at least one race or ethnicity group, the rate ratio was calculated by dividing Rate 1 by Rate 2 for the respective race or ethnicity group. An LEA was identified and reported as having significant discrepancy for the race or ethnicity group if their rate ratio exceeded 3.0. However, if the rate ratio was less than or equal to 3.0, then the LEA was reported as not having significant discrepancy for the race or ethnicity group.
8. **Quality Assurance and Verification:** Quality assurance (QA) was conducted through parallel analyses by data analysts and independent reviewers to ensure accuracy, consistency, and adherence to established business rules and reporting standards (e.g., independent verification of rate calculations and cross-checking the exclusion of ineligible LEAs).

Assumptions:

This methodology assumed that: (a) all reported disciplinary incidents were accurately coded as out-of-school suspensions or expulsions by LEAs and (b) all LEAs consistently reported data according to state guidelines and standards.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For additional information about this indicator, visit the following Texas Education Agency (TEA) webpage:

<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/suspension-and-expulsion-rates>

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2024 using 2023-2024 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.

Local educational agencies (LEAs) were required to submit their local policies and operating procedures through the Texas Education Agency's online Legal Framework portal. The Texas Legal Framework for the Child-Centered Special Education Process website (<https://fw.escapps.net/>) is maintained in collaboration with regional Education Service Centers to provide assistance to stakeholders such as local educational agencies (LEAs), advocates, and parents in learning about state and federal laws and regulations by providing rich resources regarding obligations and rights for the provision of a free and appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment to CWD. LEAs were 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. For each of the 27 LEAs in which a significant discrepancy was identified, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) required the identified LEA 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, to review its procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, and to 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 2023

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

If procedures have been adopted that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), describe how, for instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023, the State verified: (1) that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements; and, (2) each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

The State has adopted procedures that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction); however, no noncompliance was identified for Indicator 4B in FFY 2023.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

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	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
A	2020	Target >=		71.84%	73.00%	73.00%	74.00%
A	71.84%	Data	71.04%	71.84%	72.57%	73.54%	74.64%
B	2020	Target <=		14.07%	14.00%	13.00%	12.00%
B	14.07%	Data	14.42%	14.07%	13.54%	13.49%	13.11%
C	2020	Target <=		0.80%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%
C	0.80%	Data	0.84%	0.80%	0.95%	0.74%	0.66%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target A >=	74.00%	75.00%
Target B <=	11.00%	10.00%
Target C <=	1.00%	0.79%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) has established a comprehensive stakeholder engagement system that ensures broad, diverse, and continuous input into special education planning, implementation, and evaluation. This system follows the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model, which integrates annual feedback from stakeholders to improve special education services at the local, regional, and state levels. TEA collects stakeholder input through surveys, public forums, stakeholder meetings, and advisory committees, ensuring that diverse perspectives inform state priorities and decisions.

Stakeholder engagement includes parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, Education Service Centers (ESCs), institutions of higher education, parent-support and advocacy groups, related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. TEA systematically reviews stakeholder group membership and seeks recommendations from internal and external entities to fill vacancies, ensuring statewide geographic and demographic representation.

Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC)

The Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) is an external advisory workgroup that provides guidance on key special education issues in Texas. The purpose of this committee is to facilitate ongoing stakeholder input into the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP). The committee currently consists of 12 members, including two parents.

The TCISC:

- Provides guidance on setting and revising State Performance Plan (SPP) indicator targets.
- Reviews and analyzes the Annual Performance Report (APR), the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and progress on SPP indicator targets.
- Discusses statewide monitoring and general supervision activities and provides feedback to TEA to guide improvement efforts.
- Engages in discussions related to compliance and performance monitoring in Texas.

The TCISC meets quarterly to ensure that a broad range of perspectives are considered in decision-making processes related to improving results for children with disabilities (CWD) and their families.

Special Education Directors Panel

TEA also engages local special education directors through the Special Education Directors Panel, which serves as a direct feedback mechanism between local educational agencies (LEAs) and TEA. This panel includes special education directors from various LEA types, sizes, and geographic regions, ensuring representation from across Texas. Six of the panel's 11 members are parents.

The purpose of this panel is to provide feedback on TEA initiatives and special education projects. TEA works closely with ESCs, which nominate LEA special education directors from their region to serve on the panel. This structure ensures that TEA captures first-hand input from LEA leaders regarding challenges, implementation issues, and areas of need.

The Special Education Directors Panel meets virtually four times per year allowing for ongoing and accessible engagement.

Special Education Director Huddle

The TEA engages ESC special education directors through weekly meetings designed to foster collaboration and dialogue. These directors represent a diverse range of LEAs across Texas, varying in type and size. The meetings serve as a platform for discussing TEA initiatives and special education projects, ensuring that TEA receives direct, informed input. This engagement helps identify potential challenges and considerations relevant to the stakeholder groups these projects aim to support.

Texas Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) for Special Education is the state advisory panel required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The CAC consists of 17 members appointed by the Office of the Governor, each serving staggered four-year terms, with the terms of eight or nine members expiring every two years. The committee currently consists of 11 members, including three parents.

The CAC plays a critical role in identifying and addressing unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities across Texas. It provides advisory input on IDEA-related issues, data reporting, compliance requirements, and policy development.

The CAC meets at least quarterly in public meetings, allowing for transparency and engagement with broader stakeholder groups. The responsibilities of the CAC include:

- Advising TEA on unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities.
- Providing public comments on proposed state rules and regulations related to special education.
- Assisting TEA in developing data reporting systems, including reports to the U.S. Secretary of Education under IDEA.
- Recommending corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring reports.
- Advising TEA on coordinating services across agencies for children with disabilities.

Additionally, the CAC plays a key role in reviewing policies related to significant disproportionality and must submit a biennial report to the Texas Legislature recommending changes to state laws and the TEA rules related to special education.

Meeting dates, agendas, and minutes for the CAC are publicly available on the Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education webpage:

<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>.

Expanding Opportunities for Parent and Community Engagement

TEA is committed to ensuring parents and families are actively engaged in special education planning and decision-making. TEA partners with parent organizations, advocacy groups, and community stakeholders to provide training, outreach, and resources to empower parents as key partners in the educational process.

TEA facilitates public input sessions, statewide surveys, and stakeholder advisory meetings to gather feedback from families on special education policies, practices, and improvement strategies. This engagement helps ensure that Texas parents play an active role in shaping IDEA implementation and improving outcomes for CWD.

Summary

TEA's stakeholder engagement system ensures ongoing, structured opportunities for input from parents, educators, and community members. Through advisory groups such as the TCISC, Special Education Directors Panel, and the CAC, TEA gathers feedback, develops improvement strategies, and

evaluates progress toward improving special education services. These mechanisms help strengthen IDEA implementation, enhance parent engagement, and drive continuous improvement across Texas.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2024-25 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/30/2025	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	812,224
SY 2024-25 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/30/2025	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	614,087
SY 2024-25 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/30/2025	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	101,823
SY 2024-25 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/30/2025	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	2,371
SY 2024-25 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/30/2025	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	87
SY 2024-25 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/30/2025	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	2,436

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 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	614,087	812,224	74.64%	74.00%	75.61%	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	101,823	812,224	13.11%	11.00%	12.54%	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]	4,894	812,224	0.66%	1.00%	0.60%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For additional information about this indicator, visit the following Texas Education Agency (TEA) webpage:

<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/education-environments-school-age>

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in 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	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
A	Target >=		27.05%	27.00%	27.00%	28.00%
A	Data	26.75%	27.05%	26.17%	26.15%	26.40%
B	Target <=		25.70%	26.00%	25.00%	24.00%
B	Data	26.58%	25.70%	26.67%	27.58%	27.40%
C	Target <=		0.85%	0.85%	0.85%	0.85%
C	Data		0.85%	0.93%	0.66%	0.65%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) has established a comprehensive stakeholder engagement system that ensures broad, diverse, and continuous input into special education planning, implementation, and evaluation. This system follows the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model, which integrates annual feedback from stakeholders to improve special education services at the local, regional, and state levels. TEA collects stakeholder input through surveys, public forums, stakeholder meetings, and advisory committees, ensuring that diverse perspectives inform state priorities and decisions.

Stakeholder engagement includes parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, Education Service Centers (ESCs), institutions of higher education, parent-support and advocacy groups, related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. TEA systematically reviews stakeholder group membership and seeks recommendations from internal and external entities to fill vacancies, ensuring statewide geographic and demographic representation.

Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC)

The Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) is an external advisory workgroup that provides guidance on key special education issues in Texas. The purpose of this committee is to facilitate ongoing stakeholder input into the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP). The committee currently consists of 12 members, including two parents.

The TCISC:

- Provides guidance on setting and revising State Performance Plan (SPP) indicator targets.
- Reviews and analyzes the Annual Performance Report (APR), the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and progress on SPP indicator targets.
- Discusses statewide monitoring and general supervision activities and provides feedback to TEA to guide improvement efforts.
- Engages in discussions related to compliance and performance monitoring in Texas.

The TCISC meets quarterly to ensure that a broad range of perspectives are considered in decision-making processes related to improving results for children with disabilities (CWD) and their families.

Special Education Directors Panel

TEA also engages local special education directors through the Special Education Directors Panel, which serves as a direct feedback mechanism between local educational agencies (LEAs) and TEA. This panel includes special education directors from various LEA types, sizes, and geographic regions, ensuring representation from across Texas. Six of the panel's 11 members are parents.

The purpose of this panel is to provide feedback on TEA initiatives and special education projects. TEA works closely with ESCs, which nominate LEA special education directors from their region to serve on the panel. This structure ensures that TEA captures first-hand input from LEA leaders regarding challenges, implementation issues, and areas of need.

The Special Education Directors Panel meets virtually four times per year allowing for ongoing and accessible engagement.

Special Education Director Huddle

The TEA engages ESC special education directors through weekly meetings designed to foster collaboration and dialogue. These directors represent a diverse range of LEAs across Texas, varying in type and size. The meetings serve as a platform for discussing TEA initiatives and special education projects, ensuring that TEA receives direct, informed input. This engagement helps identify potential challenges and considerations relevant to the stakeholder groups these projects aim to support.

Texas Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) for Special Education is the state advisory panel required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The CAC consists of 17 members appointed by the Office of the Governor, each serving staggered four-year terms, with the terms of eight or nine members expiring every two years. The committee currently consists of 11 members, including three parents.

The CAC plays a critical role in identifying and addressing unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities across Texas. It provides advisory input on IDEA-related issues, data reporting, compliance requirements, and policy development.

The CAC meets at least quarterly in public meetings, allowing for transparency and engagement with broader stakeholder groups. The responsibilities of the CAC include:

- Advising TEA on unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities.
- Providing public comments on proposed state rules and regulations related to special education.
- Assisting TEA in developing data reporting systems, including reports to the U.S. Secretary of Education under IDEA.
- Recommending corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring reports.
- Advising TEA on coordinating services across agencies for children with disabilities.

Additionally, the CAC plays a key role in reviewing policies related to significant disproportionality and must submit a biennial report to the Texas Legislature recommending changes to state laws and the TEA rules related to special education.

Meeting dates, agendas, and minutes for the CAC are publicly available on the Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education webpage:

<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>.

Expanding Opportunities for Parent and Community Engagement

TEA is committed to ensuring parents and families are actively engaged in special education planning and decision-making. TEA partners with parent organizations, advocacy groups, and community stakeholders to provide training, outreach, and resources to empower parents as key partners in the educational process.

TEA facilitates public input sessions, statewide surveys, and stakeholder advisory meetings to gather feedback from families on special education policies, practices, and improvement strategies. This engagement helps ensure that Texas parents play an active role in shaping IDEA implementation and improving outcomes for CWD.

Summary

TEA's stakeholder engagement system ensures ongoing, structured opportunities for input from parents, educators, and community members. Through advisory groups such as the TCISC, Special Education Directors Panel, and the CAC, TEA gathers feedback, develops improvement strategies, and evaluates progress toward improving special education services. These mechanisms help strengthen IDEA implementation, enhance parent engagement, and drive continuous improvement across Texas.

Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baselines 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	2024	2025
Target A >=	29.00%	30.00%
Target B <=	24.00%	23.00%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2024	2025
Target C <=	0.85%	0.84%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2024-25 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Early Childhood (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/30/2025

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	11,985	23,523	4,967	40,475
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	1,915	7,120	1,687	10,722
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	5,066	5,095	812	10,973
b2. Number of children attending separate school	18	12	2	32
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	82	135	22	239

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 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 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	10,722	40,475	26.40%	29.00%	26.49%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility	11,005	40,475	27.40%	24.00%	27.19%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Home	239	40,475	0.65%	0.85%	0.59%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For additional information about this indicator, visit the following Texas Education Agency (TEA) webpage:

<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/preschool-environments>

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response
6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 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	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
A1	2008	Target >=	86.00%	85.00%	85.00%	86.00%	86.00%
A1	73.40%	Data	85.03%	83.77%	84.20%	82.09%	82.53%

A2	2008	Target >=	63.00%	63.00%	63.00%	63.00%	63.00%
A2	62.20%	Data	60.07%	59.21%	58.32%	56.73%	55.84%
B1	2008	Target >=	86.00%	84.00%	84.00%	85.00%	85.00%
B1	67.00%	Data	84.41%	83.37%	83.78%	81.08%	81.68%
B2	2008	Target >=	58.00%	56.00%	57.00%	57.00%	58.00%
B2	52.00%	Data	57.49%	56.21%	56.32%	54.25%	54.15%
C1	2008	Target >=	86.00%	84.00%	85.00%	85.00%	86.00%
C1	72.50%	Data	84.62%	84.02%	83.82%	81.99%	81.82%
C2	2008	Target >=	74.00%	71.00%	72.00%	72.00%	73.00%
C2	73.60%	Data	72.15%	71.10%	69.79%	68.49%	67.58%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	87.00%	87.00%
Target A2 >=	63.00%	64.00%
Target B1 >=	86.00%	86.00%
Target B2 >=	59.00%	60.00%
Target C1 >=	86.00%	87.00%
Target C2 >=	74.00%	75.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) has established a comprehensive stakeholder engagement system that ensures broad, diverse, and continuous input into special education planning, implementation, and evaluation. This system follows the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model, which integrates annual feedback from stakeholders to improve special education services at the local, regional, and state levels. TEA collects stakeholder input through surveys, public forums, stakeholder meetings, and advisory committees, ensuring that diverse perspectives inform state priorities and decisions.

Stakeholder engagement includes parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, Education Service Centers (ESCs), institutions of higher education, parent-support and advocacy groups, related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. TEA systematically reviews stakeholder group membership and seeks recommendations from internal and external entities to fill vacancies, ensuring statewide geographic and demographic representation.

Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC)

The Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) is an external advisory workgroup that provides guidance on key special education issues in Texas. The purpose of this committee is to facilitate ongoing stakeholder input into the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP). The committee currently consists of 12 members, including two parents.

The TCISC:

- Provides guidance on setting and revising State Performance Plan (SPP) indicator targets.
- Reviews and analyzes the Annual Performance Report (APR), the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and progress on SPP indicator targets.
- Discusses statewide monitoring and general supervision activities and provides feedback to TEA to guide improvement efforts.
- Engages in discussions related to compliance and performance monitoring in Texas.

The TCISC meets quarterly to ensure that a broad range of perspectives are considered in decision-making processes related to improving results for children with disabilities (CWD) and their families.

Special Education Directors Panel

TEA also engages local special education directors through the Special Education Directors Panel, which serves as a direct feedback mechanism between local educational agencies (LEAs) and TEA. This panel includes special education directors from various LEA types, sizes, and geographic regions, ensuring representation from across Texas. Six of the panel's 11 members are parents.

The purpose of this panel is to provide feedback on TEA initiatives and special education projects. TEA works closely with ESCs, which nominate LEA special education directors from their region to serve on the panel. This structure ensures that TEA captures first-hand input from LEA leaders regarding challenges, implementation issues, and areas of need.

The Special Education Directors Panel meets virtually four times per year allowing for ongoing and accessible engagement.

Special Education Director Huddle

The TEA engages ESC special education directors through weekly meetings designed to foster collaboration and dialogue. These directors represent a diverse range of LEAs across Texas, varying in type and size. The meetings serve as a platform for discussing TEA initiatives and special education projects, ensuring that TEA receives direct, informed input. This engagement helps identify potential challenges and considerations relevant to the stakeholder groups these projects aim to support.

Texas Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) for Special Education is the state advisory panel required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The CAC consists of 17 members appointed by the Office of the Governor, each serving staggered four-year terms, with the terms of eight or nine members expiring every two years. The committee currently consists of 11 members, including three parents.

The CAC plays a critical role in identifying and addressing unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities across Texas. It provides advisory input on IDEA-related issues, data reporting, compliance requirements, and policy development.

The CAC meets at least quarterly in public meetings, allowing for transparency and engagement with broader stakeholder groups. The responsibilities of the CAC include:

- Advising TEA on unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities.
- Providing public comments on proposed state rules and regulations related to special education.
- Assisting TEA in developing data reporting systems, including reports to the U.S. Secretary of Education under IDEA.
- Recommending corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring reports.
- Advising TEA on coordinating services across agencies for children with disabilities.

Additionally, the CAC plays a key role in reviewing policies related to significant disproportionality and must submit a biennial report to the Texas Legislature recommending changes to state laws and the TEA rules related to special education.

Meeting dates, agendas, and minutes for the CAC are publicly available on the Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education webpage: <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>.

Expanding Opportunities for Parent and Community Engagement

TEA is committed to ensuring parents and families are actively engaged in special education planning and decision-making. TEA partners with parent organizations, advocacy groups, and community stakeholders to provide training, outreach, and resources to empower parents as key partners in the educational process.

TEA facilitates public input sessions, statewide surveys, and stakeholder advisory meetings to gather feedback from families on special education policies, practices, and improvement strategies. This engagement helps ensure that Texas parents play an active role in shaping IDEA implementation and improving outcomes for CWD.

Summary

TEA's stakeholder engagement system ensures ongoing, structured opportunities for input from parents, educators, and community members. Through advisory groups such as the TCISC, Special Education Directors Panel, and the CAC, TEA gathers feedback, develops improvement strategies, and evaluates progress toward improving special education services. These mechanisms help strengthen IDEA implementation, enhance parent engagement, and drive continuous improvement across Texas.

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

45,380

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	329	0.72%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	6,216	13.70%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	15,667	34.52%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	15,642	34.47%

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	7,526	16.58%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	31,309	37,854	82.53%	87.00%	82.71%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	23,168	45,380	55.84%	63.00%	51.05%	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	325	0.72%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	6,642	14.64%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	15,901	35.04%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	16,303	35.93%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	6,209	13.68%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	32,204	39,171	81.68%	86.00%	82.21%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	22,512	45,380	54.15%	59.00%	49.61%	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	319	0.70%

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	5,570	12.27%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	11,297	24.89%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	16,258	35.83%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	11,936	26.30%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> <i>(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	27,555	33,444	81.82%	86.00%	82.39%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> <i>(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	28,194	45,380	67.58%	74.00%	62.13%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A2	Local educational agencies (LEAs) across all grade levels, including early childhood programs, reported an increase in children with behavioral needs during the post-pandemic period. These needs may have created challenges in improving the trajectory of children's progress in positive social emotional skills at a rate sufficient for them to function within age expectations by the time they reached six years of age or exited the program. In addition, LEAs continued to experience challenges in hiring and retaining certified teachers, service providers, and interventionists who serve as key providers of instruction that support children's development of positive social-emotional skills. These ongoing shortages may have affected the consistency and intensity of behavioral supports and interventions, potentially hindering children's progress in using positive social emotional skills. Efforts to strengthen fidelity in the implementation of the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) Process may also have contributed to the observed slippage. The Texas Education Agency emphasized to regional education service centers and LEAs the importance of providers having a thorough understanding of the COS Process to ensure the collection of valid and reliable data and reiterated the availability of training resources. As a result, increased consistency in COS training and implementation may have influenced the quality of exit data, contributing to the noted slippage. Finally, beginning in 2024–25, Developmental Delay eligibility was extended to age 9, increasing both the number and diversity of children served. As children with a broader range of developmental needs entered Texas Early Childhood Special Education programs, measured progress at exit may have been impacted. This shift in the population served may have contributed to the slippage observed.
B2	Local educational agencies (LEAs) across the state continued to experience challenges in hiring and retaining certified teachers, speech-language pathologists, and interventionists who serve as key providers of early language, communication, and literacy instruction. These ongoing shortages may have affected instructional consistency and intensity, potentially hindering children's progress in acquiring and using knowledge and skills and creating challenges in improving the trajectory of children's progress at a rate sufficient for them to function within age expectations by the time they reached six years of age or exited the program. Efforts to strengthen fidelity in the implementation of the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) Process may also have contributed to the observed slippage. The Texas Education Agency emphasized to regional education service centers and LEAs the importance of providers having a thorough understanding of the COS Process to ensure the collection of valid and reliable data and reiterated the availability of training resources. As a result, increased consistency in COS training and implementation may have influenced the quality of exit data, contributing to the noted slippage.
C2	Local educational agencies (LEAs) across all grade levels, including early childhood programs, reported an increase in children with behavioral needs during the post-pandemic period. These needs potentially created challenges in improving the trajectory of children's progress in the use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs at a rate sufficient for them to function within age expectations by the time they reached six years of age or exited the program.

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	In addition, LEAs continued to experience challenges in hiring and retaining certified teachers, service providers, and interventionists. These personnel serve as key providers of instruction that support children's development of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. These ongoing shortages may have affected the consistency and intensity of behavioral supports and interventions, potentially hindering children's progress in using appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. Efforts to strengthen fidelity in the implementation of the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) Process may also have contributed to the observed slippage. The Texas Education Agency emphasized to regional education service centers and LEAs the importance of providers having a thorough understanding of the COS Process to ensure the collection of valid and reliable data and reiterated the availability of training resources. As a result, increased consistency in COS training and implementation may have influenced the quality of exit data, contributing to the noted slippage.

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.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) employed two primary data collection instruments for SPPI 7:

The Early Childhood Outcome Center's Childhood Outcomes Summary (COS) Form:

- Served as the template for recording assessment information about student functioning in each outcome area
- Standardized individualized assessment data for consistent statewide reporting
- Utilized a seven-point scale to compare child functioning with age-level expectations
- Implemented a team-based assessment process incorporating multiple information sources, including parent and provider observations and results from valid direct assessments

Texas Education Agency Login (TEAL) SPPI 7 Application:

- Functioned as the state database for collecting, calculating, and analyzing SPPI 7 data
- Provided a standardized platform for local educational agency (LEAs) to submit Entry and Exit COS data

The TEA implemented the following data collection procedures:

Data Collection Timeline:

- Entry COS was completed within 30 school days after:
 - A child is found eligible and placed in Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE)
 - A child transfer into the LEA's ECSE program from another LEA's ECSE program
 - A child who is deaf or hard of hearing and/or has a Visual Impairment receiving special education services prior to age 3 enrolls in ECSE
- Exit COS is completed no earlier than 30 school days prior to:
 - A child turning 6-years-old
 - A child being dismissed from ECSE

Data Submission Process:

- LEAs entered data during the submission window (April 1, 2025-August 8, 2025)
- Extension period: LEAs were required to submit and gain approval for up to 5 business days following the deadline for a "Data Submission Extension" that allowed for an additional 3 business days to submit data. The process LEAs used to request a data submission extension for FFY 2024 is detailed in the

document titled 'Requesting a Data Submission Extension (SY 2024-25),' available at <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/lea-data-submission-extension-requests-0.pdf>

LEAs contacted their regional ESC for submission assistance. Data collection included 3, 4, and 5-year-old children with disabilities (CWDs) measured at two points (Entry and Exit) with minimum six-month intervals between July 1, 2024, to June 30, 2025.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For additional information about this indicator, visit the following The Texas Education Agency (TEA) webpage:

<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/preschool-outcomes>

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

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 2024 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2024 response rate to the FFY 2023 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

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) has established a comprehensive stakeholder engagement system that ensures broad, diverse, and continuous input into special education planning, implementation, and evaluation. This system follows the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model, which integrates annual feedback from stakeholders to improve special education services at the local, regional, and state levels. TEA collects stakeholder input through surveys, public forums, stakeholder meetings, and advisory committees, ensuring that diverse perspectives inform state priorities and decisions.

Stakeholder engagement includes parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, Education Service Centers (ESCs), institutions of higher education, parent-support and advocacy groups, related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. TEA systematically reviews stakeholder group membership and seeks recommendations from internal and external entities to fill vacancies, ensuring statewide geographic and demographic representation.

Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC)

The Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) is an external advisory workgroup that provides guidance on key special education issues in Texas. The purpose of this committee is to facilitate ongoing stakeholder input into the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP). The committee currently consists of 12 members, including two parents.

The TCISC:

- Provides guidance on setting and revising State Performance Plan (SPP) indicator targets.
- Reviews and analyzes the Annual Performance Report (APR), the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and progress on SPP indicator targets.
- Discusses statewide monitoring and general supervision activities and provides feedback to TEA to guide improvement efforts.
- Engages in discussions related to compliance and performance monitoring in Texas.

The TCISC meets quarterly to ensure that a broad range of perspectives are considered in decision-making processes related to improving results for children with disabilities (CWD) and their families.

Special Education Directors Panel

TEA also engages local special education directors through the Special Education Directors Panel, which serves as a direct feedback mechanism between local educational agencies (LEAs) and TEA. This panel includes special education directors from various LEA types, sizes, and geographic regions, ensuring representation from across Texas. Six of the panel's 11 members are parents.

The purpose of this panel is to provide feedback on TEA initiatives and special education projects. TEA works closely with ESCs, which nominate LEA special education directors from their region to serve on the panel. This structure ensures that TEA captures first-hand input from LEA leaders regarding challenges, implementation issues, and areas of need.

The Special Education Directors Panel meets virtually four times per year allowing for ongoing and accessible engagement.

Special Education Director Huddle

The TEA engages ESC special education directors through weekly meetings designed to foster collaboration and dialogue. These directors represent a diverse range of LEAs across Texas, varying in type and size. The meetings serve as a platform for discussing TEA initiatives and special education projects, ensuring that TEA receives direct, informed input. This engagement helps identify potential challenges and considerations relevant to the stakeholder groups these projects aim to support.

Texas Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) for Special Education is the state advisory panel required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The CAC consists of 17 members appointed by the Office of the Governor, each serving staggered four-year terms, with the terms of eight or nine members expiring every two years. The committee currently consists of 11 members, including three parents.

The CAC plays a critical role in identifying and addressing unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities across Texas. It provides advisory input on IDEA-related issues, data reporting, compliance requirements, and policy development.

The CAC meets at least quarterly in public meetings, allowing for transparency and engagement with broader stakeholder groups. The responsibilities of the CAC include:

- Advising TEA on unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities.
- Providing public comments on proposed state rules and regulations related to special education.
- Assisting TEA in developing data reporting systems, including reports to the U.S. Secretary of Education under IDEA.
- Recommending corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring reports.
- Advising TEA on coordinating services across agencies for children with disabilities.

Additionally, the CAC plays a key role in reviewing policies related to significant disproportionality and must submit a biennial report to the Texas Legislature recommending changes to state laws and the TEA rules related to special education.

Meeting dates, agendas, and minutes for the CAC are publicly available on the Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education webpage:

<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>.

Expanding Opportunities for Parent and Community Engagement

TEA is committed to ensuring parents and families are actively engaged in special education planning and decision-making. TEA partners with parent organizations, advocacy groups, and community stakeholders to provide training, outreach, and resources to empower parents as key partners in the educational process.

TEA facilitates public input sessions, statewide surveys, and stakeholder advisory meetings to gather feedback from families on special education policies, practices, and improvement strategies. This engagement helps ensure that Texas parents play an active role in shaping IDEA implementation and improving outcomes for CWD.

Summary

TEA's stakeholder engagement system ensures ongoing, structured opportunities for input from parents, educators, and community members. Through advisory groups such as the TCISC, Special Education Directors Panel, and the CAC, TEA gathers feedback, develops improvement strategies, and evaluates progress toward improving special education services. These mechanisms help strengthen IDEA implementation, enhance parent engagement, and drive continuous improvement across Texas.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	73.04%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target >=	81.00%	73.04%	81.00%	81.00%	81.00%
Data	80.80%	73.04%	69.41%	68.97%	69.98%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target >=	82.00%	82.00%

FFY 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
17,223	23,963	69.98%	82.00%	71.87%	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.

111,728

Percentage of respondent parents

21.45%

Response Rate

FFY	2023	2024
Response Rate	21.50%	21.45%

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, 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 for all racial/ethnic subgroups were proportionally represented within one percentage point of their size in the population. They were somewhat over-representative of students with autism (+3.5 percentage points) and under-representative of students with learning disabilities (-2.3 percentage points), while all other differences by subgroup were less than one percentage point.

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 and primary disability category) 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 with respect the demographic variables analyzed.

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 18 districts with a 0% response rate, all of which had no more 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 2025-2026 (one year after results from this survey become available) and those that were reviewed in 2023-2024. LEAs serving over 50,000 students were added if not already included in the list of LEAs, for a total of 397 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, 111,728 students were randomly selected from 3,123 campuses for the 2024-25 school year.

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 additional information about this indicator, visit the following Texas Education Agency (TEA) webpage:

<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/parent-involvement>

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/2025-11/SPPI%208%202024-2025%20Survey%20Results.pdf>

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

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 2024 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2025).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 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 2024 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2023), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
-----	------	------

Target	0%	0%
--------	----	----

FFY 2024 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.

261

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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
13	0	951	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 Texas Education Agency's (TEA's) definition of "disproportionate representation" refers to a local educational agency (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 TEA employs a risk ratio methodology requiring LEAs to 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 within the particular racial/ethnic groups. For LEAs meeting MSR, Rate #1 is 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 is 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 #1 (denominator). To increase precision, the quotient from both the first rate and the second rate are kept in their exact decimal form without rounding. The risk ratio is then calculated by dividing Rate #1 (numerator) by Rate #2 (denominator). The final risk ratio is then rounded to one decimal place. LEAs that exceed the risk ratio threshold of 2.5 are 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, local educational agencies (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. The Texas Education Agency (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 13 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 additional information about this indicator, visit the following The Texas Education Agency (TEA) webpage:

<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/disproportionate-representation-in-special-education>

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

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

If procedures have been adopted that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), describe how, for instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023, the State verified: (1) that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements; and, (2) each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

The State has adopted procedures that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction); however, no noncompliance was identified for Indicator 9 in FFY 2023.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 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 2024 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2025).

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 2024 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2023), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2024 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.

550

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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
95	0	662	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 Texas Education Agency’s (TEA’s) definition of “disproportionate representation” refers to a local educational agency (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 TEA 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 with disabilities served under IDEA in a particular racial/ethnic group and a minimum cell size (numerator) of at least 10 students with disabilities served under IDEA in a particular racial/ethnic group and specific disability category. For LEAs meeting MSR, Rate #1 was calculated by dividing the number of children in special education from a particular race/ethnicity group and specific disability category (numerator) by the number of children in special education from the same race/ethnicity group (denominator). Rate #2 was calculated by dividing the number of children in special education from all other race/ethnicity groups and the same specific disability category (numerator) by the number of children in special education from all other race/ethnicity groups (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, local educational agencies (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. The Texas Education Agency (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 95 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 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 additional information about this indicator, visit the following The Texas Education Agency (TEA) webpage:

<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/disproportionate-representation-in-disability-categories>

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

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

If procedures have been adopted that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), describe how, for instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023, the State verified: (1) that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements; and, (2) each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

The State has adopted procedures that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction); however, no noncompliance was identified for Indicator 10 in FFY 2023.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 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 2024 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2023), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2007	89.19%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.63%	93.55%	95.86%	96.28%	97.28%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
170,112	167,441	97.28%	100%	98.43%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

2,671

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 170,112 completed initial evaluations, 2,671 (1.57%) did not meet the state-established timeline. Of these, 1,611 evaluations (60.3 %) were completed within a range of 1 to 30 days past the deadline, and 1,060 evaluations (39.7 %) exceeded the timeline by 31 or more days. The most frequently cited reason by local educational agency (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 local educational agency (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, individual education program (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/special-education/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 were used for data collection:

Data Collection Database:

- Texas Student Data System (TSDS): Data for SPPI 11 were collected from local educational agencies (LEAs) through Application Programming Interface (API) transactions from their Individual Operational Data Store (IODS). The TSDS Child Find collection was 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 the Texas Education Agency (TEA)

Data Collection Standards:

- TSDS Child Find Collection: Implemented in the 2021-2022 school year, this data collection was in its fourth 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: <https://tealprod.tea.state.tx.us/TWEDSAPI/28/0/0/Overview/List/873>

Data Submission Timeline for FFY 2024:

- 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, 2024, to June 30, 2025
- Process: LEAs maintained Child Find data in third-party software applications, such as their student information system (SIS). LEAs then promoted data from their IODS via API and performed the necessary actions to validate and complete their data submissions.

Data Upload Procedure:

- Initial Loading: Data loading to the Individual Operational Data Store (IODS) began on August 5, 2024, through eScholar Data Manager (eDM)
- Read for Users to Complete: Completion of data in the TSDS Child Find data collection started on May 19, 2025, with a requirement to correct all fatal validation errors.

Final Data Submission Requirements:

- Deadline: All LEAs were required to resolve validation errors and complete their TSDS Child Find submission by July 31, 2025, at 11:59 PM
- Verification: Completing the submission signified the LEA's affirmation of the accuracy of the data reported through the requirement that all fatal data validation errors had been corrected
- Deadline Compliance: LEAs that submitted data by the deadline but required corrections, or those that missed the deadline, were required to file a submission extension request in order to complete their data submission
- Late Submission Protocol: LEAs were required to submit and gain approval for up to 5 business days following the deadline for a "Data Submission Extension" would have allowed for an additional 3 business days to submit data. The process LEAs used to request a data submission extension for FFY 2024 is detailed in the document titled 'Requesting a Data Submission Extension (SY 2024-25),' available at <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/lea-data-submission-extension-requests-0.pdf>
- Accountability Measures: LEAs that failed to meet the timely data submission requirement were noted in the annual federal LEA special education determination reports

Data Submission Support for LEAs:

- Initial Support: LEAs were instructed to contact their regional ESC Child Find Champion for assistance with data submissions. Training and Certification: ESC Child Find Champions were trained and certified by TSDS trainers to support LEAs.
- Escalation Process: Issues not resolved by Champions were 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 Texas Education Agency (TEA) website at <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/timely-initial-evaluation-child-find>

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
203	197	4	2

FFY 2023 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The Texas Education Agency's (TEA's) Department of General Supervision and Monitoring, in the Office of Special Populations and Student Supports, notified 203 local educational agencies (LEAs) of noncompliance with Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2023 SPPI 11 with due dates for the completion of corrective action plans (CAPs) one year after the date of the noncompliance findings. Monitoring staff in the Division of Review and Support reviewed the CAPs, updated data, and completed documentation to determine if the LEAs were implementing the appropriate regulatory requirements and had corrected any noncompliance findings.

TEA took the following actions for each LEA:

- LEA's 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 Student Verification Workbook, and provided an opportunity for questions and support
- Collected and organized all documentation and updated data 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 showed that 197 of the identified LEAs corrected the noncompliance found within one year of the initial notification of noncompliance and are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of additional records subsequently collected through monitoring (systemic compliance). TEA required 6 LEAs to submit updated CAPs when uncorrected noncompliance was found after the initial one-year timeline; 4 were verified to have subsequently corrected the noncompliance after the initial one-year timeline, and the remaining 2 LEAs are not yet verified as having corrected the noncompliance at this time.

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

203 local educational agencies (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 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.

The Texas Education Agency (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, Student Verification Workbook," and provided an opportunity for questions and support
- Collected and organized all documentation and updated data 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 TEA verified that 197 of the identified LEAs with corrected noncompliance reflected in the updated student-level data the TEA reported for this indicator has completed the required action with 100% compliance within one year of the initial notification of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA consistent with QA 23-01. Of the 6 remaining LEAs, 4 were verified to have subsequently corrected the noncompliance after the initial one-year timeline; the remaining 2 LEAs are not yet verified as having corrected the noncompliance at this time. In cases of student-level noncompliance related to timely initial evaluation, LEAs provided documentation of IEP correction, including but not limited to discussion and/or provision of compensatory services, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA consistent with QA 23-01.

FFY 2023 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) remains engaged with 2 local educational agencies (LEAs) regarding their status of continued noncompliance for SPPI 11 from Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2023. Directives were given to the LEAs to update their 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 LEAs are 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 LEAs' compliance through state and national resource use and strategy implementation

Once TEA is assured through data and other monitoring observations these LEAs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, the LEA findings will be determined to be corrected and closed accordingly.

The Interventions and Sanctions Coordinator meets with each LEA at a minimum of once per month. During those meetings, the following take 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.

If procedures have been adopted that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), describe how, for instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023, the State verified: (1) that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements; and, (2) each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

For instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023 under Indicator 11, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) allowed 162 local educational agencies (LEAs) to correct noncompliance before an official finding was issued through a pre-finding correction process. This process occurred during the clarification period, which took place within three months before a finding would have been issued. Because TEA verified that these LEAs met specific criteria during this period, the cases were considered pre-finding correction, and no formal finding of noncompliance was issued.

To qualify for pre-finding correction, the LEAs demonstrated the following:

- Full Compliance with Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Requirements – Through the State's review of updated data, the LEA achieved 100 percent compliance with the regulatory requirement through updated evidence, such as revised policies and procedures, staff training, and self-monitoring activities.
- Correction of Child-Specific Noncompliance – If applicable, the LEA corrected each instance of child-specific noncompliance unless the child was no longer within the LEA's jurisdiction.
- No Overlapping Corrective Actions – The identified noncompliance was not already subject to a corrective action plan (CAP) under a TEA complaint investigation or due process hearing decision.

After TEA verified these criteria, the noncompliance was resolved without an official finding, aligning with OSEP Memo 23-01, Section B-11.

State Performance Plan (SPP) Clarification Process

TEA tracked and verified 1,040 child-specific corrections through the State Performance Plan Indicators (SPPI) Verification of Child-Specific Corrections spreadsheet, which was used to document whether LEAs met compliance requirements for Indicator 11 during the clarification process. LEAs were eligible to participate in the clarification process for pre-finding correction under the following conditions:

- Timely Data Submission – The LEA submitted required data on time. Late submissions or extension requests disqualified the LEA from the clarification process for this indicator.
- Technical Issues – If an LEA experienced a verified technical issue with a TEA data collection system that prevented timely submission, the LEA notified TEA before the deadline. Approved technical issues allowed continued participation in the clarification process.

By allowing pre-finding correction, TEA provided LEAs an opportunity to resolve noncompliance proactively, reinforcing system-level improvements without formal findings when corrective actions were completed within the clarification period.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2022	1	0	1
FFY 2021	1	1	0

FFY 2022

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) remains engaged with one local educational agency (LEA) regarding its status of continued noncompliance for SPPI 11 from Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2022. Directives were given to the LEA to update its corrective action plan (CAP) and participate in additional monitoring requirements. This LEA continues 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 finding will be determined to be corrected and closed accordingly.

The Interventions and Sanctions Coordinator meets with the LEA at a minimum of once per month. During those meetings, the following take 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 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The Texas Education Agency's (TEA's) Department of General Supervision and Monitoring, in the Office of Special Populations and Student Supports, remained engaged with 1 local educational agency (LEA) with noncompliance with Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2021 SPPI 11. Monitoring staff in the Division of Review and Support reviewed the updated CAP, updated data and information, and completed documentation to determine if the LEA was implementing the appropriate regulatory requirements and had corrected any noncompliance findings.

TEA took the following actions for the LEA:

- LEA's 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 LEA needs
- 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 Student Verification Workbook, and provided an opportunity for questions and support
- Collected and organized all documentation and updated data 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 showed that the LEA corrected the noncompliance found and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of additional records subsequently collected through monitoring (systemic compliance).

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

The local educational agency (LEA) was 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 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.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) took the following actions for the 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 LEA needs
- 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, Student Verification Workbook," and provided an opportunity for questions and support
- Collected and organized all documentation and updated data 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 TEA verified that the LEA completed the required action with 100% compliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with QA 23-01.

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2023, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that the remaining one uncorrected finding of

noncompliance identified in FFY 2022, and the remaining one finding identified in FFY 2021 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 and 2021: (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 2024 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 2023, although its FFY 2023 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2023. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

Response to actions required in FFY 2023 SPP/APR

Local educational agencies (LEAs) with noncompliance for FFY 2023 have been verified as corrected or in progress as described in the "FFY 2023 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected," and "FFY 2023 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected" sections for SPPI 11, as well as the relevant sections pertaining to prior-year uncorrected noncompliance from FFY 2021 and FFY 2022. 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.

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2024, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, that the remaining two uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 and one finding of noncompliance in FFY 2022 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 and FFY 2023: (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 2025 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 2024, although its FFY 2024 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2024. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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 2024 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2023), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2007	77.00%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.26%	92.27%	97.66%	98.04%	96.03%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	9,010
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	1,057
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	7,199
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.	73
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	477
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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 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.	7,199	7,403	96.03%	100%	97.24%	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

204

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.

Local educational agencies (LEAs) reported a total of 9,010 children in the Texas Student Data System (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 "e" and had their compliance calculated under SPPI 11.

A total of 204 children were identified with noncompliance for SPPI 12 resulting from untimely initial evaluations and/or eligibility determination. Of these, 173 were ultimately found eligible for Part B, early childhood special education services (ECSE), but had their IEP developed and implemented after their third birthdays; 31 were ultimately found ineligible for Part B, early childhood special education services (ECSE), but their eligibility determinations were completed after their third birthdays.

Of the 204 children, 74 children had their IEP developed and implemented between 1 to 30 days beyond their third birthdays, whereas a total of 130 children had their IEP developed and implemented 31 or more days beyond their third birthdays. The most frequently cited reasons by LEAs for these delays among noncompliant transitions were late Part C referrals (less than 90 days before the child's third birthday) and scheduling delays. Other delay reasons included parent 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.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) collects early childhood transition data for SPPI 12 through the Texas Student Data System (TSDS), specifically using the TSDS Child Find collection within the Operational Data Store (ODS). This standardized, student-level data collection system, implemented in the 2021-2022 school year, ensures consistent compliance calculations and analyses across the state.

The data collection procedures include:

1. Local educational agencies (LEAs) maintain Child Find data in their local student information systems (SIS)
2. Data for SPPI 12 were collected from local educational agencies (LEAs) through Application Programming Interface (API) transactions from their Individual Operational Data Store (IODS). The TSDS Child Find collection was used for collecting student-level data for both SPPI 11 and SPPI 12
3. Data loading to the Individual Operational Data Store (IODS) began on August 5, 2024, through eScholar Data Manager (eDM).
4. Child Find Data ready to complestarting on May 19, 2025
5. LEAs review district and student level reports to inspect, investigate, and address Special Warnings (SWs) and Fatal Errors (Fs), ensuring valid and reliable data
6. LEAs must clear Fatal Errors and "Complete" their TSDS Child Find submission by the deadline (July 31, 2025), ensuring timely submission
7. LEAs that do not "Complete" their TSDS Child Find submission by the deadline, or LEAs that "Complete" by the submission deadline, but then need to make changes must submit and gain approval for up to 5 business days following the deadline for a "Data Submission Extension" that allows for an additional 3 business days to submit data. The process LEAs used to request a data submission extension for FFY 2024 is detailed in the document titled 'Requesting a Data Submission Extension (SY 2024-25),' available at <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/lea-data-submission-extension-requests-0.pdf>.

Within these procedures, the collection period captures data on children who received early childhood intervention (ECI) services and were referred to LEAs for initial evaluation and eligibility determination. Only children are included with eligibility determination dates from July 1, 2024, to June 30, 2025, and who have an ORIGINAL-ECI-SERVICES-DATE.

To ensure data quality and support LEAs in their data submission:

- The data and reporting unit within the Office of Special Populations and Student Supports (OSPSS) at the TEA published To the Administrator Addressed (TAA) letters notifying LEAs and ESCs of both the opening and closing of the TSDS Child Find collection. These letters serve as official communication from the TEA about important messages of interest for LEAs and education service centers (ESCs).
- Following a hierarchical training structure (TEA, ESC, ? LEA), TEA primarily provided training and guidance to ESC Child Find Champions who are certified by TSDS trainers to provide front-line support to LEAs. The ESCs, in turn, train key staff at LEAs. The LEA trainers then train other LEA staff.
- LEAs and ESCs could access resources and guidance documents on the SPPI 12 webpage, Texas SPED Support website, and by directly emailing either the special education technical assistance team or the data and reporting unit
- Technical support was available through the TSDS Incident Management System (TIMS), powered by the JIRA tracking system, requiring LEAs to submit TIMS tickets to resolve specific data submission technical issues
- LEAs and ESCs could access technical resources in TIMS by searching the Knowledge Base (KB) for assistance
- TEA coordinated with regional ESCs to support LEAs that have not completed or started their submissions during the last two weeks before the data submission deadline
- The TSDS Web-Enabled Data Standards (TWEDS) website provided information about data standards, as required by 19 TAC §61.1025(b)(3), data validation rules, and data submission timelines for LEAs

Through this comprehensive data collection system and multi-tiered support structure, the TEA ensured accurate and timely collection of early childhood transition data for SPPI 12.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For detailed guidance and additional information on SPPI 12, please visit the Texas Education Agency (TEA) website at <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/early-childhood-transition>.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
21	19	1	1

FFY 2023 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The Texas Education Agency's (TEA's) Department of General Supervision and monitoring, in the Office of Special Populations and Student Supports, notified 21 local educational agencies (LEAs) of noncompliance with Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2023 SPPI 12 with due dates for corrective action plans (CAPs) one year after the date of the noncompliance findings. TEA required 2 LEAs to submit updated CAPs when uncorrected noncompliance was found after the initial one-year timeline. Monitoring staff in the Division of Review and Support reviewed the CAPs, updated data, and completed documentation to determine if the LEAs were implementing the appropriate regulatory requirements and had corrected any noncompliance findings.

TEA took the following actions for each LEA:

- LEA's 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

TEA staff 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 Student Verification Workbook, and provided an opportunity for questions and support
- Collected and organized all documentation and updated data 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 showed that 19 of the identified LEAs corrected the noncompliance found within one year of the initial notification of noncompliance and are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of additional records subsequently collected through monitoring (systemic compliance). Of the remaining 2 LEAs, 1 was verified to have subsequently corrected the noncompliance after the initial one-year timeline. Lastly, the TEA verified that no outstanding corrective action existed regarding complaints or due process hearing decisions for children at these LEAs.

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

21 local educational agencies (LEAs) with Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2023 SPPI 12 noncompliance were required to submit student-level data specific to each individual case of noncompliance. Monitoring staff in the Division of Review and Support reviewed the updated data and documentation to

determine if each 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.

The Texas Education Agency (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, Student Verification Workbook," and provided an opportunity for questions and support
- Collected and organized all documentation and updated data 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 TEA verified that 19 of the identified LEAs with corrected noncompliance reflected in the updated student-level data the TEA reported for this indicator has completed the required action with 100% compliance within one year of the initial notification of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA consistent with QA 23-01. Of the 2 remaining LEAs, 1 was verified to have subsequently corrected the noncompliance after the initial one-year timeline. In cases of student-level noncompliance related to timely initial evaluation, LEAs provided documentation of IEP correction, including but not limited to discussion and/or provision of compensatory services, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA consistent with QA 23-01.

FFY 2023 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) remains engaged with one local educational agency (LEA) regarding its status of continued noncompliance for SPPI 12 from Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2023. Directives were given to the LEA to update its corrective action plan (CAP) and participate in additional monitoring requirements. This LEA continues 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 finding will be determined to be corrected and closed accordingly.

The Interventions and Sanctions Coordinator meets with the LEA at a minimum of once per month. During those meetings, the following take 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.

If procedures have been adopted that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), describe how, for instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023, the State verified: (1) that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements; and, (2) each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

For instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023 under Indicator 12, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) allowed 44 local educational agencies (LEAs) to correct noncompliance before an official finding was issued through a pre-finding correction process. This process occurred during the clarification period, which took place within three months before a finding would have been issued. Because TEA verified that these LEAs met specific criteria during this period, the cases were considered pre-finding correction, and no formal finding of noncompliance was issued.

To qualify for pre-finding correction, the LEAs demonstrated the following:

- Full Compliance with Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Requirements – Through the State’s review of updated data, the LEA achieved 100 percent compliance with the regulatory requirement through updated evidence, such as revised policies and procedures, staff training, and self-monitoring activities.
- Correction of Child-Specific Noncompliance – If applicable, the LEA corrected each instance of child-specific noncompliance unless the child was no longer within the LEA’s jurisdiction.
- No Overlapping Corrective Actions – The identified noncompliance was not already subject to a corrective action plan (CAP) under a TEA complaint investigation or due process hearing decision.

After TEA verified these criteria, the noncompliance was resolved without an official finding, aligning with OSEP Memo 23-01, Section B-11.

State Performance Plan (SPP) Clarification Process

TEA tracked and verified 81 child-specific corrections through the State Performance Plan Indicators (SPPI) Verification of Child-Specific Corrections spreadsheet, which was used to document whether LEAs met compliance requirements for Indicator 12 during the clarification process. LEAs were eligible to participate in the clarification process for pre-finding correction under the following conditions:

- Timely Data Submission – The LEA submitted required data on time. Late submissions or extension requests disqualified the LEA from the clarification process for this indicator.
- Technical Issues – If an LEA experienced a verified technical issue with a TEA data collection system that prevented timely submission, the LEA notified TEA before the deadline. Approved technical issues allowed continued participation in the clarification process.
- Exemptions – LEAs that did not serve students in the relevant grade or age range for a specific indicator were exempt from submission requirements and the clarification process.

By allowing pre-finding correction, TEA provided LEAs an opportunity to resolve noncompliance proactively, reinforcing system-level improvements without formal findings when corrective actions were completed within the clarification period.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 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 2023, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 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 and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2024 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 2023, although its FFY 2023 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

Response to actions required in FFY 2023 SPP/APR

All local educational agencies (LEAs) with noncompliance for Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2023 have been verified as corrected or in progress as described in the “FFY 2023 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected” and “FFY 2023 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected” sections 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 2024, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, that the remaining one uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 was corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2023: (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 2025 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 2024, although its FFY 2024 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2024. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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 2024 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2023), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	97.00%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.73%	99.83%	99.45%	98.59%	97.41%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
28,062	28,981	97.41%	100%	96.83%	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.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) utilized the Texas Education Agency Login (TEAL) a secure online application for the collection of data related to SPPI 13. Local educational agencies (LEAs) selected students for data collection who had disabilities and were at least age 16 up through age 21 (age 22 if appropriate) between July 1, 2024, and June 30, 2025.

During Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2024, 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 at <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/sppi-13-selection-procedures-1.pdf>.

Data collection and use of an online SPP 13 application was an integral part of the statewide training process for this indicator. Resources included guidance documents such as, the SPPI 13 Data Collection Guidance document and the SPPI 13 FAQ. The SPPI 13 Folder Checklist for measurement of SPP Indicator 13 is aligned with the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) guidance on data collection (see <https://transitionta.org/i13-checklists/>). The LEA reviewer responded either "Yes" or "No" to each of the eight compliance items included in the SPPI 13 Folder Checklist, which addressed key elements of secondary transition reflected in IDEA. To report an individualized education program (IEP) in compliance for this indicator, all eight compliance SPPI 13 Folder Checklist items must have been marked with "Yes". If there was at least one "No" response, the IEP did not meet the SPP Indicator 13 measurement requirements for compliance. The online SPP 13 TEAL application automatically calculated compliance based on the response to the Data Collection Checklist items.

Data Submission Process:

- LEAs enter data during the submission window (April 1, 2025-August 8, 2025)
- Extension period: LEAs must submit and gain approval for up to 5 business days following the deadline for a "Data Submission Extension" that allows for an additional 3 business days to submit data. The process LEAs used to request a data submission extension for FFY 2024 is detailed in the document titled "Requesting a Data Submission Extension (SY 2024-25)," available at <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/lea-data-submission-extension-requests-0.pdf>.

Updated Information for FFY 2024:

Effective July 2024, new commissioner's rules were enacted in Texas Administrative Code aligning that all federal requirements for secondary transition must be considered and, if appropriate, addressed not later than the first IEP to be in effect when the student turns 14 years of age. As a result, the State's policies and procedures now provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16. However, the State did not choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	YES
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	NO

If no, please explain

Although the state's policies/procedures require public agencies to meet these requirements at age 14, the State is reporting on youth 16 and above for this indicator.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For detailed guidance and additional information on SPPI 13, please visit the Texas Education Agency (TEA) website at <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/secondary-transition>.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
18	16	1	1

FFY 2023 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The Texas Education Agency's (TEA's) Department of General Supervision and Monitoring, in the Office of Special Populations and Student Supports, notified 18 local educational agencies (LEAs) of noncompliance with Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2023 SPPI 13 with due dates for the completion of 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 created documentation to determine if the LEA was implementing the appropriate regulatory requirements and had corrected any noncompliance findings. TEA required 2 LEAs to submit updated CAPs when uncorrected noncompliance was found after the initial one-year timeline. Monitoring staff in the Division of Review and Support reviewed the CAPs, updated data, and completed documentation to determine if the LEAs were 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 Student Verification Workbook, and provided an opportunity for questions and support
- Collected and organized all documentation and updated data 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 showed that 16 of these LEAs corrected the noncompliance within one year of the initial notification of noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of additional records subsequently collected through monitoring (systemic compliance). Of the remaining 2 LEAs, 1 was verified by the TEA to have subsequently corrected the identified noncompliance, although later than one year after initial notification. Lastly, the TEA verified that no outstanding corrective action existed regarding complaints or due process hearing decisions for children at these LEAs.

The TEA verified that each LEA with corrected noncompliance reflected in the updated data the TEA collected 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*

18 local educational agencies (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 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.

The Texas Education Agency (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, Student Verification Workbook," and provided an opportunity for questions and support
- Collected and organized all documentation and updated data 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 TEA verified that 16 of the identified LEAs with corrected noncompliance reflected in the updated student-level data the TEA reported for this indicator has completed the required action with 100% compliance within one year of the initial notification of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA consistent with QA 23-01. Of the 2 remaining LEAs, 1 was verified to have subsequently corrected the noncompliance after the initial one-year timeline. In cases of student-level noncompliance related to secondary transition, LEAs provided documentation of IEP correction, including but not limited to discussion and/or provision of compensatory services, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA consistent with QA 23-01.

FFY 2023 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) remains engaged with one local educational agency (LEA) regarding its status of continued noncompliance for SPPI 13 from Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2023. Directives were given to the LEA to update its corrective action plan (CAP) and participate in additional monitoring requirements. This LEA continues 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 finding will be determined to be corrected and closed accordingly.

The Interventions and Sanctions Coordinator meets with the LEA at a minimum of once per month. During those meetings, the following take 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.

If procedures have been adopted that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), describe how, for instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023, the State verified: (1) that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements; and, (2) each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

For instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023 under Indicator 13, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) allowed 8 local educational agencies (LEAs) to correct noncompliance before an official finding was issued through a pre-finding correction process. This process occurred during the clarification period, which took place within three months before a finding would have been issued. Because TEA verified that these LEAs met specific criteria during this period, the cases were considered pre-finding correction, and no formal finding of noncompliance was issued.

To qualify for pre-finding correction, the LEAs demonstrated the following:

- Full Compliance with Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Requirements – Through the State's review of updated data, the LEA achieved 100 percent compliance with the regulatory requirement through updated evidence, such as revised policies and procedures, staff training, and self-monitoring activities.
- Correction of Child-Specific Noncompliance – If applicable, the LEA corrected each instance of child-specific noncompliance unless the child was no longer within the LEA's jurisdiction.
- No Overlapping Corrective Actions – The identified noncompliance was not already subject to a corrective action plan (CAP) under a TEA complaint investigation or due process hearing decision.

After TEA verified these criteria, the noncompliance was resolved without an official finding, aligning with OSEP Memo 23-01, Section B-11.

State Performance Plan (SPP) Clarification Process

TEA tracked and verified 35 child-specific corrections through the State Performance Plan Indicators (SPPI) Verification of Child-Specific Corrections spreadsheet, which was used to document whether LEAs met compliance requirements for Indicator 13 during the clarification process. LEAs were eligible to participate in the clarification process for pre-finding correction under the following conditions:

- Timely Data Submission – The LEA submitted required data on time. Late submissions or extension requests disqualified the LEA from the clarification process for this indicator.
- Technical Issues – If an LEA experienced a verified technical issue with a TEA data collection system that prevented timely submission, the LEA notified TEA before the deadline. Approved technical issues allowed continued participation in the clarification process.
- Exemptions – LEAs that did not serve students in the relevant grade or age range for a specific indicator were exempt from submission requirements and the clarification process.

By allowing pre-finding correction, TEA provided LEAs an opportunity to resolve noncompliance proactively, reinforcing system-level improvements without formal findings when corrective actions were completed within the clarification period.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 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 2023, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 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 and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2024 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 2023, although its FFY 2023 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

Response to actions required in FFY 2023 SPP/APR

All local educational agencies (LEAs) with noncompliance for Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2023 have been verified as corrected or in progress as described in the "FFY 2023 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected" and "FFY 2023 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected" sections of Indicator 13 above. The description regarding how the Texas Education Agency 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 2024, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, that the remaining one uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 was corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2023: (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 2025 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 2024, although its FFY 2024 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2024. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2025 on students who left school during 2023-2024, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2023-2024 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 2024 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2024 response rate to the FFY 2023 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	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
A	2009	Target ≥	30.00%	30.00%	31.00%	31.00%	32.00%
A	26.00%	Data	19.55%	23.79%	25.80%	28.42%	27.51%
B	2009	Target ≥	63.00%	63.00%	64.00%	64.00%	65.00%
B	59.00%	Data	50.84%	53.43%	55.23%	58.85%	55.54%
C	2009	Target ≥	80.00%	80.00%	81.00%	81.00%	82.00%
C	72.00%	Data	63.93%	64.59%	65.83%	70.17%	66.91%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target A ≥	32.00%	33.00%
Target B ≥	65.00%	66.00%
Target C ≥	82.00%	83.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) has established a comprehensive stakeholder engagement system that ensures broad, diverse, and continuous input into special education planning, implementation, and evaluation. This system follows the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model, which integrates annual feedback from stakeholders to improve special education services at the local, regional, and state levels. TEA collects stakeholder input through surveys, public forums, stakeholder meetings, and advisory committees, ensuring that diverse perspectives inform state priorities and decisions.

Stakeholder engagement includes parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, Education Service Centers (ESCs), institutions of higher education, parent-support and advocacy groups, related state agencies, and

other established stakeholder groups. TEA systematically reviews stakeholder group membership and seeks recommendations from internal and external entities to fill vacancies, ensuring statewide geographic and demographic representation.

Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC)

The Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) is an external advisory workgroup that provides guidance on key special education issues in Texas. The purpose of this committee is to facilitate ongoing stakeholder input into the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP). The committee currently consists of 12 members, including two parents.

The TCISC:

- Provides guidance on setting and revising State Performance Plan (SPP) indicator targets.
- Reviews and analyzes the Annual Performance Report (APR), the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and progress on SPP indicator targets.
- Discusses statewide monitoring and general supervision activities and provides feedback to TEA to guide improvement efforts.
- Engages in discussions related to compliance and performance monitoring in Texas.

The TCISC meets quarterly to ensure that a broad range of perspectives are considered in decision-making processes related to improving results for children with disabilities (CWD) and their families.

Special Education Directors Panel

TEA also engages local special education directors through the Special Education Directors Panel, which serves as a direct feedback mechanism between local educational agencies (LEAs) and TEA. This panel includes special education directors from various LEA types, sizes, and geographic regions, ensuring representation from across Texas. Six of the panel's 11 members are parents.

The purpose of this panel is to provide feedback on TEA initiatives and special education projects. TEA works closely with ESCs, which nominate LEA special education directors from their region to serve on the panel. This structure ensures that TEA captures first-hand input from LEA leaders regarding challenges, implementation issues, and areas of need.

The Special Education Directors Panel meets virtually four times per year allowing for ongoing and accessible engagement.

Special Education Director Huddle

The TEA engages ESC special education directors through weekly meetings designed to foster collaboration and dialogue. These directors represent a diverse range of LEAs across Texas, varying in type and size. The meetings serve as a platform for discussing TEA initiatives and special education projects, ensuring that TEA receives direct, informed input. This engagement helps identify potential challenges and considerations relevant to the stakeholder groups these projects aim to support.

Texas Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) for Special Education is the state advisory panel required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The CAC consists of 17 members appointed by the Office of the Governor, each serving staggered four-year terms, with the terms of eight or nine members expiring every two years. The committee currently consists of 11 members, including three parents.

The CAC plays a critical role in identifying and addressing unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities across Texas. It provides advisory input on IDEA-related issues, data reporting, compliance requirements, and policy development.

The CAC meets at least quarterly in public meetings, allowing for transparency and engagement with broader stakeholder groups. The responsibilities of the CAC include:

- Advising TEA on unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities.
- Providing public comments on proposed state rules and regulations related to special education.
- Assisting TEA in developing data reporting systems, including reports to the U.S. Secretary of Education under IDEA.
- Recommending corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring reports.
- Advising TEA on coordinating services across agencies for children with disabilities.

Additionally, the CAC plays a key role in reviewing policies related to significant disproportionality and must submit a biennial report to the Texas Legislature recommending changes to state laws and the TEA rules related to special education.

Meeting dates, agendas, and minutes for the CAC are publicly available on the Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education webpage:

<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>.

Expanding Opportunities for Parent and Community Engagement

TEA is committed to ensuring parents and families are actively engaged in special education planning and decision-making. TEA partners with parent organizations, advocacy groups, and community stakeholders to provide training, outreach, and resources to empower parents as key partners in the educational process.

TEA facilitates public input sessions, statewide surveys, and stakeholder advisory meetings to gather feedback from families on special education policies, practices, and improvement strategies. This engagement helps ensure that Texas parents play an active role in shaping IDEA implementation and improving outcomes for CWD.

Summary

TEA's stakeholder engagement system ensures ongoing, structured opportunities for input from parents, educators, and community members. Through advisory groups such as the TCISC, Special Education Directors Panel, and the CAC, TEA gathers feedback, develops improvement strategies, and evaluates progress toward improving special education services. These mechanisms help strengthen IDEA implementation, enhance parent engagement, and drive continuous improvement across Texas.

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	41,643
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	11,744
Response Rate	28.20%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	3,444
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	2,940
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)	516
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).	851

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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	3,444	11,744	27.51%	32.00%	29.33%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	6,384	11,744	55.54%	65.00%	54.36%	Did not meet target	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)	7,751	11,744	66.91%	82.00%	66.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B	Although economic conditions are often considered in post-school outcome analyses, Texas did not identify a statistically meaningful relationship between statewide unemployment trends and FFY 2024 Indicator 14B performance. Texas' seasonally adjusted unemployment rate showed the rate remained relatively stable at approximately 4.0–4.2% during the reporting period (https://texaslmi.com/), suggesting that economic conditions did not deteriorate in ways that would explain the decline. However, the state acknowledges that national youth unemployment, distinct from the general unemployment rate, remained consistently higher, with the highest unemployment rates reported for age bracket 16–19 (12%–16%) and age bracket 20–24 (7%–9%) (https://www.bls.gov/web/empsit/cpseaa10.htm). Also, rural counties, particularly those with limited employer presence or lower labor-force participation, tended to exhibit higher unemployment levels or more limited competitive-employment opportunities (https://www.twc.texas.gov/data-reports/unemployment-data).

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	A review of statewide higher education enrollment trends was also conducted, and Texas did not identify a statistically meaningful relationship between statewide enrollment trends and Indicator 14B performance. According to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board's enrollment data, overall statewide higher education enrollment increased in fall 2024 rising 3.6%. However, geographic variation in higher education access may have impacted higher education enrollment in certain regions with data demonstrating marked regional differences in enrollment and proximity to postsecondary institutions, particularly in rural areas where access barriers are more pronounced. While unemployment and higher education enrollment does not directly account for slippage, it provides context for understanding the ongoing challenges youth with disabilities face as they transition into post-secondary life. In addition to unemployment and higher education enrollment analysis, patterns in the other Indicator 14 measures were reviewed to determine any correlation to the decline in Indicator 14B. Although Indicator 14A, which represents youth enrolled only in higher education, increased slightly (27.51% to 29.33%), Indicator 14C, which represents youth engaged in any postsecondary education, training program, competitive employment, or other employment, decreased from 66.91% to 66.00%, signaling a reduction in post-school engagement.

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	2023	2024
Response Rate	26.79%	28.20%

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 respondent group are considered representative of the target population in terms of race/ethnicity 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 diverse 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 Texas Education Agency examined the respondent group's representativeness related to race/ethnicity and disability category for the target population of all exited children with disabilities (CWD) statewide. The respondent group was representative of the target population, having differences that were within the State-established discrepancy metric of +/- 5% for all race/ethnicity groups and disability categories.

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

YES

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

Describe 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 Texas Education Agency (TEA) has developed a multifaceted strategy focusing on high school students and their families by taking the following actions:

- **Updating Contact Information:** Local educational agencies (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.
- **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.

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.

Analysis of Response Rate and Nonresponse Bias:

This section provides a comprehensive analysis of the response rate, an assessment of nonresponse bias, and the steps taken to mitigate bias and encourage participation from a broad cross-section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they exited.

Response Rate Analysis:

The response rate for the survey was calculated at multiple levels—statewide, by regional Education Service Center (ESC), and by local educational agency (LEA). This multi-tiered approach provided a detailed understanding of participation patterns across different administrative and geographical segments. Identifying areas with lower response rates allowed for targeted follow-up efforts to improve overall participation.

Nonresponse Bias Assessment:

To evaluate potential nonresponse bias, the demographic characteristics of survey respondents (including race/ethnicity and primary disability category) were compared with those of the entire target population of students who were no longer in secondary school and had received special education services. The respondent group was largely representative of the target population, with demographic differences falling within the state-established discrepancy metric of ±5%. Specifically:

- **Race/Ethnicity:** Respondents closely mirrored the racial/ethnic composition of the target population, with no group exceeding the ±5% threshold.
- **Disability Categories:** All disability groups were proportionally represented within the ±5% threshold.

This analysis suggests that the survey data are broadly representative of the target population. As such, nonresponse bias was not a significant concern with respect to the demographic variables analyzed.

Strategies used to Reduce Bias and Promote Broad Participation:

To address identified disparities and encourage participation from all segments of the target population, the following measures were implemented:

- **Multiple Response Modes:** Participants were given multiple options for completing the survey, such as online (including audio versions) and phone interviews to accommodate diverse accessibility needs.
- **Partnership with LEAs and Community Organizations:** Collaboration with school districts, transition specialists, and community organizations helped facilitate engagement with youth who may be harder to reach.
- **Engagement Strategies:** Emphasizing the importance of the survey in shaping post-school services encouraged higher participation rates.

By implementing these measures, the survey team worked to minimize nonresponse bias and ensure that findings reflected a broad cross-section of youth who had exited secondary school with IEPs in place.

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 additional information about this indicator, visit the following The Texas Education Agency (TEA) webpage:
<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/post-school-outcomes>

For comprehensive information on the Texas Student Data System (TSDS) Web-Enabled Data Standards:
<https://tealprod.tea.state.tx.us/TWEDSAPI/28/456/0/DataComponents>

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2024 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 2023 SPP/APR

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) and its contractor analyzed the representativeness of the post-school outcomes survey data in comparison to the demographics of all youth who were no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. The description of the TEA's analysis of representativeness, as well as ongoing efforts to increase response rates among underrepresented demographic groups, are included in the appropriate sections for Indicator 14 above with respect to representativeness and nonresponse bias.

14 - OSEP Response

14 - Required Actions

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

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specifications FS229.

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 baselines 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 2024-25 IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution - Due Process Complaints (ED <i>Facts</i> file spec FS229; Data group 896)	11/19/2025	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	150
SY 2024-25 IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution - Due Process Complaints (ED <i>Facts</i> file spec FS229; Data group 896)	11/19/2025	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	69

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

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) has established a comprehensive stakeholder engagement system that ensures broad, diverse, and continuous input into special education planning, implementation, and evaluation. This system follows the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model, which integrates annual feedback from stakeholders to improve special education services at the local, regional, and state levels. TEA collects stakeholder input through surveys, public forums, stakeholder meetings, and advisory committees, ensuring that diverse perspectives inform state priorities and decisions.

Stakeholder engagement includes parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, Education Service Centers (ESCs), institutions of higher education, parent-support and advocacy groups, related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. TEA systematically reviews stakeholder group membership and seeks recommendations from internal and external entities to fill vacancies, ensuring statewide geographic and demographic representation.

Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC)

The Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) is an external advisory workgroup that provides guidance on key special education issues in Texas. The purpose of this committee is to facilitate ongoing stakeholder input into the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP). The committee currently consists of 12 members, including two parents.

The TCISC:

- Provides guidance on setting and revising State Performance Plan (SPP) indicator targets.
- Reviews and analyzes the Annual Performance Report (APR), the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and progress on SPP indicator targets.
- Discusses statewide monitoring and general supervision activities and provides feedback to TEA to guide improvement efforts.
- Engages in discussions related to compliance and performance monitoring in Texas.

The TCISC meets quarterly to ensure that a broad range of perspectives are considered in decision-making processes related to improving results for children with disabilities (CWD) and their families.

Special Education Directors Panel

TEA also engages local special education directors through the Special Education Directors Panel, which serves as a direct feedback mechanism between local educational agencies (LEAs) and TEA. This panel includes special education directors from various LEA types, sizes, and geographic regions, ensuring representation from across Texas. Six of the panel's 11 members are parents.

The purpose of this panel is to provide feedback on TEA initiatives and special education projects. TEA works closely with ESCs, which nominate LEA special education directors from their region to serve on the panel. This structure ensures that TEA captures first-hand input from LEA leaders regarding challenges, implementation issues, and areas of need.

The Special Education Directors Panel meets virtually four times per year allowing for ongoing and accessible engagement.

Special Education Director Huddle

The TEA engages ESC special education directors through weekly meetings designed to foster collaboration and dialogue. These directors represent a diverse range of LEAs across Texas, varying in type and size. The meetings serve as a platform for discussing TEA initiatives and special education projects, ensuring that TEA receives direct, informed input. This engagement helps identify potential challenges and considerations relevant to the stakeholder groups these projects aim to support.

Texas Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) for Special Education is the state advisory panel required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The CAC consists of 17 members appointed by the Office of the Governor, each serving staggered four-year terms, with the terms of eight or nine members expiring every two years. The committee currently consists of 11 members, including three parents.

The CAC plays a critical role in identifying and addressing unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities across Texas. It provides advisory input on IDEA-related issues, data reporting, compliance requirements, and policy development.

The CAC meets at least quarterly in public meetings, allowing for transparency and engagement with broader stakeholder groups. The responsibilities of the CAC include:

- Advising TEA on unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities.
- Providing public comments on proposed state rules and regulations related to special education.
- Assisting TEA in developing data reporting systems, including reports to the U.S. Secretary of Education under IDEA.
- Recommending corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring reports.
- Advising TEA on coordinating services across agencies for children with disabilities.

Additionally, the CAC plays a key role in reviewing policies related to significant disproportionality and must submit a biennial report to the Texas Legislature recommending changes to state laws and the TEA rules related to special education.

Meeting dates, agendas, and minutes for the CAC are publicly available on the Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education webpage:

<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>.

Expanding Opportunities for Parent and Community Engagement

TEA is committed to ensuring parents and families are actively engaged in special education planning and decision-making. TEA partners with parent organizations, advocacy groups, and community stakeholders to provide training, outreach, and resources to empower parents as key partners in the educational process.

TEA facilitates public input sessions, statewide surveys, and stakeholder advisory meetings to gather feedback from families on special education policies, practices, and improvement strategies. This engagement helps ensure that Texas parents play an active role in shaping IDEA implementation and improving outcomes for CWD.

Summary

TEA's stakeholder engagement system ensures ongoing, structured opportunities for input from parents, educators, and community members. Through advisory groups such as the TCISC, Special Education Directors Panel, and the CAC, TEA gathers feedback, develops improvement strategies, and evaluates progress toward improving special education services. These mechanisms help strengthen IDEA implementation, enhance parent engagement, and drive continuous improvement across Texas.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	43.90%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target >=	25.00%-30.00%	43.00%-43.90%	30.00%-35.00%	30.00%-35.00%	30.00%-35.00%

Data	36.28%	43.90%	33.62%	33.03%	39.04%
------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

Targets

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

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target (low)	FFY 2024 Target (high)	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
69	150	39.04%	30.00%	35.00%	46.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For additional information about this indicator, visit the following The Texas Education Agency (TEA) webpage:
<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/resolution-sessions>

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

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

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS228.

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 baselines 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 2024-25 IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution - Mediation Requests (ED <i>Facts</i> file spec FS228; Data group 895)	11/19/2025	2.1 Mediations held	219
SY 2024-25 IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution - Mediation Requests (ED <i>Facts</i> file spec FS228; Data group 895)	11/19/2025	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	89
SY 2024-25 IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution - Mediation Requests (ED <i>Facts</i> file spec FS228; Data group 895)	11/19/2025	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	44

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

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) has established a comprehensive stakeholder engagement system that ensures broad, diverse, and continuous input into special education planning, implementation, and evaluation. This system follows the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model, which integrates annual feedback from stakeholders to improve special education services at the local, regional, and state levels. TEA collects stakeholder input through surveys, public forums, stakeholder meetings, and advisory committees, ensuring that diverse perspectives inform state priorities and decisions.

Stakeholder engagement includes parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, Education Service Centers (ESCs), institutions of higher education, parent-support and advocacy groups, related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. TEA systematically reviews stakeholder group membership and seeks recommendations from internal and external entities to fill vacancies, ensuring statewide geographic and demographic representation.

Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC)

The Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) is an external advisory workgroup that provides guidance on key special education issues in Texas. The purpose of this committee is to facilitate ongoing stakeholder input into the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP). The committee currently consists of 12 members, including two parents.

The TCISC:

- Provides guidance on setting and revising State Performance Plan (SPP) indicator targets.
- Reviews and analyzes the Annual Performance Report (APR), the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and progress on SPP indicator targets.
- Discusses statewide monitoring and general supervision activities and provides feedback to TEA to guide improvement efforts.
- Engages in discussions related to compliance and performance monitoring in Texas.

The TCISC meets quarterly to ensure that a broad range of perspectives are considered in decision-making processes related to improving results for children with disabilities (CWD) and their families.

Special Education Directors Panel

TEA also engages local special education directors through the Special Education Directors Panel, which serves as a direct feedback mechanism between local educational agencies (LEAs) and TEA. This panel includes special education directors from various LEA types, sizes, and geographic regions, ensuring representation from across Texas. Six of the panel's 11 members are parents.

The purpose of this panel is to provide feedback on TEA initiatives and special education projects. TEA works closely with ESCs, which nominate LEA special education directors from their region to serve on the panel. This structure ensures that TEA captures first-hand input from LEA leaders regarding challenges, implementation issues, and areas of need.

The Special Education Directors Panel meets virtually four times per year allowing for ongoing and accessible engagement.

Special Education Director Huddle

The TEA engages ESC special education directors through weekly meetings designed to foster collaboration and dialogue. These directors represent a diverse range of LEAs across Texas, varying in type and size. The meetings serve as a platform for discussing TEA initiatives and special education projects, ensuring that TEA receives direct, informed input. This engagement helps identify potential challenges and considerations relevant to the stakeholder groups these projects aim to support.

Texas Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) for Special Education is the state advisory panel required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The CAC consists of 17 members appointed by the Office of the Governor, each serving staggered four-year terms, with the terms of eight or nine members expiring every two years. The committee currently consists of 11 members, including three parents.

The CAC plays a critical role in identifying and addressing unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities across Texas. It provides advisory input on IDEA-related issues, data reporting, compliance requirements, and policy development.

The CAC meets at least quarterly in public meetings, allowing for transparency and engagement with broader stakeholder groups. The responsibilities of the CAC include:

- Advising TEA on unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities.
- Providing public comments on proposed state rules and regulations related to special education.
- Assisting TEA in developing data reporting systems, including reports to the U.S. Secretary of Education under IDEA.
- Recommending corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring reports.
- Advising TEA on coordinating services across agencies for children with disabilities.

Additionally, the CAC plays a key role in reviewing policies related to significant disproportionality and must submit a biennial report to the Texas Legislature recommending changes to state laws and the TEA rules related to special education.

Meeting dates, agendas, and minutes for the CAC are publicly available on the Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education webpage:

<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>.

Expanding Opportunities for Parent and Community Engagement

TEA is committed to ensuring parents and families are actively engaged in special education planning and decision-making. TEA partners with parent organizations, advocacy groups, and community stakeholders to provide training, outreach, and resources to empower parents as key partners in the educational process.

TEA facilitates public input sessions, statewide surveys, and stakeholder advisory meetings to gather feedback from families on special education policies, practices, and improvement strategies. This engagement helps ensure that Texas parents play an active role in shaping IDEA implementation and improving outcomes for CWD.

Summary

TEA's stakeholder engagement system ensures ongoing, structured opportunities for input from parents, educators, and community members. Through advisory groups such as the TCISC, Special Education Directors Panel, and the CAC, TEA gathers feedback, develops improvement strategies, and evaluates progress toward improving special education services. These mechanisms help strengthen IDEA implementation, enhance parent engagement, and drive continuous improvement across Texas.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2015	73.60%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target >=	75.00%-80.00%	75.00%-80.00%	75.00%-80.00%	75.00%-80.00%	75.00%-80.00%
Data	70.88%	73.60%	66.24%	60.08%	65.12%

Targets

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

FFY 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target (low)	FFY 2024 Target (high)	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
89	44	219	65.12%	75.00%	80.00%	60.73%	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. One possible contributing factor for a reduction in the number of mediations that end in a settlement agreement may be the increase in the number of mediations where the parent was not represented by an attorney or advocate. The data reflects that the number of mediation requests where the parent was not represented has increased by several percentage points each year for the previous four years. Historically, in mediations where the parent is not represented, the mediation ends in agreement approximately 50 percent of the time. However, in the current year, only 35 percent of mediations where the parent was unrepresented ended in agreement. In any event, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) maintains consistently high standards for the pool of mediators under contract with the agency. The majority of the contract mediators have performed this mediation work for TEA 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 continues to believe that the current year slippage is likely a function of fluctuations inherent in a system that encourages, but cannot require, parties to work together toward mutually agreeable solutions.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For additional information about this indicator, visit the following Texas Education Agency (TEA) webpage:
<https://tea.texas.gov/academics/special-student-populations/special-education/data-and-reports/mediation>

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

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

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: 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, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above):

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above):

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

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

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

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

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

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 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, 2025). 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 2024 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2025, i.e., July 1, 2025-June 30, 2026).

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 2024 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2025, i.e., July 1, 2025-June 30, 2026) 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 (EOC) 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.

https://tea.texas.gov/system/files/texas-ssip-theory-of-action-one-pager_0.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	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	30.00%	40.00%

FFY 2024 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 (Numerator)	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 (Denominator)	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
35,776	211,934	15.88%	30.00%	16.88%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide the data source for the FFY 2024 data.

The data source for the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2024 SPP/APR submission (due February 1, 2026) for the 2024-25 school year is the Consolidated Accountability File (CAF). For this indicator, the CAF includes the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR), STAAR Spanish, data for the 2024-25 accountability school year into one record per student. The CAF includes grades 4, 8, and high school reading data, aligning with EDFacts file specification (FS) 178 (Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts) for Data Group 876 (Academic achievement in reading/language arts grades 3-8 table) and 877 (Academic achievement in reading/language arts HS table). Data Group 876 refers to the unduplicated number of students in grades 3 through 8 who completed the state assessment(s) in reading/language arts and received a valid score. Data Group 877 refers to the unduplicated number of high school students who completed the state assessment(s) in reading/language arts and received a valid score.

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

Data collection and analysis for the SiMR involves the following steps:

- A testing contractor provides the CAF to the Texas Education Agency (TEA), combining various assessment data and student information in a comprehensive dataset
 - The data are analyzed descriptively at state, region, and local educational agency (LEA) levels, focusing on grades 4, 8, and high school reading performance with or without accommodations for children with disabilities receiving special education services
 - Analysis results are used to determine improvement, variability, slippage, and to re-baseline targets for the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)
- Overall, this process ensures that data are thoroughly evaluated to support the goal of improving reading proficiency for 4th, 8th, and high school students receiving special education services, aligning with the SiMR.

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, which 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.

The State's current evaluation plan can be found in the FFY 2020–2025 SSIP document, beginning on page 7, at the link provided below.
<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.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) implemented four key infrastructure improvement strategies to support the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) and enhance outcomes for children with disabilities (CWD). The following information summarizes each strategy and its key components:

• Infrastructure Improvement Strategy 1, Allocate Resources:

The goal of this strategy was to support regional educational service centers (ESCs) and local educational agencies (LEAs) in enhancing student outcomes. TEA utilized state and federal resources to bolster technical assistance capabilities, expand professional development opportunities, and improve resource allocation for the Texas SPED Support website. Furthermore, the agency continued to fund regional liaisons tasked with providing personalized support to LEA leadership teams.

• Infrastructure Improvement Strategy 2, Expand Initiatives and Opportunities:

This strategy centered on sustaining grant support, resources, and professional development opportunities aimed at improving reading instruction and addressing related challenges. By maintaining these initiatives, TEA sought to provide ongoing assistance to educators and administrators in their efforts to enhance reading outcomes for students with disabilities.

• Infrastructure Improvement Strategy 3, Communicate Expectations, Standards, and Results:

The goal of this strategy was to communicate expectations, establish standards, and drive positive outcomes. This strategy involved providing continuous statewide training through Texas Reading Academies. TEA also implemented certification requirements and training for school personnel to encourage the adoption of effective research based instructional strategies. Additionally, ESCs were directed to set a regional goal aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) to communicate expectations at both the ESC and LEA levels for improving reading outcomes for children with disabilities (CWD).

• Infrastructure Improvement Strategy 4: Collaboration

This strategy established partnerships with institutions of higher education, statewide agencies, and organizations to strengthen teacher quality initiatives and ensure uniformity across programs and policies that impact student results. Key activities within this strategy included developing a revised certification and testing framework for Special Education Teacher Certification and vetting and approving individual test items for the assessment. Additionally, teacher certification exam and educator certificate fees were waived in the areas of special education.

In summary, the four infrastructure improvement strategies aimed to create a comprehensive support system to improve reading outcomes for CWD in Texas. By allocating resources effectively, expanding initiatives and opportunities, communicating expectations and standards, and fostering collaboration among stakeholders, TEA sought to build a strong foundation for implementing the SSIP and the achievement of the SiMR.

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.

Several short-term and intermediate outcomes related to the four infrastructure improvement strategies were achieved.

Improvement Strategy 1, Allocate Resources:

Texas SPED Support:

TEA expanded resources on the Texas SPED Support website. The platform included Texas AT Support, an assistive technology resource center. Course completion rates and participant feedback were used to assess achievement. For 2024–25, the website had 2,081,189 views, a 51.4% increase from 2023–24. There were 863,165 sessions (up 58.3%) and a total of 411,565 users. There were 249,080 file downloads (94% increase). This outcome was related to professional development (PD) and technical assistance (TA).

Education Service Centers (ESCs):

ESCs continued to support local educational agencies (LEAs) through information dissemination, leadership, training, coaching, PD, and TA. ESCs continued to include a Special Education Continuous Improvement Plan (SECIP) reading goal aligned with the SiMR, supported by activities aimed at improving reading proficiency. To monitor and communicate progress, ESCs tracked activities in an online application, and submitted quarterly SECIP updates in Qualtrics. This outcome was related to data, PD, TA, and accountability/monitoring.

Strategic Integration Liaisons (SIL) Initiative:

TEA continued to fund the SIL Initiative to drive systems-level change by promoting the effective implementation of Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports (MTSS). LEAs were offered synchronous and asynchronous training opportunities. 2,952 educators participated in live sessions and self-paced courses exceeded 22,500 participants. Course completion rates and participant feedback were used to assess achievement. This outcome was related to finance, PD, and TA.

Improvement Strategy 2, Expand Initiatives and Opportunities:

Statewide Technical Assistance Grants:

TEA continued to fund 9 TA grants. The grant structure changed after the first two months of Federal Fiscal year (FFY) 2024. The grants continued to develop resources and PD, but prioritized training, follow-up coaching, and direct support. These grants ensured critical areas of need received targeted support. Based on identified needs, training content and delivery methods were adjusted, enabling successful PD to be scaled statewide. ESCs and grantees submitted quarterly and annual performance reports to evaluate and communicate achievement. This outcome was related to finance, PD, and TA.

The Strategic Integration Liaisons (SIL) Initiative:

The SIL Initiative supported LEA systems-level change through effective implementation of MTSS. The initiative expanded in FFY 2024 to include 24 liaisons statewide who provided coaching, TA, and PD for LEA leadership teams. To evaluate and communicate achievement, progress measures were collected monthly and quarterly. 2,952 educators attended MTSS synchronous courses. Asynchronous courses had over 22,500 completers. This outcome was related to PD and TA.

Standards-Based Individualized Education Program (IEP) Process Training and Coaching:

This initiative provided educators with the knowledge and skills needed to develop and implement IEPs that align with state academic standards, ensuring that CWD received appropriate support and accommodations. Targeted courses were developed to ensure participants had the opportunity to practice skills focused on a particular topic. Achievement was assessed through educator participation and feedback. In 2024–25, 6,388 participants completed the synchronous and asynchronous trainings. This outcome was related to PD and TA.

Literacy Supports for Autism Spectrum Disorder and Assistive Technology:

This course focused on common literacy barriers for students with autism and matching student needs and technology features to improve outcomes. Course completion rates and participant feedback were used to assess achievement. For 2024–25, 192 completed the online course. This outcome was related to PD.

Multi-Tiered System of Supports Best Practices Modules:

These synchronous and asynchronous modules and coaching support focused on identifying and addressing the academic and behavioral needs of students. 234 ESC and LEA trainers delivered training to 2,952 educators through MTSS synchronous courses, while asynchronous MTSS courses were completed by more than 22,500 educators. Achievement was assessed by reflection/application activities, knowledge checks, and feedback surveys. Coaching ensured fidelity in implementing skills. This outcome was related to PD and TA.

The Texas Lesson Study:

This initiative provided for collaborative, research-based lesson development and instruction, with a focus on ensuring that CWD were effectively integrated into the general education classroom. Participation rates and feedback were used to assess achievement. This outcome was related to PD and TA.

Improvement Strategy 3, Communicate Expectations, Standards, and Results:

Special Education Continuous Improvement Plan:

Each ESC established a SECIP reading goal aligned with the SiMR and monitored progress quarterly. This outcome communicated expectations for improving reading outcomes for CWD at both the ESC and LEA levels. Progress was reported quarterly on activities implemented to assess achievement. This outcome was related to accountability/monitoring, PD, and TA.

Texas Reading Academies (TRA):

TRA were updated to include content on dyslexia, MTSS, and inclusive practices. Texas Educator Preparation Program (EPPs) were provided opportunities to offer TRA for teacher candidates to ensure they are prepared with effective reading instructional practices. First-year educators in Texas were required to enroll in the TRA course during their initial year of employment. Outcome measures included enrollment data, course completion, and passing the Science of Teaching Reading exam. For FFY 2024, more than 10,000 enrolled in the TRA, and over 3,000 successfully completed the course. This outcome was related to quality standards and PD.

Reading Academies Certificate:

K-grade 3 teachers and principals were required to have a TRA certificate of completion by the end of 2023-24. Beyond 2024, this requirement was completed through EPPs. As of June 2025, the TRA Reading Academies Authorized Providers webpage listed 22 authorized EPPs. Outcomes were measured by the requirement that LEAs verify their K-3 teachers and administrators held a certificate of completion in the Searchable Database for TRA Completions or were enrolled in a TRS course. For FFY 2024, more than 10,000 enrolled in the TRS, and over 3,000 completed the course. This outcome was related to quality standards and PD.

Improvement Strategy 4, Collaboration:

Special Education Certification Redesign:

Content validation was completed for the Special Education 6–12 and Deafblind EC–12 exams in preparation for their September 2025 launch. Test items were reviewed for the Special Education EC–6 exam in preparation for its September 2027 launch. The completion of content validation and approval of test items were used to assess achievement. This redesign aligns with quality standards and supports the SiMR by enhancing the quality and consistency of newly certified teachers.

Texas Reading Academy Opportunities:

EPPs in Texas were provided opportunities to offer TRA for elementary teacher candidates to ensure that future teachers are prepared with effective reading instructional practices. A list of EPPs providing TRA was maintained on TEA's Reading Academies Authorized Providers webpage with 22 EPPs listed as authorized providers as of June 2025. Outcome measures included enrollment data, completing assignments, and demonstrating content mastery. This outcome was related to quality standards and PD.

By focusing on PD, TA, data-driven decision-making, accountability, and collaboration, TEA has laid the groundwork for sustainable systems improvement.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) will continue its infrastructure improvement strategies in the next reporting period, focusing on allocating resources, expanding initiatives and opportunities, communicating expectations, standards, and results, and fostering collaboration.

Strategy 1, Allocate Resources and Strategy 2, Expand Initiatives and Opportunities:

TEA will continue to bolster technical assistance capabilities, expand professional development opportunities, and improve resource allocation for Texas SPED Support. The agency will also continue to fund regional liaisons tasked with providing personalized support to LEA leadership teams.

- The authorization period for the commissioner-approved reading instruments will be extended through August 2026. These tools will remain available to school systems at no cost. The extension of the authorization period is anticipated to promote use of high-quality reading instruments.
- Develop additional practicum courses to provide educators with opportunities to practice discrete skills related to specific topics (e.g., dyslexia, specific learning disability, Early Childhood Special Education). Additional practicum courses are anticipated to improve reading outcomes by strengthening educators' ability to implement targeted instructional strategies.
- Continue offering Best-Practice Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) modules through both on-demand and face-to-face training, and expanding the pool of certified trainers to deliver training. Participants will gain knowledge for applying strategies in focused areas, strengthening instructional effectiveness for students with diverse learning needs. It is anticipated that expanding the pool of certified trainers and implementing effective strategies will foster greater reading proficiency for students.
- Develop new reading intervention academies to provide training for intervention providers, promoting effective delivery of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions aligned with Texas Reading Academies (TRA) and TIER/MTSS Best Practices modules. Anticipated outcomes include enhanced provider capacity to implement evidence-based Tier 2 and Tier 3 reading interventions.
- Divide the original 18-hour Teaching Literacy to Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities course into six smaller modules and ensure education service center (ESC) representatives continue delivering training and coaching for implementation fidelity. Anticipated outcomes include improved accessibility and engagement and sustained educator support.
- Release the enhanced, updated version of the TRA in 2025–26. The enhanced 2025–26 TRA are expected to strengthen evidence-based instructional practices for K–3 educators.
- Adopt a commissioner-approved list of reading instruments for beginning-, middle-, and end-of-year assessments in grades K–3 to measure foundational literacy skills. The commissioner-approved K–3 assessments are expected to ensure consistent, high-quality assessments that better identify student needs and guide reading instruction.

- Develop and implementation of an adaptive vocabulary assessment pilot for students in kindergarten through third grade. The pilot is expected to promote vocabulary development and support targeted instruction.
- Create specialized reading academies for interventionists, offering in-depth training for educators providing reading interventions. The specialized reading academies are expected to increase educator expertise in delivering effective reading interventions.
- Provide LEAs with a reading intervention tool. The reading intervention tool is expected to promote consistent intervention practices that accelerate literacy growth.
- Require LEAs to provide reading interventions for students who fail two consecutive early literacy assessments (K–3). Requiring interventions is expected to ensure that students receive support that reduces persistent reading difficulties and improves literacy outcomes.
- Allocate funds for a 2025-26 Literacy for Students with Visual Impairments grant to develop a series of online courses for teachers of students with visual impairments and classroom teachers. These courses will build on foundational literacy instruction by providing specialized strategies and resources tailored to the unique learning needs of this population. Enhanced literacy instruction for students with visual impairments is expected to lead to improved reading skills and greater academic achievement for this population.
- Allocate funds for 2025-26 to develop a Dyslexia Instruction and Delivery Components course designed to deepen the knowledge of the required instructional and delivery components for educators providing dyslexia instruction. Improved instructional interventions are expected to lead to better literacy outcomes for students with dyslexia.
- Allocate funds for the 2025-2026 Literacy for Students with Visual Impairments grant, which will support the development of asynchronous course content focused on literacy for students with visual impairments. The content will be published in 2026-2027. These courses will target teachers of students with visual impairments and classroom teachers who serve these students. The courses will build on foundational literacy instruction providing specialized information tailored to the unique learning needs of this population. Equipping teachers with specialized strategies tailored to this population's unique learning needs is anticipated to improve reading outcomes for students with visual impairments.
- Waive certification exam fees for first-time special education certification attempts. Waiving exam fees is expected to encourage additional educators to pursue special education certification, enhancing statewide capacity to support students with disabilities.
- The following additional fund allocations are expected to expand access to high quality reading interventions, resulting in more effective instruction for struggling readers and improved early literacy outcomes statewide.
 - o Provide a \$250 intervention allotment for districts offering reading interventions that meet fidelity standards, capped at 10% of eligible students who failed two consecutive K-3 early literacy assessments and were not already generating a dyslexia allotment.
 - o Provide quarter-day funding for summer reading intervention programs.
 - o Provide \$400 grants for direct reading tutoring services for students who fail consecutive early literacy assessments or the third-grade State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR®) test.

Improvement Strategy 3, Communicate Expectations, Standards, and Results:

- Maintain the requirement for first-year educators in Texas public schools or charter schools to participate in the TRA course during their initial year of employment, including those new to teaching/administering kindergarten through 3rd grade students, new to Texas, or new to a Texas public or open-enrollment public charter school. It is anticipated that first-year educators will gain essential skills to enhance literacy instruction and increase reading proficiency among K–3 students.

Improvement Strategy 4, Collaboration:

- Continue to provide opportunities for Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs) in Texas to offer the TRA for elementary teacher candidates. Anticipated outcomes include elementary teacher candidates receiving high-quality literacy training, ensuring they enter the classroom prepared to deliver effective reading instruction aligned with state standards.
- Improve teacher preparation program content, including required TRA in funded teacher preparation programs. Improving program content is expected to better prepare new teachers to deliver high-quality reading instruction.

By focusing on these next steps and anticipated outcomes, TEA expects to achieve improved reading outcomes for CWD.

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

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) implemented the following evidence-based practices to support the achievement of the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) and improve reading outcomes for children with disabilities (CWD):

- Texas Reading Academies (TRA) and the Science of Reading (STR)
- Literacy Supports for Autism Spectrum Disorder
- Supports for Students with Dyslexia
- Language-Literacy Connection for Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DHH) Children

By implementing these evidence-based practices, the TEA aimed to create a comprehensive support system that empowers educators to meet the diverse needs of students with disabilities and improve reading outcomes in alignment with the SiMR.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practice.

This section provides a summary of evidence-based practices implemented during the reporting period.

Texas Reading Academies and the Science of Reading:

Texas Reading Academies (TRA), a statewide professional development program, engaged elementary educators with high-quality instructional strategies. TRA are rooted in the Science of Teaching Reading (STR), the body of scientific, evidence-based research about what students need to become proficient readers and how to teach students to read. In the TRA program, teachers explored research-based lessons and classroom application of literacy skills. During the 2024-25 school year, the TRA were updated to include enhanced alignment and additional content on dyslexia, Multi-Tiered

Systems of Support (MTSS), and inclusive practices. For FFY 2024, more than 10,000 individuals enrolled in the Texas Reading Academies, and over 3,000 participants successfully completed the course.

Educators who were employed in their first year in a Texas public school or charter school were required to enroll and actively participate in the Reading Academies course during their first year of employment. Beginning in fall 2024, Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs) in Texas were provided opportunities to offer the Reading Academies for elementary teacher candidates. As of June 2025, 22 Educator Preparation Programs were listed as authorized providers on the Texas Education Agency's Reading Academies — Authorized Providers webpage.

Literacy Supports for Autism Spectrum Disorder:

Literacy Supports for Autism Spectrum Disorder provided evidence-based training, follow-up coaching, technical assistance, and instructional resources to support educators serving students with autism. These included:

- Autism Circuit Academy (ACA) – a comprehensive professional development designed to help Texas educators acquire and effectively implement evidence-based practices (EBPs) for teaching students with autism. For grant year 2024–25, a total of 53 participants completed the Level 1 course, and 11 participants completed the Level 2 course.
- Literacy Instruction for Students with Autism - provided participants an understanding of the literacy needs of individuals with autism as the foundation for framing their instruction. For grant year 2024–25, a total of 78 participants completed the online course.
- Literacy Supports-Autism Spectrum Disorder and Assistive Technology - focused on common literacy barriers for students with autism, features of technology that address literacy barriers, and the process for matching student needs and technology features. For grant year 2024–25, a total of 192 participants completed the online course.
- Introduction for Evidence-Based Practices for Students with Autism - defined EBPs, identified resources for EBPs, and reviewed the role of the teacher in selecting and implementing EBPs with fidelity in educational settings. For grant year 2024–25, a total of 323 participants completed the course.

Supports for Students with Dyslexia:

Supports for Students with Dyslexia focused on early identification and intervention for students with dyslexia. The Texas State Board of Education (SBOE) required that each district and open-enrollment charter school implement the SBOE's strategies for screening, individualized evaluation, and techniques for treating dyslexia and related disorders through its approved "Dyslexia Handbook: Procedures Concerning Dyslexia and Related Disorders." The Texas Dyslexia Academies, a series of 6 courses offered synchronously at each education service center (ESC) or asynchronously on Texas SPED Support provided information on systematic, explicit, and evidence-based instruction designed to meet the needs of students with dyslexia. For grant year 2024–25, 49,390 participants completed the Texas Dyslexia Academy online course in TEALearn, TEA's professional development platform, and 13,427 participated in face-to-face trainings, for a total of 62,817 participants.

Language-Literacy Connection for Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DHH) Children:

The Language-Literacy Connection for Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DHH) Children training aimed to improve reading instruction quality for DHH students. This training provided evidence-based information on the skills necessary for literacy success by focusing on ways providers facilitate literacy-related skills for DHH students in the early years. The training enhanced educators' understanding of the unique language and literacy needs of DHH students and equipped them with evidence-based strategies to support reading development. During the 2024–25 grant year, 51 individuals enrolled in the course, of whom 44 successfully completed it. The Literacy Education for DHH Learners, a two-part online course series, provided information on the framework for literacy learning and how elements of language (i.e., syntactic, lexical, and sub lexical) are the building blocks of literacy. A total of 44 individuals enrolled in Part 1 of the Literacy Education for DHH Learners course, of whom 27 completed the section. For Part 2, 23 individuals enrolled, and 14 participants successfully completed it.

The implementation of these practices is expected to enhance teacher effectiveness and improve reading outcomes for CWD. By equipping educators with the necessary tools and knowledge, TEA anticipates progress in student reading achievement.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes.

The following section provides a summary of how each evidence-based practice, along with supporting activities or strategies, was intended to impact the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) by changing program/district policies, procedures, and practices, as well as teacher/provider behaviors, parent/caregiver outcomes, and child outcomes.

Texas Reading Academies and the Science of Reading:

Requiring first year Texas educators to enroll and actively participate in the Reading Academies during their first year of employment ensured educators were well-prepared to teach reading effectively, using data-informed, explicit, systematic, and differentiated instruction. This strengthened evidence-based reading instruction by shifting district policies, procedures, and teacher practices toward daily Science of Teaching Reading instructional practices. Equipping teachers with these practices promoted improved foundational literacy skills and ultimately enhanced reading outcomes.

Providing Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs) in Texas opportunities to offer the Reading Academies for elementary teacher candidates helped ensure that future elementary teachers are well-prepared with effective reading instructional practices before they enter the classroom, promoting improved reading outcomes for students.

Literacy Supports for Autism Spectrum Disorder:

The Literacy Supports for Autism Spectrum Disorder equipped educators with evidence-based practices (EBPs) to strengthen district frameworks and change teacher instructional practices, thereby improving reading achievement for students with autism. Through professional development, coaching, technical assistance, and the Autism Circuit Academy educators were equipped to implement EBPs with fidelity, address literacy barriers, and integrate assistive technology effectively. These activities strengthen teacher capacity for individualized, data-driven instruction and promoted systemic changes that prioritize literacy supports driving improvements in reading outcomes.

Supports for Students with Dyslexia:

Supports for Students with Dyslexia improved reading outcomes by driving systemic and instructional changes. By requiring the implementation of the Dyslexia Handbook: Procedures Concerning Dyslexia and Related Disorders, districts standardized policies for early screening, individualized evaluation, and evidence-based intervention. This ensured consistent identification and support for students with dyslexia. The Texas Dyslexia Academies provided targeted professional development that promoted the implementation of teacher practices toward structured, multisensory approaches to strengthen decoding and comprehension skills. As a result, students received specialized instruction, leading to improvements in reading proficiency.

Language-Literacy Connection for Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DHH) Children:

The Language–Literacy Connection for Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DHH) Children focused on improving reading instruction quality for DHH students by providing evidence-based training and resources. Training enhanced educators' understanding of unique language and literacy needs and equipped them with practical, research-driven strategies to integrate into reading instruction for DHH students. This shift in instructional practices ensured that educators could provide improved reading instruction leading to positive reading outcomes.

The implementation of these practices is expected to enhance teacher effectiveness and improve reading outcomes for children with disabilities (CWD). By equipping educators with the necessary tools and knowledge, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) anticipates progress in student reading achievement.

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

Descriptions of the data collected to monitor the fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change are in this section. To ensure the strategies were implemented as intended, a comprehensive approach to fidelity data collection was employed. This process involved multiple methods and sources to provide a thorough evaluation of implementation practices.

Self-Assessments:

Educators and staff completed self-assessments to reflect on their understanding and application of the strategies. These assessments provided insight into individual understanding of the strategy, offering feedback to improve training.

Attendance Records:

Training attendance was recorded to ensure that all participants were accounted for and to track engagement levels.

Pre-Post Training Knowledge Checks:

Knowledge checks at training sessions measured the increase in participants' understanding and retention of the material. This helped assess the effectiveness of the training programs.

Anecdotal Data:

Observations from coaching sessions and direct observations of strategy implementation were collected. These qualitative data points provided context and depth to the quantitative metrics, offering a more comprehensive view of how strategies were being applied in real-world settings.

Evaluation and Analysis:

The collected data was analyzed to identify trends, strengths, and areas needing improvement. This analysis ensured that the strategies are being implemented with fidelity and guided any necessary adjustments to enhance their effectiveness.

Texas Reading Academies:

All K-3 teachers and administrators of K-3 students within their schools were required to have a Texas Reading Academies (TRA) certificate of completion in the Searchable Database for TRA Completions. First year Texas educators were required to enroll and actively participate in the Reading Academies during their first year of employment. Local educational agencies (LEAs) were responsible for verifying compliance with these requirements. A list of Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs) in Texas delivering TRA was maintained on the Texas Education Agency's Texas Reading Academies and Educator Preparation Programs website.

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.

Additional data was collected and analyzed to support the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice from three groups.

Education Service Center (ESC) Special Education (SPED) Liaisons:

SPED Liaisons, Strategic Integration Liaisons (SILs), and Lead SILs worked to improve outcomes for children with disabilities (CWD) by providing timely, targeted program support to local educational agencies (LEAs). They supported LEA teams through the integration and alignment of the Texas Education Agency (TEA) initiatives. Data on progress towards performance measures was collected monthly and quarterly through Qualtrics.

Technical Assistance (TA) Grants:

Technical Assistance (TA) grants addressed thematic topics and included:

- Grantees who completed required grant activities
- Identified ESC members from all 20 ESCs across the state who supported the implementation (i.e., training and coaching) of required grant activities and reported progress monthly via Qualtrics
- TEA special education program staff who oversaw the grants

TA grantees reported progress towards required activities and metric data quarterly to the initiative's lead at the Texas Education Agency (TEA).

Education Service Centers (ESCs):

Each ESC developed a Regional Special Education Continuous Improvement Plan (SECIP). This plan identified goals based on an analysis of state targets and regional and LEA-level data. In their annual SECIP submission, each ESC established a reading goal aligned with the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). ESCs were required to monitor progress towards the state reading goal and their two additional goals. Progress was reported quarterly on activities implemented in connection with these goals.

Data collected support the decision to continue the ongoing use of evidence-based practices in several ways:

- By offering timely and targeted support, LEAs can more effectively implement evidence-based practices. This ensures that interventions are applied correctly and promptly, leading to better outcomes for CWD.
- Aligning reading goals with the SSIP ensures that local efforts are in sync with state-wide improvement plans. This alignment helps in maintaining a clear focus on priority areas and achieving consistent progress across the state. Monitoring and reporting progress quarterly help in tracking the effectiveness of the implemented practices.
- Providing resources and professional development opportunities ensured that educators have the knowledge and skills necessary to improve reading outcomes for CWD.

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

In this section, we summarize the next steps for each evidence-based practice and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period. The next steps for the practices include the following:

Reading Academies and the Science of Reading:

Educators who are employed in their first year in a Texas public school or charter school will continue to be required to enroll and actively participate in the Reading Academies during their first year of employment. Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs) in Texas will continue to be provided opportunities to offer the Reading Academies for elementary teacher candidates.

Literacy Supports for Autism Spectrum Disorder:

Training, follow-up coaching, technical assistance, and instructional resources to support educators serving students with autism will continue to be offered to enhance knowledge and implementation of evidence-based practices in reading.

Supports for Students with Dyslexia:

Districts and open-enrollment charter schools must continue implementing the State Board of Education's (SBOE) approved strategies for screening, individualized evaluation, and intervention for dyslexia and related disorders, as outlined in the Dyslexia Handbook: Procedures Concerning Dyslexia and Related Disorders. Additionally, the Texas Dyslexia Academies will remain available to provide guidance on systematic, explicit, and evidence-based instruction tailored to meet the needs of students with dyslexia.

Language-Literacy Connection for Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DHH) Children:

Online courses and resources will continue to be made available to educators to increase their knowledge, understanding, and implementation of high-quality reading instruction for children who are deaf or hard of hearing. These resources will continue to provide evidence-based information on the skills necessary for literacy success by focusing on ways providers facilitate literacy-related skills for DHH students.

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.

A review of data supported the decision to continue implementing the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) without any modifications. The State made progress toward improving reading outcomes for children with disabilities (CWD) as measured by the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR).

From Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2020 to FFY 2024, we have seen varying levels of progress on State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR) reading assessments among CWD in grades 4, 8, and high school. In FFY 2020, we established a baseline proficiency rate of 10.85%. The following year, FFY 2021, showed significant improvement, with a proficiency rate of 15.22%, exceeding the target of 12%. In FFY 2022 and FFY 2023, there were modest increases to 15.05% and 15.83% respectively, although these rates fell short of the ambitious targets of 20% and 25%. FFY 2024 continued this upward trajectory with a statewide rate of 16.88%, which did not meet the target of 30% but reflects continued progress over time.

4th Grade Reading Proficiency:

In FFY 2020, the baseline year, 11.83% of 4th grade CWD scored at grade level or above on the STAAR English Language Arts (ELA) assessment. In FFY 2021, the reading assessment score improved significantly to 21.58%, surpassing the target of 12%. However, in FFY 2022, the percentage declined to 16.29%, which did not meet the target of 20%. In FFY 2023, there was a slight improvement to 17.81%, but it still fell short of the target of 25%. In FFY 2024, 21.01% of 4th grade CWD scored at grade level or above, which remains below the 30% target but reflects continued improvement over the previous two years.

8th Grade Reading Proficiency:

In FFY 2020, 10.04% of 8th graders scored at grade level or above on the STAAR ELA assessment. This percentage increased to 15.83% in FFY 2021, exceeding the target of 12%. In FFY 2022, there was a slight decrease to 15.22%. By FFY 2023, the percentage increased again to 15.94%. In FFY 2024, 16.55% of 8th grade CWD scored at grade level or above, which did not meet the 30% target but continues the positive upward trend observed since the baseline year.

High School Reading Proficiency:

In FFY 2020, 10.49% of high school CWD scored at grade level or above on the STAAR English I assessment. This percentage decreased to 9.83% in FFY 2021. In FFY 2022, the proficiency level increased to 13.91%, and in FFY 2023, it further increased to 14.03%. In FFY 2024, 12.84% of high school CWD scored at grade level or above, which is below the 30% target and slightly lower than FFY 2023, but still above the baseline year and generally consistent with the pattern of gradual improvement from FFY 2020 to FFY 2024.

The SSIP data from FFY 2020 through FFY 2024 shows progress despite some fluctuations. The positive trends highlight the effectiveness of current strategies, although continued focus is needed to sustain and enhance progress and to meet ambitious targets. A review of data supports implementing the current SiMR without changes.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) has established a comprehensive stakeholder engagement system that ensures broad, diverse, and continuous input into special education planning, implementation, and evaluation. This system follows the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP) model, which integrates annual feedback from stakeholders to improve special education services at the local, regional, and state levels. TEA collects stakeholder input through surveys, public forums, stakeholder meetings, and advisory committees, ensuring that diverse perspectives inform state priorities and decisions.

Stakeholder engagement includes parents, teachers, service providers, evaluation personnel, special education directors, district and campus administrators, Education Service Centers (ESCs), institutions of higher education, parent-support and advocacy groups, related state agencies, and other established stakeholder groups. TEA systematically reviews stakeholder group membership and seeks recommendations from internal and external entities to fill vacancies, ensuring statewide geographic and demographic representation.

Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC)

The Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) is an external advisory workgroup that provides guidance on key special education issues in Texas. The purpose of this committee is to facilitate ongoing stakeholder input into the Texas Continuous Improvement Process (TCIP). The committee currently consists of 12 members, including two parents.

The TCISC:

- Provides guidance on setting and revising State Performance Plan (SPP) indicator targets.
- Reviews and analyzes the Annual Performance Report (APR), the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and progress on SPP indicator targets.
- Discusses statewide monitoring and general supervision activities and provides feedback to TEA to guide improvement efforts.
- Engages in discussions related to compliance and performance monitoring in Texas.

The TCISC meets quarterly to ensure that a broad range of perspectives are considered in decision-making processes related to improving results for children with disabilities (CWD) and their families.

Special Education Directors Panel

TEA also engages local special education directors through the Special Education Directors Panel, which serves as a direct feedback mechanism between local educational agencies (LEAs) and TEA. This panel includes special education directors from various LEA types, sizes, and geographic regions, ensuring representation from across Texas. Six of the panel's 11 members are parents.

The purpose of this panel is to provide feedback on TEA initiatives and special education projects. TEA works closely with ESCs, which nominate LEA special education directors from their region to serve on the panel. This structure ensures that TEA captures first-hand input from LEA leaders regarding challenges, implementation issues, and areas of need.

The Special Education Directors Panel meets virtually four times per year allowing for ongoing and accessible engagement.

Special Education Director Huddle

The TEA engages ESC special education directors through weekly meetings designed to foster collaboration and dialogue. These directors represent a diverse range of LEAs across Texas, varying in type and size. The meetings serve as a platform for discussing TEA initiatives and special education projects, ensuring that TEA receives direct, informed input. This engagement helps identify potential challenges and considerations relevant to the stakeholder groups these projects aim to support.

Texas Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education

The Texas Continuing Advisory Committee (CAC) for Special Education is the state advisory panel required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The CAC consists of 17 members appointed by the Office of the Governor, each serving staggered four-year terms, with the terms of eight or nine members expiring every two years. The committee currently consists of 11 members, including three parents.

The CAC plays a critical role in identifying and addressing unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities across Texas. It provides advisory input on IDEA-related issues, data reporting, compliance requirements, and policy development.

The CAC meets at least quarterly in public meetings, allowing for transparency and engagement with broader stakeholder groups. The responsibilities of the CAC include:

- Advising TEA on unmet needs in the education of children with disabilities.
- Providing public comments on proposed state rules and regulations related to special education.
- Assisting TEA in developing data reporting systems, including reports to the U.S. Secretary of Education under IDEA.
- Recommending corrective action plans in response to federal monitoring reports.
- Advising TEA on coordinating services across agencies for children with disabilities.

Additionally, the CAC plays a key role in reviewing policies related to significant disproportionality and must submit a biennial report to the Texas Legislature recommending changes to state laws and the TEA rules related to special education.

Meeting dates, agendas, and minutes for the CAC are publicly available on the Continuing Advisory Committee for Special Education webpage: <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>.

Expanding Opportunities for Parent and Community Engagement

TEA is committed to ensuring parents and families are actively engaged in special education planning and decision-making. TEA partners with parent organizations, advocacy groups, and community stakeholders to provide training, outreach, and resources to empower parents as key partners in the educational process.

TEA facilitates public input sessions, statewide surveys, and stakeholder advisory meetings to gather feedback from families on special education policies, practices, and improvement strategies. This engagement helps ensure that Texas parents play an active role in shaping IDEA implementation and improving outcomes for CWD.

Summary

TEA's stakeholder engagement system ensures ongoing, structured opportunities for input from parents, educators, and community members. Through advisory groups such as the TCISC, Special Education Directors Panel, and the CAC, TEA gathers feedback, develops improvement strategies, and evaluates progress toward improving special education services. These mechanisms help strengthen IDEA implementation, enhance parent engagement, and drive continuous improvement across Texas.

Annual Needs Assessment Stakeholder Survey

A brief annual survey about the needs of educators in the state was disseminated to regional education service center (ESC) special education directors, special education technical assistance (TA) grantees, ESC representatives, ESC special education liaisons, and other applicable stakeholders (e.g., regional day school for the deaf directors, Texas School for the Blind and Visually Impaired, Texas School for the Deaf) in order to determine development and implementation needs for the following grant year. The responses were analyzed, and findings were presented to TEA staff to make aligned decisions on the focus of special education TA grants.

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

The following section outlines the key strategies achieved by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) in federal fiscal year (FFY) 2024 to engage stakeholders. These efforts focused on aligning regional goals and activities with the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) and the Theory of Action, enhancing the capacity of education service centers (ESCs), and supporting local educational agencies (LEAs) in improving outcomes for children with disabilities (CWD). The timeline highlights the collaborative efforts, feedback mechanisms, and ongoing support provided to ensure the successful implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) improvement efforts. Additionally, it includes engagements with the Special Education (SPED) Director Panel and the Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC) to gather valuable feedback and address any emerging needs.

July 2024

All 20 ESCs met the deadline for approval of 2024-2025 regional goals and activities aligned with the SSIP and Theory of Action. They identified the State-identified Measurable Result (SIMR) as their first 24-25 regional goal and aligned their special education (SPED) Team activities to at least three of the four Key Strands of Action from the Theory of Action document.

April 2024 – July 2024

ESCs developed and submitted their goals, aligned to the key strands of action, engaged in collaborative dialogue through questions, and received feedback from TEA prior to final approval.

September 2024

The TEA Office of Special Populations and Student Supports (OSPSS) staff collected a list of aligned activities and feedback from two external stakeholder groups (SPED Director Panel and Texas Continuous Improvement Steering Committee (TCISC)) to identify any questions or needs aligned with TEA's or the ESCs' requirements within the Theory of Action and Key Strands of Action. Additional presentations and discussions occurred from October 2024 to June 2025 to keep ESCs updated on TEA initiatives aligned with SSIP, offer additional support, and receive feedback on awareness, usage, and implementation efforts throughout the state.

November 2024, February 2025, May 2025

Quarterly engagements with ESC SPED Directors were held to identify progress on Key Strands of Action, ESC team activities, and data being collected throughout the year. These meetings allowed TEA OSPSS staff to troubleshoot barriers and celebrate progress with ESCs.

January 2025

Special education technical assistance (TA) needs assessment disseminated to the field; responses were due by the end of the month and were then analyzed and presented to TEA staff in February so grant decisions for the following year can be finalized by March.

June 2025

The TEA OSPSS staff engaged with ESC SPED Directors at in-person meetings to further strengthen the capacity of ESCs in their areas of influence to support LEAs in improving reading achievement for students with disabilities.

Monthly

Special education resources and showcases were highlighted in TEA's SPED Newsletter, reaching approximately 61,500 subscribers per newsletter.

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.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

For additional information about this indicator, visit the following Texas Education Agency (TEA) webpage:

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

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

17 - Required Actions

Indicator 18: General Supervision

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Compliance indicator: This SPP/APR indicator focuses on the State's exercise of its general supervision responsibility to monitor its local educational agencies (LEAs) for requirements under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) through the State's reporting on timely correction of noncompliance (20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(11) and 1416(a); and 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.149, 300.600). In reporting on findings under this indicator, the State must include findings from data collected through all components of the State's general supervision system that are used to identify noncompliance. This includes, but is not limited to, information collected through State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, and fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which noncompliance is identified by the State.

Data Source

The State must include findings from data collected through all components of the State's general supervision system that are used to identify noncompliance. This includes, but is not limited to, information collected through State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, and fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which noncompliance is identified by the State. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation. Include all findings of noncompliance regardless of the specific type and extent of noncompliance.

Measurement

This SPP/APR indicator requires the reporting on the percent of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- # of findings of noncompliance issued the prior Federal fiscal year (FFY) (e.g., for the FFY 2024 submission, use FFY 2023, July 1, 2023 – June 30, 2024)
- # of findings of noncompliance the State verified were corrected no later than one year after the State's written notification of findings of noncompliance.

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

Instructions

Targets must be 100%.

States are required to complete the General Supervision Data Table within the online reporting tool.

Report in Column A, the number of findings of noncompliance made in FFY 2023 (July 1, 2023 – June 30, 2024), as reported in the compliance indicator, and report in Column C1, the number of those findings which were timely corrected, as soon as possible and in no case later than one year after the State's written notification of noncompliance. Report in Column B, the number of additional findings of noncompliance related to the compliance indicator made in FFY 2023 (July 1, 2023–June 30, 2024) and report in Column C2, the number of those additional findings related to the compliance indicator which were timely corrected, as soon as possible and in no case later than one year after the State's written notification of noncompliance.

States may also provide additional information related to other findings of noncompliance that are not specific to the compliance indicators. This row would include reporting on all other findings of noncompliance that were not reported by the State under the compliance indicators listed below (e.g., Results indicators (including related requirements), Fiscal, Dispute Resolution, etc.). In future years (e.g., with the FFY 2026 SPP/APR), States may be required to further disaggregate findings by results indicators (1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17), fiscal and other areas.

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 findings of 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 and the actions that have been taken or will be taken, to ensure the subsequent correction of the outstanding noncompliance, to address areas in need of improvement, and any sanctions or enforcement actions used, as necessary and consistent with IDEA's enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

18 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2023	96.54%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data					96.54%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%

Indicator 4B. 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))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
0	16	0	16	0

Please explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any additional findings reported in Column B.

Differences in the number of findings resulted from additional findings of noncompliance identified in Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2023 that were issued based on other IDEA requirements but were related to the requirements of Indicator 4B as defined in the USDE's Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) Related Requirements document. Whereas specific Indicator 4B findings are tied to information from a state database, these additional findings of noncompliance and associated corrective actions arose from general supervision and monitoring activities (scheduled cyclical monitoring) and dispute resolution (complaints).

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on updated data:

The Texas Education Agency's (TEA's) Department of General Supervision and monitoring, in the Office of Special Populations and Student Supports, notified 16 local educational agencies (LEAs) of a total of 16 findings of noncompliance with Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2023 Indicator 4B related requirements with due dates for the completion of 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 Divisions of Review and Support or Complaints and Directed Supports reviewed the CAP, updated data, and completed 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 Student Verification Workbook, and provided an opportunity for questions and support
 - Collected and organized all documentation and updated data 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 showed that the 16 LEAs with noncompliance findings from monitoring activities or dispute resolution are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of additional records subsequently collected through monitoring (systemic compliance). No outstanding corrective actions existed regarding monitoring activities or complaints for children at these LEAs.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected:

Local educational agencies (LEAs) were required to submit student-level data specific to each finding of noncompliance. Monitoring staff in the Divisions of Review and Support and Complaints and Directed Supports reviewed the updated data and documentation to determine if each individual case of noncompliance was corrected and to verify whether systemic corrections were made to ensure the LEA was implementing the appropriate regulatory requirements related to Indicator 4B.

The Texas Education Agency (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, Student Verification Workbook," and provided an opportunity for questions and support
- Collected and organized all documentation and updated data 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 TEA verified that each of the 16 LEAs with one or more of the 16 corrected noncompliance findings reflected in the data the Texas Education Agency (TEA) 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.

All of the 16 LEAs with Indicator 4B related noncompliance findings were verified to have corrected the noncompliance within one year of notification.

Indicator 9. 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))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
0	7	0	7	0

Please explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any additional findings reported in Column B.

Differences in the number of findings resulted from additional findings of noncompliance identified in Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2023 that were issued based on other IDEA requirements but were related to the requirements of Indicator 9 as defined in the USDE's "Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) Related Requirements" document. Whereas specific Indicator 9 findings are tied to information from a state database, each of these additional findings of noncompliance and associated corrective actions arose from dispute resolution (complaints).

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on updated data:

The Texas Education Agency's (TEA's) Department of General Supervision and monitoring, in the Office of Special Populations and Student Supports, notified 7 local educational agencies (LEAs) of a total of 7 findings of noncompliance with Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2023 Indicator 9 related requirements with due dates for the completion of 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 Divisions of Review and Support or Complaints and Directed Supports reviewed the CAP, updated data, and completed 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 Student Verification Workbook, and provided an opportunity for questions and support
 - Collected and organized all documentation and updated data 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 showed that the 7 LEAs with noncompliance findings from dispute resolution are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of additional records subsequently collected through monitoring (systemic compliance). No outstanding corrective actions existed regarding monitoring activities or complaints for children at these LEAs.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected:

Local educational agencies (LEAs) were required to submit student-level data specific to each finding of noncompliance. Monitoring staff in the Divisions of Review and Support and Complaints and Directed Supports reviewed the updated data and documentation to determine if each individual case of noncompliance was corrected and to verify whether systemic corrections were made to ensure the LEA was implementing the appropriate regulatory requirements related to Indicator 9.

The Texas Education Agency (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, Student Verification Workbook," and provided an opportunity for questions and support
- Collected and organized all documentation and updated data 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 TEA verified that each of the 7 LEAs with one or more of the 7 corrected noncompliance findings reflected in the data the Texas Education Agency (TEA) 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.

All of the 7 LEAs with Indicator 9 related noncompliance findings were verified to have corrected the noncompliance within one year of notification.

Indicator 10. 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))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
0	7	0	7	0

Please explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any additional findings reported in Column B.

Differences in the number of findings resulted from additional findings of noncompliance identified in Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2023 that were issued based on other IDEA requirements but were related to the requirements of Indicator 10 as defined in the USDE's "Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) Related Requirements" document. Whereas specific Indicator 10 findings are tied to information from a state database, these additional findings of noncompliance and associated corrective actions arose from general supervision and monitoring activities (scheduled cyclical monitoring).

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on updated data:

The Texas Education Agency's (TEA's) Department of General Supervision and monitoring, in the Office of Special Populations and Student Supports, notified 7 local educational agencies (LEAs) of a total of 7 noncompliance findings with Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2023 Indicator 10 related requirements with due dates for the completion of 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 completed 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 Student Verification Workbook, and provided an opportunity for questions and support
 - Collected and organized all documentation and updated data 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). Lastly, the TEA verified that no outstanding corrective action existed regarding complaints or due process hearing decisions for children at the LEA.

The TEA verified that each of the 7 LEAs with corrected noncompliance reflected in the data the TEA reported related to Indicator 10 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance with the relevant IDEA requirements) related to appropriate identification with respect to race/ethnicity and disability category.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case of noncompliance* was corrected:

Local educational agencies (LEAs) were required to submit student-level data specific to each finding of noncompliance. Monitoring staff in the Division of Complaints and Directed Supports reviewed the updated data and documentation to determine if each individual case of noncompliance was corrected and to verify whether systemic corrections were made to ensure the LEA was implementing the appropriate regulatory requirements related to Indicator 10.

The Texas Education Agency (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, Student Verification Workbook," and provided an opportunity for questions and support
- Collected and organized all documentation and updated data 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 TEA verified that each of these 7 noncompliance findings within the 7 identified LEAs was corrected and reflected in the updated data the TEA collected related to Indicator 10 by completing the required actions to remediate any inappropriate identification with respect to race/ethnicity and disability category with 100% compliance unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA consistent with QA 23-01.

Indicator 11. 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))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
203	286	197	278	14

Please explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any additional findings reported in Column B.

Differences in the number of findings resulted from additional findings of noncompliance identified in Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2023 that were issued based on other IDEA requirements but were related to the requirements of Indicator 11 as defined in the USDE's "Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) Related Requirements" document. Whereas specific Indicator 11 findings are tied to information from a state database, these additional findings of noncompliance and associated corrective actions arose from general supervision and monitoring activities (scheduled cyclical monitoring, risk-based targeted monitoring, and intensive support processes) and dispute resolution (complaints and due process hearings). In addition, new for FFY 2023, TEA identified noncompliance and required corrective actions related to timely eligibility determinations as related to initial evaluations and Indicator 11; these findings are distinct from Indicator 11 but are sourced from the same state database. These findings represent the majority of those counted in Column B and a significant portion of the overall increase in the statewide number of general supervision noncompliance findings and required corrective actions.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on updated data:

The Texas Education Agency's (TEA's) Department of General Supervision and Monitoring, in the Office of Special Populations and Student Supports, notified local educational agencies (LEAs) of noncompliance with Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2023 Indicator 11 related requirements with due dates for the completion of corrective action plans (CAPs) one year after the date of the noncompliance findings. TEA required LEAs to submit a CAP when noncompliance was found. Monitoring staff in the Divisions of Review and Support or Complaints and Directed Supports reviewed the CAP, updated data, and completed documentation to determine if the LEA was implementing the appropriate regulatory requirements and had corrected these

noncompliance findings. For FFY 2023, 203 LEAs were found to have less than 100% compliance regarding timely initial evaluations as reported through the state database; 21 LEAs had noncompliance regarding timely eligibility determinations as reported through the state database; and an additional 45 findings of noncompliance related to initial evaluation procedures were made within 35 distinct LEAs in the course of state monitoring activities, complaints, and due process hearings.

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 Student Verification Workbook, and provided an opportunity for questions and support
- Collected and organized all documentation and updated data 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 showed that of the 45 monitoring and dispute resolution based noncompliance findings, 34 of the LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, based on a review of additional records subsequently collected through monitoring (systemic compliance), within one year of notification; 1 LEA was verified to have subsequently corrected 4 findings but remains engaged with TEA in ongoing corrective actions to ensure that compliance is achieved and appropriately documented for 1 uncorrected finding. Of the 241 findings related to timely eligibility determination reported through the state database, 7 LEAs did not provide sufficient documentation within one year of notification for TEA to verify systemic corrections and were determined to have a status of continuing noncompliance, were subject to additional oversight and sanctions under relevant sections of the Texas Administrative Code and were required to engage in additional intensive monitoring activities. To date, 4 of these LEAs have been verified to have been subsequently corrected, while 3 LEAs remain engaged with TEA in ongoing corrective actions to ensure that compliance is achieved and appropriately documented. Finally, of the 203 LEAs found noncompliant through the state database for Indicator 11, 6 did not provide sufficient documentation within one year of notification for TEA to verify systemic corrections and were determined to have a status of continuing noncompliance, were subject to additional oversight and sanctions under relevant sections of the Texas Administrative Code and were required to engage in additional intensive monitoring activities. To date, 4 of these LEAs have been verified to have been subsequently corrected, while 2 LEAs remain engaged with TEA in ongoing corrective actions to ensure that compliance is achieved and appropriately documented.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case of noncompliance* was corrected:

Local educational agencies (LEAs) were required to submit student-level data specific to each finding of noncompliance. Monitoring staff in the Divisions of Review and Support and Complaints and Directed Supports reviewed the updated data and documentation to determine if each individual case of noncompliance was corrected and to verify whether systemic corrections were made to ensure the LEA was implementing the appropriate regulatory requirements related to Indicator 11.

The Texas Education Agency (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, Student Verification Workbook," and provided an opportunity for questions and support
- Collected and organized all documentation and updated data 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 TEA verified that 475 noncompliance findings reflected in the data the TEA collected for Indicator 11 and related requirements were corrected as a result of completing the required corrective actions within one year of notification, and that 8 of the remaining noncompliance findings were subsequently corrected; 6 noncompliance findings remain uncorrected, with the LEAs participating in ongoing interventions with TEA monitoring personnel. In cases of student-level noncompliance related to timely initial evaluation, LEAs provided documentation of IEP correction, including but not limited to discussion and/or provision of compensatory services, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA consistent with QA 23-01.

Indicator 12. 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))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
21	15	19	14	3

Please explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any additional findings reported in Column B.

Differences in the number of findings resulted from additional findings of noncompliance identified in Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2023 that were issued based on other IDEA requirements but were related to the requirements of Indicator 12 as defined in the USDE's "Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) Related Requirements" document. Whereas specific Indicator 12 findings are tied to information from a state database, these additional findings of noncompliance and associated corrective actions arose from general supervision and monitoring activities (scheduled cyclical monitoring) and dispute resolution (complaints and due process hearings).

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on updated data:

The Texas Education Agency's (TEA's) Department of General Supervision and Monitoring, in the Office of Special Populations and Student Supports, notified local educational agencies (LEAs) of noncompliance with Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2023 Indicator 12 related requirements 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 Divisions of Review and Support or Complaints and Directed Supports reviewed the CAP, updated data, and completed documentation to determine if the LEA was implementing the appropriate regulatory requirements and had corrected any noncompliance findings. For FFY 2023, 21 LEAs were found to have less than 100% compliance regarding timely early childhood transitions as reported through the state database; an additional 15 findings of noncompliance related to early childhood transition procedures were made within 13 distinct LEAs in the course of state monitoring activities.

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 Student Verification Workbook, and provided an opportunity for questions and support
 - Collected and organized all documentation and updated data 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 showed that of the 13 LEAs with one or more of the 15 monitoring and dispute resolution based noncompliance findings, 12 LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, based on a review of additional records subsequently collected through monitoring (systemic compliance), within 1 year of notification; 1 LEA was verified to have subsequently corrected the noncompliance. Additionally, 2 of the 21 LEAs found noncompliant through the state database did not provide sufficient documentation within one year of notification for TEA to verify systemic corrections and were determined to have a status of continuing noncompliance, were subject to additional oversight and sanctions under relevant sections of the Texas Administrative Code and were required to engage in additional intensive monitoring activities. To date, 1 of these LEAs has been verified to have been subsequently corrected, while 1 LEA remains engaged with TEA in ongoing corrective actions to ensure that compliance is achieved and appropriately documented.

The TEA verified that each LEA with corrected noncompliance reflected in the data the TEA collected through the state database, monitoring activities, and dispute resolution processes for Indicator 12 and related requirements is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance with the relevant IDEA requirements).

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

Local educational agencies (LEAs) were required to submit student-level data specific to each finding of noncompliance. Monitoring staff in the Divisions of Review and Support and Complaints and Directed Supports reviewed the updated data and documentation to determine if each individual case of noncompliance was corrected and to verify whether systemic corrections were made to ensure the LEA was implementing the appropriate regulatory requirements related to Indicator 12.

The Texas Education Agency (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, Student Verification Workbook," and provided an opportunity for questions and support
- Collected and organized all documentation and updated data 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 TEA verified that 33 noncompliance findings reflected in the data the TEA collected for Indicator 12 and related requirements were corrected as a result of completing the required corrective actions within one year of notification, and that 2 of the remaining noncompliance findings were subsequently corrected; 1 noncompliance findings remains uncorrected, with the LEA participating in ongoing interventions with TEA monitoring personnel. In cases of student-level noncompliance related to timely early childhood transition, LEAs provided documentation of IEP correction, including but not limited to discussion and/or provision of compensatory services, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA consistent with QA 23-01.

Indicator 13. 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 and 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 a representative of any participating agency 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))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
18	102	16	91	13

Please explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any additional findings reported in Column B.

Differences in the number of findings resulted from additional findings of noncompliance identified in Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2023 that were issued based on other IDEA requirements but were related to the requirements of Indicator 13 as defined in the USDE's "Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) Related Requirements" document. Whereas specific Indicator 13 findings are tied to information from a state database, these additional findings of noncompliance and associated corrective actions arose from general supervision and monitoring activities (scheduled cyclical monitoring and risk-based targeted monitoring activities).

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on updated data:

The Texas Education Agency's (TEA's) Department of General Supervision and Monitoring, in the Office of Special Populations and Student Supports, notified local educational agencies (LEAs) of noncompliance with Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2023 Indicator 13 related requirements with due dates for the completion of 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 completed documentation to determine if the LEA was implementing the appropriate regulatory requirements and had corrected any noncompliance findings. For FFY 2023, 18 LEAs were found to have less than 100% compliance regarding secondary transition as reported through the state database; an additional 102 findings of noncompliance related to secondary transition procedures were made within 52 distinct LEAs in the course of state monitoring activities.

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 Student Verification Workbook, and provided an opportunity for questions and support
- Collected and organized all documentation and updated data as evidence

After receiving the requested documentation for the noncompliance findings, all documentation was reviewed, and a determination was made whether compliance had been met. This determination showed that 16 LEAs with noncompliance findings identified through the state database are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, based on a review of additional records subsequently collected through monitoring (systemic compliance), within one year of notification; 1 LEA was verified to have subsequently corrected the noncompliance after the initial one-year timeline; and 1 LEA remains engaged with TEA in ongoing corrective actions to ensure that compliance is achieved and appropriately documented. Similarly, 48 LEAs having 91 of the 102 monitoring-based noncompliance findings were verified, based on TEA's review of required documentation, to have corrected the noncompliance identified and to be correctly implementing regulatory requirements related to Indicator 13 within one year of notification; 4 LEAs with 10 of the monitoring-based noncompliance findings was verified to have subsequently corrected the noncompliance after the initial one-year timeline; and 1 LEA remains engaged with TEA in ongoing corrective actions to ensure that compliance is achieved and appropriately documented. No outstanding corrective actions existed regarding complaints or due process hearing decisions for children at these LEAs.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case of noncompliance* was corrected:

Local educational agencies (LEAs) were required to submit student-level data specific to each finding of noncompliance. Monitoring staff in the Divisions of Review and Support and Complaints and Directed Supports reviewed the updated data and documentation to determine if each individual case of noncompliance was corrected and to verify whether systemic corrections were made to ensure the LEA was implementing the appropriate regulatory requirements related to Indicator 13.

The Texas Education Agency (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, Student Verification Workbook," and provided an opportunity for questions and support
- Collected and organized all documentation and updated data 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 TEA verified that 107 noncompliance findings reflected in the data the TEA collected for Indicator 13 and related requirements were corrected as a result of completing the required corrective actions within one year of notification, and that 11 of the remaining noncompliance findings were subsequently corrected; 2 noncompliance findings remain uncorrected, with the LEAs participating in ongoing interventions with TEA monitoring personnel. In cases of student-level noncompliance related to secondary transition, LEAs provided documentation of IEP correction (with all required members of Admission, Review, and Dismissal Committees present), including but not limited to discussion and/or provision of compensatory services, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA consistent with QA 23-01.

Optional for FFY 2024 and 2025:

Other Areas - All other findings: States may report here on all other findings of noncompliance that were not reported under the compliance indicators listed above (e.g., Results indicators (including related requirements), Fiscal, Dispute Resolution, etc.).

Column B: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
0	0	0

Please explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any findings reported in this section:

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case of noncompliance* was corrected:

Total for All Noncompliance Identified (Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and Optional Areas):

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
242	433	232	413	30

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Number of findings of Noncompliance that were timely corrected	Number of findings of Noncompliance that were identified FFY 2023	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
645	675	96.54%	100%	95.56%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Percent of findings of noncompliance not corrected or not verified as corrected within one year of identification	4.44%
---	-------

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Findings of noncompliance for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, as well as their related requirements, are reported in this section at the local educational agency (LEA) level, in alignment with definitions provided in the introduction and with the data presented for each of the compliance indicators.

Summary of Findings of Noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 Corrected in FFY 2024 (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State identified during FFY 2023 (the period from July 1, 2023 through June 30, 2024)	675
2. Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of written notification to the LEA of the finding)	645
3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year	30

Subsequent Correction: Summary of All Outstanding Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023 Not Timely Corrected in FFY 2024 (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of findings of noncompliance not timely corrected	30
5. Number of findings in Col. A the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline for Indicator 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 ("subsequent correction")	6
6a. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 4B	0
6b. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 9	0
6c. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 10	0
6d. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 11	4
6e. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 12	1
6f. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 13	10
6g. (optional) Number of written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - All other findings	0
7. Number of findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected	9

Subsequent correction: If the State did not ensure timely correction of previous findings of noncompliance, provide information on the nature of any continuing noncompliance and the actions that have been taken, or will be taken, to ensure the subsequent correction of the outstanding noncompliance, to address areas in need of improvement, and any sanctions or enforcement actions used, as necessary and consistent with IDEA's enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

At the time of this report, 5 local educational agencies (LEAs) remain engaged with the Texas Education Agency (TEA) for a total of 9 federal fiscal year (FFY) 2023 noncompliance findings described in this section that are not yet verified as corrected. 4 of these findings was for noncompliance directly tied to SPP compliance indicator (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, or 13) requirements, while the other 5 findings were for noncompliance in requirements related to the SPP compliance indicators.

For all LEAs that failed to implement necessary corrective action within one year of receiving written notification and were designated as having uncorrected noncompliance, enforcement measures were taken immediately and involved the imposition of graduated sanctions. Any LEA with uncorrected noncompliance beyond one year from the initial written notification received a Notice of Continuing Noncompliance (CNC) identifying sanctions with a required CAP, including possible directed supports.

LEAs designated in CNC status meet with an Interventions and Sanctions Coordinator at a minimum of once per month. During those meetings, the following typically take 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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2022	2	2	0

FFY 2022

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on updated data:

The Texas Education Agency's (TEA's) Department of General Supervision and monitoring, in the Office of Special Populations and Student Supports, remained engaged with 2 local educational agencies (LEAs) for 2 findings of noncompliance with Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2022 Indicator 11 requirements and Indicator 13 related requirements. TEA required these LEAs to submit updated CAPs for uncorrected noncompliance. Monitoring staff in the Divisions of Review and Support or Complaints and Directed Supports reviewed the updated CAPs, updated data and information, and completed documentation to determine if the LEAs were 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 LEA needs

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 Student Verification Workbook, and provided an opportunity for questions and support
- Collected and organized all documentation and updated data 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 showed that each of the 2 LEAs is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of additional records subsequently collected through monitoring (systemic compliance). No outstanding corrective actions existed regarding monitoring activities or complaints for children at these LEAs.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case of noncompliance* was corrected:

The local educational agencies (LEAs) were required to submit student-level data specific to each finding of noncompliance. Monitoring staff in the Divisions of Review and Support and Complaints and Directed Supports reviewed the updated data and documentation to determine if each individual case of noncompliance was corrected and to verify whether systemic corrections were made to ensure the LEAs were implementing the appropriate regulatory requirements.

The Texas Education Agency (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 LEA needs
- 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, Student Verification Workbook," and provided an opportunity for questions and support
- Collected and organized all documentation and updated data 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 TEA verified that the noncompliance findings reflected in the data the TEA collected was corrected as a result of completing the required corrective actions. In cases of student-level noncompliance related to timely initial evaluation, these LEAs provided documentation of IEP correction (with all required members of Admission, Review, and Dismissal Committees present), including but not limited to discussion and/or provision of compensatory services, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with QA 23-01.

18 - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that the remaining two uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2022: (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 2024 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Response to actions required in FFY 2023 SPP/APR

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the TEA reported 2 LEA-level findings of noncompliance from FFY 2022 that remained uncorrected, and at the time of this FFY 2024 SPP/APR submission, both LEAs have been verified to have subsequently corrected the noncompliance.

Local educational agencies (LEAs) with noncompliance for FFY 2023 have been verified as corrected or in progress as described in relevant sections for each SPP compliance indicator, as well as the relevant sections pertaining to prior-year uncorrected noncompliance from FFY 2022. 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 Indicator 18.

18 - OSEP Response

18 - Required Actions

The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, that the remaining nine uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2023: (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 and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

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

Chief State School Officer

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:

Kristin McGuire

Title:

Deputy Commissioner, Office of Special Populations and Student Supports, Texas Education Agency

Email:

kristin.mcguire@tea.texas.gov

Phone:

512-463-8119

Submitted on:

04/22/26 2:39:19 PM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

Texas

2026 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)

Percentage (%)	Determination
82.73%	Meets Requirements

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

Section	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	20	14	70.00%
Compliance	22	21	95.45%

(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 2026: Part B."

2026 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	98%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	24%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	80%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	25%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	82%	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	99%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	47%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	86%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	20%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	81%	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	13	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma*	47	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."

2026 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator (3)	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023 (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	98.43%	NO	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	97.24%	NO	2
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	96.83%	NO	2
Indicator 18: General Supervision	95.56	NO	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/FFY2024-Part-B-SPP-APR-Reformatted-Measurement-Table.pdf>

(4) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are $\geq 5\%$ and $< 10\%$ for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, and $\geq 90\%$ and $< 95\%$ for Indicators 11, 12, 13 and 18.

Data Rubric

Texas

FFY 2024 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
18	1	1

APR Score Calculation

Subtotal	22
Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2024 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) =	27

(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: 7/30/25	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 2/18/26	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 2/18/26	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 2/18/26	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 1/7/26	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/19/25	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 11/19/25	1	1	1	3

618 Score Calculation

Subtotal	21
Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.28571429) =	27.00

(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 1.28571429 points are 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	27
B. 618 Grand Total	27.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	54.00
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	54.00
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 1.28571429.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2026 Submission

SPP/APR Data

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

Part B 618 Data

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

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	FS002 & FS089	7/30/2025
Part B Personnel	FS070, FS099, FS112	2/18/2026
Part B Exiting	FS009	2/18/2026
Part B Discipline	FS005, FS006, FS007, FS088, FS143, FS144	2/18/2026
Part B Assessment	FS175, FS178, FS185, FS188	1/7/2026
Part B Dispute Resolution	FS227, FS228, FS229, FS230	11/19/2025
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	FS231, FS232, FS233, FS234, FS235, FS236, FS237, FS238	11/19/2025

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 and metadata responses submitted to *EDFacts* align. 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: 2024-25

Section A: Written, Signed Complaints

(1) Total number of written signed complaints filed.	1,218
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued.	745
(1.1) (a) Reports with findings of noncompliance	387
(1.1) (b) Reports within timelines	725
(1.1) (c) Reports within extended timelines	20
(1.2) Complaints pending.	20
(1.2) (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing.	20
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	453

Section B: Mediation Requests

(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes.	418
(2.1) Mediations held.	219
(2.1) (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints.	141
(2.1) (a) (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints.	89
(2.1) (b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints.	78
(2.1) (b) (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints.	44
(2.2) Mediations pending.	152
(2.3) Mediations withdrawn or not held.	47

Section C: Due Process Complaints

(3) Total number of due process complaints filed.	429
(3.1) Resolution meetings.	150
(3.1) (a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings.	69
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated.	16
(3.2) (a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited).	5
(3.2) (b) Decisions within extended timeline.	11
(3.3) Due process complaints pending.	120
(3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing).	293

Section D: Expedited Due Process Complaints (Related to Disciplinary Decision)

(4) Total number of expedited due process complaints filed.	61
(4.1) Expedited resolution meetings.	35
(4.1) (a) Expedited written settlement agreements.	17
(4.2) Expedited hearings fully adjudicated.	5
(4.2) (a) Change of placement ordered	0
(4.3) Expedited due process complaints pending.	5
(4.4) Expedited due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	51

This report shows the most recent data that was entered by:
Texas

These data were extracted on the close date:
11/19/2025

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 2026 will be posted in June 2026. 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 18, 2026

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) 2026 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) 2024 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

Texas' 2026 determination is based on the data reflected in its "2026 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 2026: Part B](#)" (HTDMD).

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making determinations in 2026, as it did for Part B determinations in 2015-2025. (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 2026, OSEP continued to use results data related to:

- (1) the participation of children with disabilities (CWD) on Statewide assessments (which include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment);
- (2) the participation and performance of CWD on the most recently administered (school year 2023-2024) National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), as applicable (For the 2026 determinations, OSEP is using results data on the participation and performance of children with disabilities on the NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE), and Puerto Rico. OSEP used the available NAEP data for Puerto Rico in making Puerto Rico's 2026 determination as it did for Puerto Rico's 2025 determination. OSEP used the publicly available NAEP data for the BIE that was comparable to the NAEP data available for the 50 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico; specifically OSEP did not use NAEP participation data in making the BIE's 2026 determination because the most recently administered NAEP participation data for the BIE that is publicly available is 2020, whereas the most recently administered NAEP participation data for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico that is publicly available is 2024);
- (3) the percentage of CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma; and
- (4) the percentage of CWD who dropped out.

You may access the results of OSEP's review of Texas' SPP/APR and other relevant data by accessing the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS) 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 18, 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 your State to review the Introduction to the SPP/APR, which may also include language in the "OSEP Response" and/or "Required Actions" sections.

Your State will also find the following important documents in the Determinations Enclosures section:

- (1) Texas' RDA Matrix;

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.

- (2) the HTDMD [link](#);
- (3) "2026 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 2024-2025," 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' 2026 determination is Meets Requirements. A State's or Entity's 2026 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 2023, 2024, and 2025), and those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2026 determination.

The Department is committed to transparency, accountability, strong partnerships with States and stakeholders, high expectations, and improved outcomes for children with disabilities. To support these priorities, the Secretary is considering modifications to the factors the Department uses when making determinations, effective June 2027. Potential additional factors include graduation rates and assessment data, such as graduation rates for students with disabilities compared to all students, and Statewide assessment results of students with disabilities compared to all students. Other potential factors include longstanding noncompliance (such as OSEP-identified noncompliance that remains unresolved) as a factor in determinations.

For the FFY 2025 SPP/APR submission due on February 1, 2027, OSEP is providing the following information about the IDEA Section 618 data. The 2025-26 IDEA Section 618 Part B data submitted as of the due date will be used for the FFY 2025 SPP/APR and the 2027 IDEA Part B Results Matrix and data submitted during correction opportunities will not be used for these purposes. The 2025-26 IDEA Section 618 Part B data will automatically be prepopulated in the SPP/APR reporting platform for Part B SPP/APR Indicators 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 15, and 16 (as they have in the past). 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 EDPass prior to the applicable due date: 1) revise the uploaded data to address the business rule; or 2) provide a data note addressing why the uploaded data 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 2024 SPP/APR. In addition, Texas must:

- (1) review LEA performance against targets in the Texas' 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,



Erin McHugh
Deputy Director
Office of Special Education Programs

cc: Texas Director of Special Education