

# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

---

T. WILLARD FAIR, *Chairman*

*Members*

DR. AKSHAY DESAI

MARK KAPLAN

ROBERTO MARTÍNEZ

JOHN R. PADGET

KATHLEEN SHANAHAN

SUSAN STORY

Dr. Eric J. Smith  
Commissioner of Education



May 28, 2010

Dr. John L. Ruis, Superintendent  
Nassau County School District  
1201 Atlantic Avenue  
Fernandina Beach, FL 32034

Dear Superintendent Ruis:

The Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services is in receipt of your district's response to the preliminary findings of its 2009–10 Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Compliance Self-Assessment. This letter and the attached document comprise the final report for Nassau County School District's 2009–10 Level 1 and Fall Cycle Level 2 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 education 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 February 5, 2010, the preliminary report of findings from the 2009-10 Level 1 and Fall Cycle Level 2 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 and to provide evidence to the Bureau no later than April 5, 2010.

**BAMBI J. LOCKMAN**  
*Chief*

*Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services*

Superintendent Ruis  
May 28, 2010  
Page 2

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). **There were no systemic findings of noncompliance for Nassau County School District; the district is to be commended for this.**

*In its 2009–10 Level 1 and Fall Cycle Level 2 self-assessment, Nassau County School District assessed 57 standards. There were no incidents of noncompliance identified on those standards. The following is a summary of the district's timely correction of student-specific incidents of noncompliance:*

**Correction of Noncompliance by Student**


	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Records Reviewed/Protocols Completed	11	-
Total Items Assessed	311	-
Noncompliant	0	0%
Timely Corrected	N/A	N/A

The attached *Nassau County District Summary Report: Findings of Noncompliance by Standard* contains a summary of the findings reported by the individual standard or regulation assessed. The district had no systemic findings of noncompliance on specific standards that required the development of a corrective action plan (CAP). In addition, a Matrix of Services review was required. Nassau County School District reviewed six matrixes for students reported at the 254 or 255 cost factors for weighted funding through the Florida Education Finance Program. Cost factor discrepancies were found in one (16.7%) of those records; verification of correction was required.

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](mailto:patricia.howell@fldoe.org).

Sincerely,



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

Attachment

cc: Pauline Gregory  
Kathleen Hardee  
Frances Haithcock  
Mary Jane Tappen  
Kim C. Komisar  
Patricia Howell  
Jill Snelson  
Sheila Gritz  
Karen Denbroeder

Florida Department of Education  
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services

2009 – 2010 Self-Assessment  
Level 1 and Fall Cycle Level 2

**Nassau County 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 DJJ protocols completed: 5

Number of standards per DJJ: 31

Number of T16 protocols completed: 6

Number of standards per T16: 26

Total number of protocols: 11

Total number of standards: 311

Total number of incidents of noncompliance (NC): 0

Overall % incidents of noncompliance: 0%

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.

**No findings of noncompliance!**