Texas Education Agency

SPECIAL EDUCATION
CYCLICAL MONITORING REPORT

School Year (SY) 2025-2026

Cycle 1, Group 2

JANUARY-MARCH

LOS FRESNOS CISD (031906)

April 30, 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents

CYCLICAL MONITORING REPORT 1

INTRODUCTION 3

OVERVIEW OF CYCLICAL MONITORING 4

DATA REVIEW 4

Data Sources 4

Student Sampling and Campus Information 4

STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS AND RESULTS 5

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND REQUIRED ACTION 7

Compliance Review 7

Successes 7

Noncompliance Findings 8

Required Actions 11

Technical Assistance 11

CONTACT 12

APPENDIX: ACRONYMS 13

Copyright © 2025. Texas Education Agency. All Rights Reserved.

SCHOOL YEAR (SY): 2025-2026
MONITORING PATH: Cyclical Monitoring
CYCLE: 1, **GROUP:** 2 (JANUARY-MARCH)

REGION: 01
DISTRICT NAME: LOS FRESNOS CISD (031906)
DISTRICT TYPE: INDEPENDENT

SHARED SERVICE ARRANGEMENT (SSA) MEMBER: NA
FISCAL AGENT: NA

TEXAS VIRTUAL SCHOOL NETWORK CAMPUS: NA
RESIDENTIAL FACILITY (RF): NA

MONITORING TYPE: Comprehensive Desk Review
SELF-REPORTED NONCOMPLIANCE: No
COMPLIANCE STATUS: Noncompliant
ACTION REQUIRED: Corrective Action Plan

CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN (CAP) SUBMISSION DUE DATE: June 1, 2026
CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN (CAP) COMPLETION DUE DATE: April 30, 2027

INTRODUCTION

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) appreciates the time and effort of parents, students, teachers, staff, and administration in supporting the special education cyclical monitoring review at LOS FRESNOS CISD (031906).

The special education cyclical monitoring report provides the local education agency (LEA) with findings from the comprehensive cyclical monitoring review. It serves as official notification from the TEA that any findings of noncompliance will require corrective action. Noncompliance findings must be corrected no more than one year from the date of notification (for information on the required actions and timeframe for completion, see 34 CFR § 300.600(e).

The report is structured to describe the cyclical monitoring activities and findings from the monitoring review and stakeholder feedback. At the end, it summarizes any required actions and provides contact information for questions or to request report corrections.

Copyright © 2025. Texas Education Agency. All Rights Reserved.

OVERVIEW OF CYCLICAL MONITORING

TEA conducts a comprehensive cyclical monitoring review every six years for each LEA. This balanced monitoring review supports positive student outcomes, ensuring the LEA maintains compliance with the requirements and purposes of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), as outlined in 34 CFR § 300.600, State Monitoring and Enforcement, 19 Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §74.28(g), and Texas Education Code (TEC) §38.003(c-1).

Monitoring activities focus on seven state-identified priority areas and may include but are not limited to a desk review (i.e., policy review and folder review), on-site campus review, and stakeholder feedback:

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

DATA REVIEW

Data Sources

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

- Results Driven Accountability (RDA)
- State Performance Plan (SPP)
- Desk Review
- Policy Review
- Stakeholder Survey
- Residential Facility (RF) Summer PEIMS
- LEA Staff Interviews, Discussions and Supplemental Information

Student Sampling and Campus Information

Student records included in the folder review were selected using a stratified random sampling method, comprising two strata: elementary and secondary. Each stratum encompassed aggregated grade levels to ensure representative inclusion of students receiving special education services from campuses listed in AskTED. For additional information, please reference Appendix: Special Education Sampling Methods in the Cyclical Review Guide on Differentiated Monitoring and Support (DMS) website.

Copyright © 2025. Texas Education Agency. All Rights Reserved.

STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) collected stakeholder input through an open survey administered during the comprehensive cyclical monitoring review. Respondents included families/guardians, special education providers, general education providers, and district and campus administrators. For reviews that included an on-site component, additional stakeholder feedback was gathered through structured interviews. The purpose of analyzing both survey and interview data was to identify positive stakeholder sentiment across three key constructs:

1. **Information and Understanding**
   This construct evaluates how effectively school districts inform parents about available support organizations for special education. It also assesses the extent to which parents understand their rights under special education law, including procedural safeguards for guardians of students with disabilities.
2. **Communication and Involvement**
   This construct examines how school districts engage parents and guardians of students with disabilities in decision-making processes. It includes the clarity of explanations provided when disagreements arise and the extent to which families feel safe expressing concerns without fear of negative consequences.
3. **IEP Development and Implementation**
   This construct measures positive sentiment of perceived competency required for developing individualized education programs (IEPs) and the implementation of special education program requirements.

Table 1 presents stakeholder feedback by role; specifically, families/guardians, special education providers, general education providers, and district/campus administrators—across each construct. Data were collected using a non-probabilistic sampling method, with respondents self-identifying their role and LEA when completing the online survey or participating in interviews. As such, interpretations of the findings should be made with caution. The respondent count reflects the number of unique individuals within each role category. To protect confidentiality, results for roles with fewer than five respondents are suppressed. Percentages represent the proportion of positive responses relative to the total number of responses received.

Copyright © 2025. Texas Education Agency. All Rights Reserved.

Table 1. Stakeholder Results by Role and Construct

Construct	Family/Guardian	Special Education Providers	General Education Providers	District/Campus Administration
Number of Respondents	6	18	19	5
Information and Understanding	79.31%	94.41%	92.76%	100.00%
Communication and Involvement	75.00%	75.00%	78.95%	90.00%
IEP Development and Implementation		91.67%	92.00%	95.00%

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

Copyright © 2025. Texas Education Agency. All Rights Reserved.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND REQUIRED ACTION

Compliance Review

The compliance review consists of two components: a policy review and a review of student folders across seven priority areas. Table 2 displays, for each priority area, the total number of policy review questions and student folders examined (denominator), the number found to be compliant (numerator), and the resulting overall compliance percentage.

Table 2. Summary of the Desk Review (Policy Review and Folder Review) by Priority Area

Priority Area	Policy Review	Folder Review
Child Find/Evaluation/FAPE	100% (17 of 17)	100% (16 of 16)
IEP Development	100% (3 of 3)	63% (10 of 16)
IEP Content	100% (4 of 4)	100% (16 of 16)
IEP Implementation	100% (10 of 10)	100% (16 of 16)
Properly Constituted ARD	100% (8 of 8)	100% (16 of 16)
State Assessment	100% (3 of 3)	100% (16 of 16)
Transition	100% (6 of 6)	100% (5 of 5)

Note. Noncompliant student folders had at least one finding of noncompliance for the priority area.

Successes

The following successes were identified from the monitoring review:

SUCCESS: Systems for student involvement are implemented well as evidenced by student invitations and their attendance at admission, review and dismissal (ARD) committee meetings for discussing postsecondary goals and transition needs.

SUCCESS: Systems for parent involvement are implemented well as evidenced by parent invitations and their attendance at admission, review and dismissal (ARD) committee meetings.

SUCCESS: Systems demonstrate a comprehensive continuum of placement options for determining students' least restrictive environment (LRE) to meet their instructional and related service delivery needs.

Copyright © 2025. Texas Education Agency. All Rights Reserved.

Noncompliance Findings

This report serves as the official written notification for a LEA designated as "Noncompliant" and outlines the required corrective actions, as detailed in Table 6. In accordance with 34 CFR §300.600(e), all corrective actions must be completed as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the date of this report.

The overall compliance status reflects findings of noncompliance identified in Tables 3 and 4, as well as any self-reported noncompliance documented in Table 5.

Table 3. Noncompliance Findings from the Folder Review

Area	Citation	Level	Status	Action
Evaluation	19 TAC §89.1011(h)	Individual (<=2 students)	Pre-finding Corrected	No Action Required
IEP Content	TEC §38.003(b); The Dyslexia Handbook (pg 38-39)	Individual (<=2 students)	Pre-finding Corrected	No Action Required
IEP Content	TEC §38.003(b); The Dyslexia Handbook (pg 40-41)	Individual (<=2 students)	Pre-finding Corrected	No Action Required
IEP Content	TEC §38.003(b); The Dyslexia Handbook (pg 40-41)	Individual (<=2 students)	Pre-finding Corrected	No Action Required
IEP Development	34 CFR §300.320(a)(1)	Individual (<=2 students)	Pre-finding Corrected	No Action Required
IEP Development	34 CFR §300.320(a)(2)(i);19 TAC §89.1055(b)	Systemic (>2 students)	Noncompliant	Corrective Action Plan
Transition	19 TAC §89.1055(k); 19 TAC §89.1055(l); 19 TAC §89.1055(m); 19 TAC §89.1055(n); 19 TAC §89.1055(o); TEC §29.0111	Individual (<=2 students)	Pre-finding Corrected	No Action Required
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Note. The "Area" column has seven possible values representing the state-identified priority areas. The "Citation" column contains unique citations of applicable laws and regulations. The "Level" column

Copyright © 2025. Texas Education Agency. All Rights Reserved.

contains two possible values: Individual (two or fewer students) and Systemic (more than two students). The “Status” column contains two possible values: Noncompliant and Pre-findings Corrected. The “Action” column contains two possible values: Corrective Action Plan and No Action Required.

Copyright © 2025. Texas Education Agency. All Rights Reserved.

Table 4. Noncompliance Findings from the Policy Review

Area	Citation	Level	Status	Action
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Note. The "Area" column contains seven possible priority areas. The "Citation" column contains citations of applicable laws/regulations. The "Level" column contains one value: Systemic. The "Status" column contains one value: Noncompliant. The "Action" column contains one value: Corrective Action Plan.

Table 5 lists self-reported noncompliance identified by the LEA. This noncompliance is also included in the overall total count of noncompliance in Table 6.

Table 5. Self-Reported Noncompliance

Area	Citation	Level	Status	Action
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Table 6. Overall Cyclical Monitoring Compliance Status

Compliance Status Overall	Number of Noncompliance to be Addressed *(shown in "Status" column of Tables 3, 4 and 5)*	Required Action Overall
Noncompliant	1	Corrective Action Plan

The overall compliance status of the LEA reflects noncompliance identified through any cyclical monitoring activities.

LEAs designated as "Noncompliant" must submit a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) within 30 calendar days of the date of this report. The CAP must address all citations associated with noncompliance findings.

All required corrective actions must be completed as soon as possible, and no later than one year from the date of this notification, in accordance with 34 CFR §300.600(e). TEA will determine whether noncompliance has been corrected based on the following criteria:

- **Child-specific correction**: Each individual instance of noncompliance has been resolved.
- **Systemic correction**: The LEA demonstrates 100% compliance in implementing the applicable regulatory requirements.

LEAs are not required to submit a CAP if both of the following conditions are met:

- The noncompliance involves two or fewer students (child-specific), and
- TEA verifies that both child-specific and systemic corrections were completed by the pre-finding correction deadline.

Copyright © 2025. Texas Education Agency. All Rights Reserved.

However, a CAP is required if:

- The individual-level noncompliance (involving two or fewer students) is not corrected by the pre-finding correction deadline, or
- The noncompliance is systemic (involving more than two students).

LEAs that fail to submit a CAP or do not complete all required actions within one year of the report date will be designated as having "Uncorrected Noncompliance."

Required Actions

- **Report Date:** April 30, 2026
- **Deadline to Request Report Corrections:** May 7, 2026 at 11:59 PM
- **Corrective Action Plan Submission:** June 1, 2026
- **Corrective Action Plan Completion:** April 30, 2027

Technical Assistance

Technical assistance has been provided based on the findings and recommendations from the cyclical review. This support is specifically tailored to address identified areas of need and to promote alignment with both compliance requirements and best practices.

Table 7. Technical Assistance

Area	Technical Assistance Resource
IEP DEVELOPMENT	IEP Measurable Annual Goals: Question and Answer Document (https://spedsupport.tea.texas.gov/resource-library/iep-measurable-annual-goals-question-and-answer-document)
IEP DEVELOPMENT	Writing the PLAAFP (https://spedsupport.tea.texas.gov/learning-library/language-and-communication-focused-ieps/writing-plaafp)
IEP CONTENTS AND BEHAVIOR	TDA 4: Dyslexia: From Child Find through the Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) Committee Process (https://spedsupport.tea.texas.gov/learning-library/texas-dyslexia-academies-online-courses/tda-4-dyslexia-child-find-through)

Copyright © 2025. Texas Education Agency. All Rights Reserved.

CONTACT

The LEA should notify the Division of Monitoring, Review and Support about any concerns within 5 business days from the date of this report. The report will subsequently become publicly available on the TEA Differentiated Monitoring and Support (DMS) website shortly thereafter.

For more information about the general supervision and monitoring requirements, required actions, or related resources, please visit the Differentiated Monitoring and Support (DMS) website or contact:

Office of Special Populations and Student Supports
Division of Monitoring, Review and Support
Phone: (512) 463–9414
Email: ReviewandSupport@tea.texas.gov

Copyright © 2025. Texas Education Agency. All Rights Reserved.

APPENDIX: 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
OSPSS	Office of Special Populations and Student Supports
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

Copyright © 2025. Texas Education Agency. All Rights Reserved.