

# RF Monitoring Workgroup - Session 2

March 24-25, 2015

## General Feedback

### Any other thoughts on RF Monitoring?

- I think that you are never going to please/agree with everyone.
- I think that there are questions that need to be added in order to obtain deeper information re: this population.
- Should read ESY/summer programs because not all students have regression/recoupment issues. Summer programming is helpful in reducing academic gaps.
- In regards to facilities and commensurate day, I do know one that truly may not every have that availability. It is a short term mental health crisis facility intended to stabilize individuals. The students are typically there 3-5 days and have done "school" 2-4 hours depending on therapies, physician visits, etc. Just something to consider!
- RF monitoring needs to be continued to make sure RF kids don't fall through the crack. For LRE, the level of intensity of care needs to be considered for LRE. We do great on commensurate day and data integrity but we will always be a 2 or 3 staging because of LRE. By nature of their disabilities and level of care, ARDCs usually (but not always) recommend a more restrictive placement/match previous district's IEP.
- It is hard to let go of what is known, meaning TEA built the RF system. Sometimes the district say things that are not easy resolved or dismantled.
- Appreciate being asked for ideas
- Staff in my office asked whether there could be discussion on the provision of education services to students without disabilities living in residential facilities.
- Could RF monitoring cover these students and whether they are receiving a commensurate school day?
- We need more time to focus on selection criteria and performance measure before we can answer questions as a group that pertain to whether or not to use RF tracker or other system.
- Is there a way to start with a template and have this group break up into sub-groups to work on the actual product by specialization?
- It sounds strange, but the homework helps. We have been discussing such an intricate topic (RFT) for the last 2 days and it helps to step back to collect my thoughts then revisit.
- Instructional arrangement 02 is used for multiple purposes---not just hospital. This makes it difficult when it is considered more restrictive because in some cases LEAs are not serving students in hospitals.
- The piece of RFM that continues to be a challenge to me is: in PBMAS, staging is based on PLs on specific indicators. LEAs respond specifically to those indicators that have high PLs. But in RFM, staging is based on LRE, commensurate school day and data integrity, but the response is based on the 13 investigatory topics regardless of response.
  - Is there a way to incorporate SA or PJA into RF staging or even something similar to the SPP clarification period? An opportunity to submit SLR data before determining staging?
- To create a monitoring system more similar to PBMAS, add relevant or selected investigatory topics student level review questions to RFT prior to "end of year" event. Then assign performance levels to each question.

# RF Monitoring Workgroup - Session 2

March 24-25, 2015

## General Feedback

TEA create a “How my district was selected” rubric to determine staging. Districts would focus on those sub-indicators with a PL of 2 or 3, create a CAP.

- We are all monitoring these throughout the year. Entering that data into RF by May snapshot wouldn't be a problem.
- Add to RFT –Is student making progress in current IA? Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
- Randomly select students for whom we send documentation to support questions for investigatory topic
- Info on type of facility important but not an excuse to fulfill responsibilities
- RF system partnerships beyond monitoring
- Also important to address in terms of other regulating agencies

## **About the meeting. . . What went well? What could be improved?**

- I think TEA did a great job with the process and focus as well as being open to options
- I think one of the focus areas should be how to make the RF Tracker more effective in “screening” who should be staged in addition to student performance.
- Love both individual and group “think”!
- I appreciate TEA involving SPED directors in this process!
- Staying on time
- The activities were productive and allowed for group input!! We might allow more time for group discussion that is purposefully facilitated by allowing groups to ask each other questions after presentation
- We did not hear a whole lot from the outside agencies. I wonder if they believe we are on the right track.
- The diversity within the groups is very helpful for understanding different perspectives in the world of RF
- The facilitation has helped keep the pacing to ensure we cover all needed topics.
- The opportunity for group work to brainstorm. I am confident that the directors felt they had an opportunity to provide their input or their situations.
- Liked space and location
- Meeting was well organized. No additional suggestions.