

A **A** **A** **A**
A **A** **A** **A**

INTRODUCTION3

OVERVIEW OF CYCLICAL MONITORING4

COMPLIANCE REVIEW AND NONCOMPLIANCE FINDINGS.....4

 Compliance Review4

 Noncompliance Findings5.....

A A A A

TEA conducts a comprehensive cyclical monitoring review once every six years for each LEA. The balanced monitoring review supports positive student outcomes and ensures the LEA maintains compliance with the requirements and purposes of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), per [34 CFR §](#)

A	A	A	A	A
---	---	---	---	---

A	A	
---	---	--



A	A	A	A	A
State Assessment	PR47 - TEC §39.025(a-4) ; 19 TAC §101.3023	Systemic	Noncompliant	Corrective Action Plan
Transition	PR49 - 34 CFR §300.43(a)(1)	Systemic	Noncompliant	Corrective Action Plan
Transition	PR50 - 34 CFR §300.43(a)(2)	Systemic	Noncompliant	Corrective Action Plan
Transition	PR52 - 34 CFR §300.124(b); 34 CFR §300.323(b)	Systemic	Noncompliant	Corrective Action Plan

Note. The “36g

A A A A A

A A

[House Bill \(HB\) 4545](#) was passed during the 87th Regular Texas Legislative Session and signed into law by Governor Abbott on June 16, 2021, and June 7, 2021, respectively. This bill subsequently became codified into Texas Education Code (TEC).

HB 4545 amended TEC [§28.0211](#) and [§28.0217](#)

For more information about HB 4545, please see the following resources:

- x [House Bill 4545 Implementation Overview](#) (TAA Letter)
- x [House Bill 4545 Overview for Parents](#) (YouTube Video)
- x [House Bill 4545 Frequently Asked Questions](#)

A

A

A

A

A

Data from the following areas were considered for the cyclical monitoring review:

- AskTED District Identification Data
- Results Driven Accountability (RDA) Data
- Significant Disproportionality (SD) Data
- State Performance Plan (SPP) Data
- Desk Review Data
- On-site Review Data (if applicable)
 - o On-site Interviews (e.g., campus administrator (-)Tj 0.a Tcmd ag., c1 ()TJncisc- 0 Tcr3

LEAs with a cyclical on-site review included an additional dyslexia sample. The dyslexia on-site sample was generated by TEA and includes the stratified random selection of not more than six students that consists of two strata with three students each identified with either dyslexia and special education or dyslexia and Section 504.

A A A

LEAs must ensure students with disabilities receiving special education are provided a “free appropriate public education” (FAPE) when attending and being educated at an RF located in their geographical boundary (see [TAC §89.1115\(d\)\(1\)\(i\)](#)). Jean Massieu Academy (057819) had NA based on the NA.

A A A A Q Q A A N O A A A

A A A A

TEA collected stakeholder data through an open survey during the comprehensive cyclical monitoring review from family/guardians, special education providers, general education providers, and district/campus administration. If an on-site review was conducted, stakeholder data was also collected through structured interviews. The purpose of analyzing survey and interview data was to identify positive stakeholder sentiment related to three constructs:

- **Understanding** This construct measures positive sentiment about knowledge of special education program requirements and LEA provisions of ~~service~~
- **Engagement** This construct measures positive sentiment regarding engagement with special education and opportunities for involvement in special education training related
- **Competency in Implementation** This construct measures positive sentiment ~~of~~ perceived competency required for implementing special education program requirements

Table 9 shows stakeholder results for each construct (i.e., understanding, engagement, competency) by role (i.e., family/guardians, special education providers, general education providers, district/campus administration). Stakeholder data were collected using a non-probabilistic sampling method and included respondents who self-identified their role and LEA when completing the online survey or interview. Therefore, inferences and judgments from the stakeholder analysis should be approached with caution. The number of respondents refers to the number of unique respondents for a particular role. Roles with fewer than five respondents are masked. The percentages are the total number of positive responses out of all responses.

Table 9. Stakeholder Results by Role and Construct

A	PA A	A A	A A	(Campus and District) A
Number of Respondents	FR	**	**	**

Understanding *

A	A A	A
Screening x	TEC §28.006(g), (g-2); TEC §38.003(a); 19 TAC §74.28 (c), (d), (e), (m)	Meets Requirements
Reading Instruments x	TEC §28.006(b), (b-1), (c), (c-1), (c-2), (d)(2), (g), (g-1), (g-2); TEC §38.003; 19 TAC §74.28(d), (m), (j)	Pre-finding Corrected
Evaluation and Identification x	TEC §28.006(g), (g-1); TEC §29.0031(a)(1); TEC §38.003(a), (b), (b-1); 19 TAC §74.28 (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (i), (m)	Pre-finding Corrected
Instruction x	TEC §38.003(b); 19 TAC §74.28(a), (c), (e), (i); TEC §21.054(b)	Meets Requirements
Progress Monitoring	TEC §28.021(b); TEC §29.0031(d)	Pre-finding Corrected

A A A A

The following successes were identified during dyslexia monitoring:

- PROCEDURE Comprehensive dyslexia program procedures are implemented across the local education agency.
- NOT APPLICABLE (NA)

A A A A A

The following areas of need were identified during dyslexia monitoring:

- NOT APPLICABLE (NA)
- NOT APPLICABLE (NA)

A A

TEA recommends the following resources to support the LEA's dyslexia program:

- [TEA Review and Support Dyslexia Monitoring](#)
- [TEA Special Education Dyslexia and Related Disorders](#)
- [Dyslexia: TEA Professional Learning Course](#) [TEA Learn Dyslexia Modules](#)

A

A A A A

The required actions from the comprehensive cyclical monitoring review are shown in Table 12. More information about the support levels is in the [Differentiated Monitoring and Support Guide](#).

Table 12. Summary of Required Action

A A	A A	A A	A A
Strategic Support Plan (SSP)	NA	Universal (DL 1)	NA
Corrective Action Plan (CAP)	May 30, 2024	Intensive	30 Days
Dyslexia Performance Plan (DPP)	NA	NA	NA

Note. SSP due date was when the initial SSP submission was due. The SSP communication cadence uses the current year's RDA DLs (e.g., 2023 DL from SY 2022–2023) and includes a check-in frequency of 30 days (DL 4), 60 days (DL 3), or 90 days (DL 2). The SSP support level is based on the current year's RDA DLs and includes three possible values: Intensive (DL 4 or 3), Targeted (DL 2), and Universal (DL 1).

AA N

A A

A

A

[Differentiated Monitoring and Support System](#)

[Differentiated Monitoring and Support Guide](#)

[State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report and Requirements](#)

[Race and Ethnicity in Special Education: Difference Between Data Collection and Data Reporting](#)

[Results Driven Accountability Reports and Data](#)

[Results Driven Accountability District Reports](#)

[2023 Accountability Manual, Chapter 12—Results Driven Accountability \(RDA\)](#)

A

A A A

A A

ARD	Admission, Review, and Dismissal
CAP	Corrective Action Plan
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CISD	Consolidated Independent School District
DMS	Differentiated Monitoring and Support
DPP	Dyslexia Performance Plan
DL	Determination Level
ESC	Education Service Center
FAPE	Free Appropriate Public Education
ISD	Independent School District
IDEA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
LEA	Local Education Agency
OSEP	Office of Special Education Programs
0.7 (o)-3.6 (f)Rt561 0.30 1m2Rt5P	