

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

T. WILLARD FAIR, *Chairman*

Members

PETER BOULWARE

DR. AKSHAY DESAI

ROBERTO MARTÍNEZ

JOHN R. PADGET

KATHLEEN SHANAHAN

LINDA K. TAYLOR

Dr. Eric J. Smith
Commissioner of Education



July 27, 2009

Ms. MaryEllen Elia, Superintendent
Hillsborough County School District
P.O. Box 3408
Tampa, Florida 33601-3408

Dear Superintendent Elia:

The Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services is in receipt of your district's response to the preliminary findings of its 2008-09 Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Compliance Self-Assessment. This letter and the attached document comprise the final report for Hillsborough County School District's 2008-09 self-assessment monitoring process.

The self-assessment system is designed to address the major areas of compliance related to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). SPP Indicator 15, Timely Correction of Noncompliance, requires that the state identify and correct noncompliance **as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from identification**. While any incident of noncompliance is of concern, in accordance with the language in SPP Indicator 15, the Bureau's current monitoring system considers the timeliness of correction of noncompliance to be of greatest significance.

The results of district self-assessments are included in the State's APR and are used to inform oversight activities, including the selection of districts for on-site monitoring, and the local educational agency (LEA) determinations required under Section 300.603, Title 34, Code of Federal Regulations, which result in districts being identified as "meets requirements," "needs assistance," "needs intervention," or "needs substantial intervention."

On March 30, 2009, the preliminary report of findings from the self-assessment process was released to your district's ESE Director. The preliminary report detailed student-specific incidents of noncompliance that required immediate correction. Districts were required to correct all student-specific noncompliance no later than May 26, 2009, and to provide evidence to the Bureau no later than June 2, 2009. In addition, the preliminary report identified any standards for which the noncompliance was considered systemic (i.e., evident in $\geq 25\%$ of the records reviewed).

BAMBI J. LOCKMAN

Chief

Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services

Superintendent Elia
July 27, 2009
Page 2

In the event that there were systemic findings, a corrective action plan (CAP) was required. Hillsborough County School District's CAP was submitted to the Bureau for review and approval. We look forward to receiving the district's report on their results no later than **January 27, 2010**. Your district's adherence to this schedule is required in order to ensure correction of systemic noncompliance within a year as required by OSEP and Florida's SPP.

In its 2008-09 self-assessment, Hillsborough County School District assessed 65 standards. One or more incidents of noncompliance were identified on ten of those standards (15.4%). The following is a summary of the district's timely correction of student-specific incidents of noncompliance:


Correction of Noncompliance by Student

	Number	Percentage
Records Reviewed/Protocols Completed	31	–
Total Items Assessed	716	–
Noncompliant	20	2%
Timely Corrected	20	100%

The attached *Hillsborough District Summary Report: Findings of Noncompliance by Standard* contains a summary of the findings reported by the individual standard or regulation assessed. In the event there were systemic findings of noncompliance on specific standards that required the development of a CAP, those items are designated by shaded cells. In addition, a Matrix of Services review was required. Hillsborough County School District reviewed 15 matrixes for students reported at the 254 or 255 cost factors for weighted funding through the Florida Education Finance Program. No discrepancies were identified.

We understand that the implementation of this self-assessment required a significant commitment of resources and appreciate the time and attention your staff has devoted to the process thus far. If you have questions regarding this process, please contact your assigned district liaison for monitoring or Patricia Howell, Program Director, at (850) 245-0476 or via electronic mail at patricia.howell@fldoe.org.

Sincerely,



Bambi J. Lockman, Chief
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services

Attachment

cc: Joyce Wieland
Frances Haithcock
Mary Jane Tappen
Kim C. Komisar
Patricia Howell
Vicki Eddy
Sheila Gritz
Donnajo Smith

**Florida Department of Education
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services**

Self-Assessment 2008 - 2009

Hillsborough District Summary Report: Findings of Noncompliance by Standard

This report provides a summary of the district's results and must be used when developing a corrective action plan. Results are reported by standard, with systemic noncompliance (occurrence in $\geq 25\%$ of possible incidents) indicated as appropriate. See the *Student Report: Incidents of Noncompliance* for student-specific findings. Results are based on the following:

Number of EP protocols completed: 8	Total number of protocols: 31
Number of standards per EP: 16	Total number of standards: 716
Number of SP protocols completed: 8	Total number of incidents of noncompliance (NC): 20
Number of standards per SP: 21	Overall % incidents of noncompliance: 2%
Number of T16 protocols completed: 15	
Number of standards per T16: 28	

Percent of noncompliance is calculated as the # of incidents of noncompliance for a given standard divided by the # of protocols reviewed for that standard, multiplied by 100.

* Correctable for the student(s): A finding for which immediate action can be taken to correct the noncompliance.

** Individual CAP: For a finding which cannot be corrected for an individual student, a corrective action plan (CAP) is required to address how the district will ensure future compliance; this plan will be limited in scope, based on the nature of the finding.

*** Systemic CAP: For a finding of noncompliance on a given standard that occurs in $\geq 25\%$ of possible incidents, a corrective action plan (CAP) is required to ensure future compliance; this plan must address the systemic nature of the finding and will be broader in scope than an individual CAP.

Note: In the event that there is a systemic finding of noncompliance on a standard that requires an individual CAP, only a systemic CAP is required.

Self-Assessment 2008 - 2009

Hillsborough District Summary Report: Findings of Noncompliance by Standard

Noncompliance (NC)		*Correctable for the Student(s)	**Individual CAP	# NC	% NC	***Systemic CAP
T16-1	The notice to the IEP team meeting included a statement that a purpose of the meeting was the consideration of postsecondary goals and transition services, that the student would be invited, and indicated any agency likely to provide or pay for services during the current year that would be invited. (34 CFR 300.322(b)(2); Rule 6A-6.03028(3)(b), FAC.)		X	3	20.0%	
T16-2	The student was invited to the IEP meeting. (34 CFR 300.321(b)(1); Rule 6A-6.03028(4)(h), FAC.)	X		1	6.7%	
T16-15	The district obtained consent from the parent or from the student whose rights have transferred prior to inviting to the IEP team meeting a representative of an agency likely to provide or pay for transition services. (34 CFR 300.321(b)(3))		X	1	6.7%	
T16-16	The IEP includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition service that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals. (34 CFR 300.320(b))	X		1	6.7%	
SP-6	The notice contained a listing of persons invited to the meeting, by title and position. (34 CFR 300.137(c); 300.321(a)-(b); 300.322(b))		X	2	25.0%	X
SP-12	The SP for a school-age student includes a statement of present levels of academic achievement and functional performance related to the services to be provided, including how the student's disability affects involvement and progress in the general curriculum. For a prekindergarten student, the SP contains a statement of how the disability affects the student's participation in the appropriate activities. (34 CFR 300.320(a)(1))	X		7	87.5%	X

Noncompliance (NC)		*Correctable for the Student(s)	**Individual CAP	# NC	% NC	***Systemic CAP
EP-1	The EP was current on the day of this review and had been revised within the prior three years for students in grades K-8 and within the prior four years for students in grades 9-12. (Rule 6A-6.030191(6)(c), FAC.)	X		1	12.5%	
EP-6	The notice contained a listing of persons invited to the meeting, by title and position. (Rule 6A-6.030191(2)(b), FAC.)		X	1	12.5%	
EP-10	The EP for a school-age student includes a statement of present levels of strengths and interests. (Rule 6A-6.030191(4)(a), FAC.)	X		1	12.5%	
EP-14	In developing the EP, the team considered the strengths of the student and needs resulting from the student's giftedness, the results of recent evaluations, including class work and state or district assessments, and, in the case of a student with limited English proficiency, the language needs of the student as they relate to the EP. (Rule 6A-6.030191(5)(a)-(c), FAC.)	X		2	25.0%	X