SCHOOL YEAR (SY): 2023-2024

MONITORING PATH: Cyclical Monitoring CYCLE: 5, GROUP: 1 (October-December)

REGION: 13

DISTRICT NAME: Pflugerville ISD (227904)

DISTRICT TYPE: Independent

SHARED SERVICE ARRANGEMENT (SSA) MEMBER: NA

FISCAL AGENT: NA

TEXAS VIRTUAL SCHOOL NETWORK CAMPUS: NA

RESIDENTIAL FACILITY (RF): Yes

MONITORING TYPE: Comprehensive Desk Review

SELF-REPORTED NONCOMPLIANCE: No COMPLIANCE STATUS: Noncompliant ACTION REQUIRED: Corrective Action Plan

STRATEGIC SUPPORT PLAN (SSP) DUE DATE: NA

CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN (CAP) DUE DATE: March 1, 2024

DYSLEXIA STATUS: Meets Requirements DYSLEXIA ACTION REQUIRED: NA

DYSLEXIA PERFORMANCE PLAN (DPP) DUE DATE: NA

INTRODUCTION

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) extends its appreciation to the parents, students, teachers, staff, and administration for their time and effort supporting the special education cyclical monitoring review at Pflugerville ISD (227904).

The special education cyclical monitoring report provides the local education agency (LEA) with findings from the comprehensive cyclical monitoring review and serves as official notification fr.@#4the\NTEABha6a48y7indbagsro0mganGeth@il@indec(\n)]|\text{ITETQUIREQQ

OVERVIEW OF CYCLICAL MONITORING

Table 1. Summary of the Desk Review (Policy Review and Folder Review) by Priority Area

Priority Area	Policy Review	Folder Review
Child Find/Evaluation/FAPE	100% (16 of 16)	100% (24 of 24)
IEP Development	100% (3 of 3)	67% (16 of 24)
IEP Content	100% (3 of 3)	100% (24 of 24)
IEP Implementation	100% (14 of 14)	100% (24 of 24)

Properly Constituted ARD 100% (7 of 7) 100% (24 of 24)

For mo	re informat	ion about Hi	B 4545, plea	ase see the	following i	resources:

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.

STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

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:

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

Construct	Family/ Guardian	Special Education	General Education	Administration
Number of Respondents	FΚ	FR	FR	FR
Understanding	*	*	*	*
Engagement	*	*	*	*
Competency	*	*	*	*

[&]quot;FR" (Too Few Respondents) denotes respondent ROLE counts <5 AND "*" denotes masked data for the corresponding percentage values. "**" denotes no data reported for LEA.

DYSLEXIA PROGRAM EVALUATION

The Dyslexia Program Evaluation Rubric, aligned to Senate Bill 2075 of the 86th Legislature, TEC 38.003 (c-1), and 19 TAC Chapter 74.28, is utilized for determining program statuses shown in Tables 8 and 9. For any dyslexia area of implementation not meeting requirements, the LEA must complete a Dyslexia Performance Plan (DPP). The DPP guides LEAs through the continuous improvement process to address areas needing growth to positively impact students with dyslexia. LEAs should complete the DPP no later than 120 calendar days after receiving notification of "Did Not Meet Requirements." The TEA will provide the DPP, or it can be accessed on the <u>Division of Review and Support Dyslexia Program Evaluation</u> webpage and can

Area	Legal Requirement	Status
Screening	TEC §28.006(g), (g-2); TEC §38.003(a); 19 TAC §74.28 (c), (d), (e), (m)	Meets Requirements
Reading Instruments	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)	Meets Requirements
Evaluation and Identification	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)	Meets Requirements
Instruction	TEC §38.003(b); 19 TAC §74.28(a), (c), (e), (i); TEC §21.054(b)	Meets Requirements

Progress Monitoring

SUMMARY OF REQUIRED ACTION

The required actions from the comprehensive cyclical monitoring review are shown in Table 12. More information about the support levels is in the <u>Differentiated Monitoring and Support Guide</u>.

Table 12. Summary of Required Action

Required Action	Due Date	Support Level	Communication Cadence
Strategic Support Plan (SSP)	NA	Universal (DL 1)	NA
Corrective Action Plan (CAP)	March 1, 2024	Intensive	30 Days
Dyslexia Performance Plan (DPP)	NA	NA	NA

[.] 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-

APPENDIX I: SELF-REPORTED NONCOMPLIANCE

Table 13 lists self-reported noncompliance identified by the LEA. This noncompliance is also included in the overall total count of noncompliance in Table 2.

Table 13. Self-Reported Noncompliance

Area	Citation	Level	Status	Action
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

APPENDIX II: ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

<u>Differentiated Monitoring and Support System</u>

<u>Differentiated Monitoring and Support Guide</u>

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)

APPENDIX III: ACRONYMS

Acronym Description

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

OSPM Office of Special Populations and Monitoring

PEIMS Public Education Information Management System

RDA Results Driven Accountability

RF Residential Facilities

SD Significant Disproportionality

SPP State Performance Plan

SSA Shared Service Arrangement

SSP Strategic Support Plan

TAA To the Administrator Addressed (TAA) Letter

TAC Texas Administrative Code
TEA Texas Education Agency
TEC Texas Education Code

TSDS Texas Student Data System

