Texas Education Agency
2020-2021 CYCLICAL MONITORING REPORT

Local Education Agency (LEA) Name: Junction ISD
CDN: 134-901

LEA Compliant ☐	Non-Compliance Identified ☒	Corrective Actions: Complete

INTRODUCTION

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) would like to extend appreciation to Junction ISD for their efforts, attention, and time committed to the completion of the review process.

The TEA has developed a monitoring approach that reviews compliance-based indicators while also looking for best practices. In commitment to the approach, the cyclical monitoring report will provide the results of the LEA's compliance review related to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and federal and state statutes, a summary of data related to Results-Driven Accountability (RDA), State Performance Plan (SPP), Significant Disproportionality (SD), and dyslexia program evaluation will recommend targeted technical assistance and support for LEAs related to special education, and highlight best practices of LEAs that demonstrate success.

CYCLICAL MONITORING

The TEA conducts cyclical reviews of all LEAs statewide over six years. The purpose of cyclical monitoring is to support positive outcomes for students with disabilities and to determine compliance with special education regulations and dyslexia program regulations.

LEAs are required to submit artifacts and/or sources of evidence for compliance and promising practices review in the following areas:

- Child Find/Evaluation/FAPE
- IEP Development
- IEP Content
- IEP Implementation
- State Assessment
- Properly Constituted ARD Committees
- Transition

2020–2021 CYCLICAL REVIEW COMPLIANCE SUMMARY

On August 27, 2019 , the TEA conducted a policy review of Junction ISD. On December 18, 2020, the TEA conducted a comprehensive desk review of Junction ISD. The total number of files reviewed for the Junction ISD comprehensive desk review was 19 . The review found overall that 13 files out of 19 files were compliant. An overview of the policy review and student file review for Junction ISD are organized in the chart below by indicating the number of compliant findings within the reviewed file submissions related to the compliance area. Itemized details of these findings are in the appendix:

Compliance Area	Policy Review (# compliant of # reviewed)	Student File Review (# compliant of # reviewed)
Child Find/Evaluation/FAPE	18 of 18	19 of 19
IEP Development	5 of 5	19 of 19
IEP Content	3 of 3	19 of 19
IEP Implementation	20 of 20	19 of 19
Properly Constituted ARD	7 of 7	19 of 19
State Assessment	4 of 4	13 of 19
Transition	6 of 6	5 of 5

DATA SUMMARY OF RESULTS-DRIVEN ACCOUNTABILITY, STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN INDICATORS, AND SIGNIFICANT DISPROPORTIONALITY

The following supplemental data may be used to support development of the Strategic Support Plan (SSP) for continuous improvement and/or a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) if noncompliance is identified.

Year	Results-Driven Accountability (RDA) Determination Level	SPP Indicators 11, 12, 13 Compliance*	Significant Disproportionality
2020	DL 1—Meets Requirements	COMPLIANT	N/A

*Indicator 11: Child Find
 Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition
 Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

2020-2021 COVID-19 IMPACT NARRATIVE SUBMISSION

In the 2020-2021 academic year, Local Education Agencies (LEAs) had an opportunity to share the practices incorporated to support Child Find and FAPE for students being served by special education during the COVID-19 pandemic by completing the COVID 19 Impact Narrative.

Junction ISD submitted a COVID-19 Impact Narrative as a supplement to their Cyclical Review:

☐Yes   ☒No

2020-2021 CYCLICAL REVIEW PARENT, TEACHER, ADMINISTRATOR INTERVIEWS/SURVEY

Staff and Family Surveys

On December 18, 2020, the TEA Review and Support team received 60 surveys during the comprehensive desk review. The Review and Support surveys focused on the following review areas: About 63% percent of participants felt they receive sufficient communication from their school, and about 38% who indicated they do not feel they receive sufficient communication from their school. The best way the school/district provides information about (trainings, online trainings, support groups and other available resources) concerning special education services is via notices sent home, email, and phone calls.

About 54% parent/family member participants felt they would be most comfortable attending special education information sessions at the school campus. About 15% participants selected public library followed by Education Service Center, District Event Center, and Community Center.

About 38% participants somewhat agreed they have a clear understanding of special education services, and 12.5% strongly agreed, followed by about 25% agreed. 12.50% disagreed or somewhat disagreed.

The most selected areas of special education the participants would like to know about were Child Find; evaluation; ARD support network, School, family, and Community engagement network; Inclusion in Texas network; and Small and Rural Schools Network.

The majority of participants felt training to help meet the needs of students with disabilities was effective, followed by trainings being somewhat effective.

About 31% of participants somewhat agree that there were frequent opportunities to collaborate with related service providers, 20% agreed, followed by about 13.33% of participants that somewhat disagreed.

The obstacles concerning student's special education programming and services were reported as:

- Assuring students receive accommodations and/or modifications as outlined in the IEP.
- Scheduling ARD meetings.
- Knowledge of available services and programming.

About 47% of participants agree with the importance of including student's interests/life goals in the transition process, followed by 43% of participants who strongly agreed.

100% of participants indicated they chose In-Person learning model. Those participating in remote

learning did not respond when asked if students interacted with teachers consistently. About 23% participants reported that remote learning for students receiving special education was somewhat effective, 15% indicated effective, 23% indicated remote learning was somewhat ineffective, followed by 15% indicating it was effective.

COVID

About 55% of participants felt that during COVID school closure/remote learning, the Emergency Contingency Plan was effective in student progress, followed by about 45% indicating it was not effective.

During COVID closures the top three methods of support for students with moderate to severe disabilities include:

- Teachers made regular contact with students and parents to meet academic and emotional needs.
- Teachers modified work.
- Teachers provided individualized support.

Participants indicated that during COVID school closure/remote learning, they needed professional development in all areas with the top three being: How to teach virtually, how to use virtual platforms, and how to grade/assess engagement. Comments by the participants indicate the LEA did the best they could during the COVID impact.

Participants indicated that during COVID school closure/remote learning strategies, the main supports used by the district that did not work well for students with disabilities were the: Online submission of assignments, virtual instruction with child's teacher, LMS platform such as Schoology, Canvas, or Goggle Classroom. Some comments indicate concerns regarding their students making progress.

About 39% of participants indicated that they somewhat agreed, followed by about 32% that agreed, and about 11% disagreed that school staff worked with parent/guardian in addressing severe behavior and work refusal.

This survey was approved by the Texas Education Agency's data governance board. Participation in this survey was both voluntary and anonymous. No data was collected identifying a name so individual responses cannot be linked to any respondent. Participants were given the option to stop the survey at any time.

Strengths

Based on results of the policy review and student file review, along with data collected from LEA staff and family surveys, the Review and Support team identified the following strengths for Junction ISD:

- Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (PLAAFPs) are descriptive to provide a complete profile of student strengths and needs.

- Academic goals were developed with short-term objectives when appropriate to facilitate student growth and success.
- All monitored special education policies and practices follow federal and state requirements and are linked to the Legal framework to support compliance with state and federal guidelines.

Considerations

Based on results of the policy review and student file review, along with data collected from LEA staff and family surveys, the Review and Support team identified the following considerations for Junction ISD:

- Consider development of systems and processes for including measurable transition goals that are achievable annually, in addition to measurable transition supplement goals related to education and training, employment, and independent living beyond high school, as determined by the Admission Review and Dismissal (ARD).
- Consider developing a system and processes for development of detailed Intensive Program of Instruction (IPI) for students who do not meet state assessment standards.

Technical Assistance

As a result of monitoring, the TEA has identified the following technical assistance resources to support Junction ISD engaging in **targeted** support as determined by the RDA determination level data and artifacts within the compliance review:

Topic	Resource
- Transition Goals	- https://www.texastransition.org: **The Student-Centered Transitions Network** builds collaborative infrastructures among students, families, schools, LEAs, and communities. The SCTN aims for all students with disabilities to be actively involved in planning, communicating, and evaluating progress in meeting their transition goals from early childhood through high school graduation and postsecondary readiness.
- Intensive Program of Instruction	- Legal Framework and Accelerated Instruction and Intensive Programs of Instruction: Applicability of the laws requiring accelerated instruction and intensive programs of instruction to students with disabilities who participate in special education programs.

Findings of Noncompliance

A finding is made when noncompliance is identified with the Review and Support report findings, SPP notification, and/or individualized education program (IEP) requirements. Noncompliance that is

systemic in nature must be included in a comprehensive corrective action plan (CAP) with action steps to address each of the noncompliance findings. ***When noncompliance has been identified as part of this cyclical review, Junction ISD will receive formal notification of noncompliance in addition to this report.***

The TEA Department of Special Education Monitoring will further advise the LEA on the corrective action process, if applicable.

The TEA follows procedures for the correction of noncompliance consistent with federal guidelines (OSEP Memo 09-02.)

Before the TEA can report that noncompliance has been corrected, it must first verify the LEA:

- Has corrected each individual case of noncompliance (Prong 1); and
- Is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., subsequently achieved 100% compliance) (Prong 2).

The TEA is required to monitor the completion of a corrective action plan if any noncompliance is discovered. The corrective action plan must be designed to correct any and all areas of noncompliance ***as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from the date of notification.***

Corrective Action Plan (CAP)

The LEA will develop a CAP to address any items identified as noncompliance in this summary report. An approved form for the CAP can be accessed on the Review and Support website or in the resources located in ASCEND.

The LEA must submit the CAP in ASCEND within 30 school days from the date of this report and/or formal notification of noncompliance. The TEA will review the CAP submitted by the LEA for approval. If the TEA determines that a revision(s) is necessary, the LEA will be required to revise and resubmit. The Review and Support team will contact the LEA to provide notification when the CAP has been approved.

Individual Correction

The educational agency has **60 school days** from the date of this summary report to correct all identified findings of noncompliance for individual students, unless noted otherwise in the report.

LEA ACTIONS

Timeline for Strategic Support Plan (SSP) and/or Corrective Action Plan (CAP) Below:

Required Actions	Submission Due Date	Completion Due Date	Support Level	Communication Schedule
SSP	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not applicable

| CAP | 3/22/2021 | 1/29/2022 | N/A | 30 days |

For more information about cyclical monitoring and the Differentiated Monitoring and Support process, please visit the [Review and Support website](#)

**LEA may have previously identified corrective actions in addition to findings in this report.

REFERENCES

[Differentiated Monitoring and Support System](#)

[Review and Support General Supervision Monitoring Guide](#)

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

[Results-Driven Accountability Reports and Data](#)

[Results-Driven Accountability District Reports](#)

[Results-Driven Accountability Manual](#)

APPENDIX

State Assessment

STUDENT FILE REVIEW

Item	IDEA Citation	TEC/TAC Citation	Evidence of Findings	Required Actions	Must Be Addressed in CAP
SA4		TEC §28.0213	☒ Yes ☐ No	Individual—Yes • Convene ARD committee meetings for those students whose records indicate noncompliance in this area to consider if the student's Free and Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) has been impacted and determine if compensatory services are needed. Systemic—Yes • Review and revise policies and procedures, including operating guidelines and practices addressing this issue.	☒ Yes

				• Provide training on these procedures to the appropriate staff. • Develop processes that allow for self-monitoring this area of noncompliance. • Provide evidence of systemic correction of noncompliance has taken place.	