

## ***How Was My Local Education Agency (LEA) Selected for Special Education Residential Facility Interventions?***

In staging local education agencies (LEAs) for Residential Facility (RF) Monitoring, the following criteria were utilized:

- **LEA's 2011 ranking from RF Tracker data**

For the 2010-2011 year, the RF Tracker ranked LEAs on four topics: least restrictive environment (LRE), commensurate school day, extended school year (ESY) services, and related services.

- The LRE calculation weight is the greatest in the ranking. The calculation is derived from 2 factors: 1) Is the student educated at the site of the facility? (If the student is residing in a facility that meet the definition of a detention/correctional facility, this calculation does not count against the district for this student.) 2) Has the student moved from a more restrictive environment to a less restrictive environment while in the RF?
- Commensurate school day calculation is derived from the students who have a commensurate school day and those who do not.
- ESY calculation is derived from the number of students who were reported to have received ESY services. This year will be the last year for this calculation since RF Tracker no longer collects this data.
- Related services calculation is derived from the number of RF students who receive related services.

Each calculation is made in terms of the number of points generated by each factor. The points from each factor are added and the calculation is represented as a percentage of the total possible points. The percentage of points that the LEA did not receive is divided by 2 to determine the rubric points.

The data represented by this calculation simply raises questions concerning these factors; it does not necessarily mean the LEA has noncompliance. The activities that the LEA completes for the topics required for the stage of intervention will give the LEA an opportunity to review information about services, practices, and LEA systems to determine if there is need for improvement or correction of noncompliance.

- **Time since the district was last visited**

RF monitoring began in the 2006-2007 school year. The LEA was given a value of points that correlates with the last school year the LEA was engaged in RF monitoring activities.

Last visited:      2010-2011 = 0 points  
                         2009-2010 = 3 points  
                         2008-2009 = 6 points  
                         2007-2008 = 9 points  
                         2006-2007 = 12 points  
                         No previous on-site visit conducted = 15 points

- **The LEA reported new residential facilities in 2010-2011**

A comparison of the number of residential facilities reported in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 indicated new RFs in the LEA.      No = 0 points                      Yes = 5 points

- **The number of years special education noncompliance has been cited since the 2004-2005 school year**

The noncompliance may have been cited due to: sustained complaint allegations, adverse due process hearing decisions, current focused data analysis, program effectiveness review, LEA public meeting, compliance review, State Performance Plan (SPP) reporting of data (identify SPP indicator), noncompliance identified as a result of special education on-site visit, noncompliance identified as a result of nonpublic review, noncompliance identified

as a result of RF Monitoring, noncompliance identified as result of review of documentation by TEA, and/or continuing special education noncompliance issues.

1 yr = 1 point	4 yrs = 5 points
2 yrs = 2 points	5 yrs = 7 points
3 yrs = 3 points	6 yrs = 10 points

- **Whether the LEA is currently in escalated oversight**

Escalated oversight and/or sanctions may be due to continuing noncompliance, failure to follow monitoring process, failure to meet program requirements, failure to meet compliance requirements, and/or serious, imminent risks. The TEA may be engaging in escalated follow-up with the LEA, or ordered the LEA to acquire outside professional services, or may have assigned a technical assistance team, monitor, conservator, or management team.

No = 0 points	Yes = 10 points
---------------	-----------------

- **Data quality issues concerning the RF Tracker data**

The LEA did complete the RF Tracker activities according to agency timelines or errors in the data were identified.

No = 0 points	Yes = 15 points
---------------	-----------------

For the 2011-2012 selections, LEAs who generated 45 or more points on the rubric were staged for RF interventions.

<b>Stage 1</b>	LEA acquired 45 – 49 rubric selection points.
<b>Stage 2</b>	LEA acquired 50 – 55 rubric selection points.
<b>Stage 3</b>	LEA has acquired 56 – 61 rubric selection points.
<b>Stage 4</b>	LEA has acquired 62 – 76 rubric selection points.
<b>Stage 4A</b>	LEA received an on-site review during the previous school year and is currently implementing a corrective action plan.
<b>Stage 4B</b>	LEA previously received an on-site review and all noncompliance identified during the review has been corrected.

*\*\*LEAs who have received a stage of intervention, but currently are in escalated oversight due to having a conservator appointed for RFM purposes OR LEAs who have had a conservator appointed for RFM purposes who was dismissed during the 2011 year will not participate in intervention activities. These LEAs are highly encouraged to determine what selection factors were involved in the staging of the LEA and to take steps to make necessary changes and/or improvements which will alleviate staging in the future.*

An on-site review also may occur, including a program access review, regardless of an otherwise established stage of intervention, when other substantial, imminent, or ongoing risks related to: noncompliance identified in substantiated complaints, adverse due process hearing decisions, previously determined areas of noncompliance, testing irregularities, performance or effectiveness concerns, and/or other documented risks are identified.