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Differentiated Monitoring and Support System

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) staff have the responsibility to monitor compliance with federal and state requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA) (20 U.S.C. §1400) and Texas Administrative Code (TAC) (TAC §89.1001). Each state is accountable for establishing a system of general supervision to enforce regulatory requirements and ensure continuous improvement. The U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs identified nine interconnected components that comprise a state's system of general supervision:

- State Performance Plan (SPP)
- State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)
- Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation
- Data of Processes and Results
- Targeted Technical Assistance and Professional Development
- Effective Dispute Resolution
- Integrated Monitoring Activities
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives and Sanctions
- Fiscal Management

An effective model of general supervision depends upon fluid interaction among these components, with an emphasis on accountability at all levels to Texas's children and youth with disabilities served by this system.

The TEA Division of Review and Support has implemented a Diagnostic Analysis Protocol to analyze and refine the system of general supervision. Through this process, the TEA has developed an overall diagnostic framework for the Texas special education Differentiated Monitoring and Support (DMS) system. The diagnostic framework emphasizes the connection between monitoring activities and actions that improve student outcomes. The diagnostic framework concentrates on the three domains of **Implementation, Student Outcomes**, and **Family Engagement** as integral to addressing the **seven critical areas of compliance** in all aspects of the system of monitoring and support.
The diagnostic framework supports the TEA and LEAs in reviewing a variety of increasingly complex information about program implementation, student outcomes, and family engagement in all aspects of the DMS system. The protocol connects LEA performance to considerations, professional development, and technical assistance guidance to promote continuous improvement of student outcomes. The Self-Assessment is one element of the DMS system used by the TEA to increase compliance and improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

**DIAGNOSTIC FRAMEWORK**

- **Implementation**
  - Properly Constituted ARD
  - Evaluation
  - IEP Content
  - IEP Development
  - IEP Implementation
  - State Assessment
  - Transition

- **Student Outcomes**

- **Family Engagement**

Within the **Implementation** domain, the leadership team will consider practices related to the design and implementation of special education programs that meet the compliance requirements of IDEA. In addressing each item of the rubric, the leadership team will consider several probing questions related to each area in the Implementation domain. There are 23 strategy areas in this domain. Some areas and probing questions for Implementation include:

- **Child Find:** Are the Child Find procedures compliant with state and federal rules and regulations?
- **Intervention:** How are parents made aware of the LEA intervention procedures?
- **Evaluation:** Does each student receive a comprehensive educational evaluation that addresses all areas of concern?
- **FAPE:** Are special education services implemented with fidelity?
Within the **Student Outcomes** domain, the leadership team will consider data analysis practices related to student achievement and improved outcomes for students with disabilities. In addressing this item, the leadership team will consider four probing questions related to the Student Outcomes domain:

- How are students in special education performing in comparison to their peers?
- Are students in special education making progress toward meeting their IEP goals?
- What resources do teachers and administrators have that support the connection between standardized state assessment and instruction?
- Are students receiving special education services receiving those services in the least restrictive environment (LRE)?

Within the **Family Engagement** domain, the leadership team will consider practices related to involving parents/guardians and other family members in the education of students with disabilities. In addressing the two items in the rubric, the leadership team will consider several probing questions related to the Family Engagement domain. A few of the questions in Family Engagement include:

- How is parent/guardian participation in the development or review of the student’s IEP documented?
- What systems are in place to build a strong school climate?
- What types of community experiences are facilitated by LEA staff?
- What procedures are in place at the LEA to facilitate and improve parent/guardian involvement in the special education process?

### Purpose of the Self-Assessment

The purpose of the Self-Assessment is to assist Local Education Agency (LEA) leadership teams in evaluating and improving their special education program. The Self-Assessment is intended to engage leadership teams through a proactive approach by addressing special education compliance and improving student performance.

### Team Membership

The Self-Assessment is designed to support LEA teams in reviewing data to identify areas of strength and areas of need. This leadership team is responsible to ensure data from a broad representation of stakeholders is considered as part of the program evaluation. The team should be representative of the size and demographics of the LEA and may include leaders with a variety of backgrounds.

- Special education director
- Central office staff
- Campus administrators
- Special education teachers
- General education teachers
The Self-Assessment leadership team is not limited to these individuals, nor does the team always need to include all of these individuals. The decision of who to include on the Self-Assessment team is the LEA's decision.

Self-Assessment Components

While completing the Self-Assessment rubric, the leadership team will consider probing questions, review sources of evidence, select a quality of implementation level for each compliance/strategy item based on performance category descriptions, and provide a written justification that describes the decision-making process of the leadership team.

After completing the evaluative rubric, the leadership team will review the results report to identify and prioritize areas for improvement that may be addressed in the Strategic Support Plan.

Self-Assessment Rubric Elements

While completing the evaluative rubric, the leadership team will review sources of evidence, consider probing questions, select a quality of implementation level for each compliance/strategy item based on performance category descriptions, and provide a written justification that describes the decision-making process of the leadership team.

Compliance/Strategy Items

The leadership team will consider a series of compliance/strategy items within the three domains. Each compliance/strategy item includes probing questions, sources of evidence, and performance categories. The leadership team will use these elements of the compliance/strategy items to select an overall quality level that represents the current practices within the LEA. These compliance/strategy items are then used by the leadership team in conjunction with other data sources to develop a Strategic Support Plan.

For 2021-2022 academic year, Local Education Agencies will be required to complete 7 total compliance/strategy items under the three Domains. These 7 prioritize compliance/strategy items consist of Child Find, IEP Implementation, IEP Development and Content, Instructional Strategies, Properly Constituted ARD, Secondary Transition, and Family Engagement.

As the leadership team completes the Self-Assessment, you will move naturally through all the compliance/strategy items in the center of the screen, or you can choose to go directly to any compliance/strategy item using the navigation table when your team is ready.

Probing Questions

The leadership team will consider probing questions to explore the LEA level of quality when implementing various special education program elements. Leadership teams use these questions to establish a thorough understanding of the current practices and systems in place within the LEA, and to initiate discussion among the team about areas to prioritize for continuous improvement. The leadership team does not need to provide an explicit answer to any of the probing questions. Instead, these are designed to assist the team in having robust conversations about each section of
Sources of Evidence

The leadership team will conduct a holistic review of current and future improvement efforts. Each LEA is encouraged to collect, synthesize, and analyze data to identify the quality of implementation for each area within the Self-Assessment rubric. Sources of evidence may include policy adopted by the school board (board of trustees of an independent school district or governing body of a charter school, “board”), internal written procedures, technical assistance or guidance documents, forms, checklists, surveys, interviews, focus groups, training artifacts, internal monitoring results, observations, student information system data, screening, informal publications (newsletters, websites, blogs, etc.), formative and summative assessment results, and staff qualifications (experience, industry certification, credentials, training, etc.).
In every case, if the LEA simply gathers evidence this does not meet expectations. The assignment for the leadership team is to synthesize, analyze, and act on sources of evidence in order to assess the impact of improvement efforts on outcomes for students with disabilities. When reviewing sources of evidence, the leadership team will select each source that was reviewed in order to select the quality level. There is no need to select all sources, and new sources of evidence can be added using the “other” option.
Policy and Operating Procedures

For each compliance/strategy item, there is an associated state and federal regulation. LEAs need to ensure all policy and operating procedures are adopted and implemented in order to select and justify a Quality of Implementation Level.

**Implementation**

**CHILD FIND**

**Authority:** 34 CFR. 5300.111; TEC 529.009

**Policy Statement:**
The LEA has adopted policy, established operating procedures or guidance and monitors implementation of operating procedures or guidance describing the process used to identify, locate, and evaluate all students in the LEA who have or are suspected to have a disability and, as a result, need special education and related services.
Quality of Implementation Level

Each section of the Self-Assessment includes several performance categories that guide the leadership team through considering the LEA quality of implementation before selecting a final quality level. For each performance category, the leadership team will select the quality of implementation level that best describes the current practices within the LEA. Performance levels include: Developed, Proficient, and Exemplary. If you are in doubt or if the LEA performance falls between two levels, choose the quality level where you are able to demonstrate all of the elements of the description using your sources of evidence.

If the LEA identifies that they are below the Developed level, the LEA should contact the Department of Review and Support for further support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition to what is provided in the Policy Statement above, the LEA ensures evidence- based instruction is aligned to instructional standards (TEKS) across all contents and is adapted and individualized based on student needs (strengths and areas of growth) and formative assessment results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Proficient** |
| In addition to what is provided in the Policy Statement above, the LEA ensures evidence-based instruction is aligned to student needs and instructional standards (TEKS) across all contents and is adapted and individualized based on formative assessment results. Staff informally collaborate on professional decisions regarding curriculum, materials, and instructional practices. |

| **Exemplary** |
| In addition to what is provided in the Policy Statement above, the LEA ensures evidence-based instruction is aligned to student needs and instructional standards (TEKS) across all contents and is adapted and individualized based on formative assessments and staff have formalized structures and scheduled meetings for collaborative professional decisions regarding curriculum, materials, and instructional practices. |
Summary Scoring

As the leadership team finalizes all the performance category ratings, the Summary Scoring section will appear. Based on your answers on the performance categories, a recommended quality of implementation level will be suggested for the leadership team to consider. The leadership team does not need to keep this recommendation but should consider the overall current performance of this compliance/strategy item within the context of the other items and other continuous improvement efforts. The leadership team should review the quality levels selected for each of the performance categories and consider the balance of rating levels. If the LEA has selected multiple performance categories at the “Developed” level, it is best to select developing as the overall rating as well. This will lead the LEA to address these areas of need within the Strategic Support Plan as part of the continuous improvement process. Following a discussion among leadership team members, select the overall rating that best describes the LEA current quality level related to the compliance/strategy item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on your answers, your recommended summary rating for this Compliance Strategy Item is <strong>Proficient</strong>. Please select your own overall rating:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Developed   ○ Proficient   ○ Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for Summary Rating:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Justification

The leadership team will then summarize the summary scoring discussion into a brief justification statement that explains the strengths and needs considered by the leadership team in selecting the final quality of implementation level. This justification should include enough detail to support the leadership team in the future development of a Strategic Support Plan that will address the continuous improvement efforts of the LEA to increase compliance and improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

Summary Scoring

Based on your answers, your recommended summary rating for this Compliance Strategy Item is Proficient. Please select your own overall rating:

- Developed
- Proficient
- Exemplary

Justification for Summary Rating:

Submit

After the leadership team has identified sources of evidence, selected a quality of implementation level, and provided a written justification for every item, the “submit” option will appear in the navigation bar. When you click submit, you will be asked to confirm. Once the leadership team confirms that the Self-Assessment is complete, you will not be able to edit or change your responses.
Reporting

After submitting the Self-Assessment, the leadership team will have access to several reports. Detailed reports are designed for LEA internal use while developing continuous improvement plans, making administrative decisions, targeting resources to areas of need, etc. Summary reports are designed for public reporting and communication with stakeholders about the efforts being made to ensure compliance and the fidelity of student services and increase outcomes for students with disabilities. As the leadership team completes a Self-Assessment annually, multi-year reports will become available in both detailed and summary form to assist the leadership team in evaluating progress.