

Differentiated Monitoring and Tiered Engagement

Risk Assessment Rubric

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires state education agencies (SEAs) such as the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) to oversee IDEA compliance by school districts within the states. The oversight mandate is known as the IDEA “**general supervision**” requirement. Under this oversight mandate, SEAs must ensure that each student with an individual education program (IEP) within the state receives a free appropriate public education (FAPE). As part of the general supervision process, the KDE’s Office of Special Education and Early Learning (OSEEL) is providing Differentiated Monitoring and Tiered Engagement (DMTE) to Local Education Agencies (LEA) as part of its compliance review and results-driven accountability system. The OSEEL differentiates its approach for each LEA based on the LEA’s unique strengths and areas for improvement. LEAs are identified as Tier I – Universal Engagement, Tier II – Targeted Engagement or Tier III – Intensive Engagement.

District engagement will be differentiated based on OSEEL’s Differentiated Monitoring and Tiered Engagement system. Tier I districts will receive statewide universal guidance, support and technical assistance (TA) in the form of guidance documents, website support and services from OSEEL by request. Tier II districts will receive universal as well as targeted support and TA in the form of statewide or regional training, coaching or content-specific TA. Tier III districts will receive the support available to Tier I and II districts as well as an onsite monitoring review. A district’s level of risk is determined by the LEA Annual Determination and the OSEEL’s Risk Assessment Rubric.

A district is identified for Tier III and Risk Focused Monitoring (RFM):

- An *Annual Determination* of needs assistance two, needs intervention or needs substantial intervention and has not received a focused monitoring visit in the past two years; **OR**
- An *Annual Determination* of meets requirements, with a score in the top 5% of all districts on the *Risk Assessment Rubric* and has not received an on-site focused monitoring visit in the past five years.

Districts can also be identified for Tier III Engagement through:

1. Comprehensive Special Education Review
2. Kentucky Educational Collaborative for State Agency Children (KECSAC) and Correctional Facilities Monitoring
3. Management Audits
4. Fiscal Audits

A district is identified for Tier II when noncompliance is discovered through:

1. Self-Assessments

2. Indicator desk reviews
3. Alternate Assessment: desk reviews, justifications, assurances

All districts are offered Tier I support.

General Risk Measures

	Score = 0	Score = 1	Score = 2	Score = 3
Percentage of students receiving special education and related services	Percentage is equal to or less than the state average	Percentage is 0.01% to 4.99% above the state average	Percentage is 5% to 9.99% above the state average	Percentage is 10% or more above the state average
Timely and accurate submission of data of the IDEA annually: 1) Child Count 2) Exiting 3) Discipline 4) Indicators 11, 12, 13 Self-Assessments 5) Alternate Assessment 6) Personnel 7) Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CCEIS) 8) Maintenance of Effort (MOE)	All required data submitted on or before established due date and did not require any corrections to the reports.	Either one submission past established due date or one report had to be corrected.	A total of two submissions late or needing corrections.	More than two submissions are past established due dates, or more than two reports had to be corrected
IDEA Formal Written Complaints	No formal complaints with findings of non-compliance	One IDEA formal complaint with substantiated non-compliance identified	Two IDEA formal complaints with substantiated non-compliance identified	Three or more IDEA formal complaints with substantiated non-compliance identified
Director of Special Education (DoSE) experience	Three years or more of DoSE experience in the district	Two years of DoSE experience in the district	One year of DoSE experience in the district	First-year as a DoSE in the district
Significant Disproportionality under the IDEA (if a district has multiple findings	The LEA is at or below the 3.000	The LEA has one year of significant	The LEA is a current CCEIS identified	The LEA is above the 3.000

	Score = 0	Score = 1	Score = 2	Score = 3
for significant disproportionality, the highest determination category of those data is the area to which the overall risk score for this category is assigned)	minimum threshold for the potential CCEIS identification	disproportionality data above the 3.000 minimum threshold for potential CCEIS identification or has more than one year of reasonable progress exit	district or is in year one of reasonable progress exit	minimum threshold for potential CCEIS identification for the past two data years

Indicator Risk Measures

Indicator	0	1	2	3
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion	The district does not have significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for students with IEPs.	-----	-----	The district does have significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for students with IEPs.
Indicator 5a: Educational Environments (School Age)	The LEA is meeting or exceeding the state target identified on the State Performance Plan (SPP)	The LEA is below the state target identified on the SPP and has improved from the previous year	The LEA is below the state target identified on the SPP and has remained constant from the previous year	The LEA is below the state target identified on the SPP and has declined from the previous year

Indicator	0	1	2	3
Indicator 6a Educational Environments (Preschool)	The LEA is meeting or exceeding the state target identified on the SPP	The LEA is below the state target identified on the SPP and has improved from the previous year	The LEA is below the state target identified on the SPP and has remained constant from the previous year	The LEA is below the state target identified on the SPP and has declined from the previous year
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes	The LEA is meeting or exceeding the state target identified on the SPP.	The LEA is below the state target identified on the SPP and has improved from the previous year	The LEA is below the state target identified on the SPP and has remained constant from the previous year	The LEA is below the state target identified on the SPP and has declined from the previous year
Indicator 8: Parent Involvement	The LEA is meeting or exceeding the SPP target	The LEA is below the state target identified on the SPP and has improved from the previous year	The LEA is below the state target identified on the SPP and has remained constant from the previous year	The LEA is below the state target identified on the SPP and has declined from the previous year
Indicator 14C: Post School Outcomes	The LEA remained constant or demonstrated growth from previous year.	-----	-----	The LEA declined from the previous year.

Bonus Areas

Timely Grant Management Application and Planning (GMAP) application submitted in a substantially approvable form	-1			
1 st Year DoSE Mentorship through OSEEL GUIDES	-1			
Participation in Transformation Zone (T-Zone)	-1			
Meets Requirements for LEA annual determinations for the last five years	-1			