

FINAL REPORT OF RANDOM MONITORING OF
EXCEPTIONAL STUDENT EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN

DUVAL COUNTY

OCTOBER 28 - NOVEMBER 2, 2002



FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

This is one of many publications available through the Bureau of Instructional Support and Community Services, Florida Department of Education, designed to assist school districts, state agencies which support educational programs, and parents in the provision of special programs. For additional information on this publication, or for a list of available publications, contact the Clearinghouse Information Center, Bureau of Instructional Support and Community Services, Florida Department of Education, Room 628, Turlington Bldg., Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0400.

telephone: (850) 245-0477

FAX: (850) 245-0987

Suncom: 205-0477

e-mail: cicbiscs@fldoe.org

website: <http://myfloridaeducation.com/commhome/>

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

F. PHILIP HANDY, *Chairman*

T. WILLARD FAIR, *Vice Chairman*

Members

SALLY BRADSHAW

LINDA J. EADS, Ed.D.

CHARLES PATRICK GARCÍA

JULIA L. JOHNSON

WILLIAM L. PROCTOR, Ph.D.

JIM HORNE
Commissioner of Education



December 15, 2003

Mr. John C. Fryer, Jr., Superintendent
Duval County School District
1701 Prudential Drive
Jacksonville, Florida 32207-8182

Dear Superintendent Fryer:

We are pleased to provide you with the Final Report of Random Monitoring of Exceptional Student Education Programs in Duval County. The report from our visit on October 28-November 1, 2002, includes the system improvement plan proposed by your staff.

An update of outcomes achieved and/or a summary of related activities, as identified in your district's system improvement plan, must be submitted by June 30 and December 30 of each school year for the next two years, unless otherwise noted on the improvement plan.

If my staff can be of any assistance as you continue to implement the system improvement plan, please contact Eileen L. Amy, Administrator, ESE Program Administration and Quality Assurance. Mrs. Amy may be reached at 850/245-0476, or via electronic mail at Eileen.Amy@fldoe.org.

Thank you for your continuing commitment to improve services for exceptional education students in Duval County.

Sincerely,

Michele Polland

Michele Polland, Acting Chief

Enclosure

cc: Martha Barrett, School Board Chair
Members of the School Board
LaShonda Dawkins, School Board Attorney
School Principals
Mark Cashen, ESE General Director
Jim Warford, Chancellor

MICHELE POLLAND

Acting Chief

Bureau of Instructional Support and Community Services

Duval County Final Monitoring Report
Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Monitoring Process	4
Authority	4
Method	4
Random Monitoring.....	4
District Selection.....	5
Off-Site Monitoring Activities.....	5
Parent Surveys	5
Reviews of Student Records and District Forms	5
On-Site Monitoring Activities	5
Reporting Process	6
Exit Conference	6
Preliminary Report.....	6
Final Report	6
Background.....	7
Demographic Information.....	7
Reporting of Information	9
Sources of Information	9
Parent Surveys, Individual Interviews, Case Studies, and Classroom Visits	9
General Supervision.....	9
Assessment.....	12
Curriculum and Instruction	13
Discipline	14
Least Restrictive Environment.....	15
Post-School Transition.....	17
Pre-K Transition from Part C to Part B Programs	19
Parent Involvement	19
Gifted	20
Student Record and District Form Reviews.....	21
Student Record Reviews: Students with Disabilities.....	21
Student Record Reviews: Gifted.....	22
District Forms Review	23
Special Category Record Reviews.....	23
Positive Observations.....	24
Summary	27
System Improvement Plan	29
Recommendations.....	37
Appendix A: Survey Results.....	39
Appendix B: Monitoring Team Members.....	47
Appendix C: Glossary of Acronyms.....	51
Appendix D: Forms Review	55

**Duval County School District
Random Monitoring Visit
October 28-November 1, 2002**

Executive Summary

During the week of October 27-November 1, 2002, the Florida Department of Education, Bureau of Instructional Support and Community Services, conducted an on-site review of the exceptional student education programs in Duval County Public Schools. The purpose of the random monitoring visit was to ensure the district's compliance with federal and state laws, rules, and regulations regarding exceptional student education programs, as well as to assess the district's implementation of procedures related to requirements. In addition, the random monitoring process is intended to assist districts in the development of improvement plans related to compliance and implementation of exceptional student education programs designed to promote student educational outcomes. The results of the monitoring process are reported under ten categories or related areas that are considered to impact or contribute to procedural compliance and student progress.

Summaries of Findings

Parent Surveys, Individual Interviews, Case Studies, and Classroom Visits

General Supervision

With a few exceptions, district and regional support is readily available to support school personnel regarding program and compliance issues related to exceptional student education (ESE). School-based staff appeared to be knowledgeable of compliance responsibilities, with a few exceptions. In discussion with monitoring staff, it was noted that some district and regional ESE specialists did not consistently provide accurate information regarding policies and procedures for the implementation of state and federal requirements (e.g. change of placement; transition team participants; LEA representation). It is recommended that district and regional specialists continue to have access to accurate information relative to federal and state requirements. In reviewing data, the monitoring team found discrepancies between district and school data sources of information for some students (e.g. matrix ratings). The Bureau has requested the district to investigate the unique noncompliance issue regarding individual educational plan (IEP) development at Lee Senior High School.

Assessment

It appears that most students with disabilities take the Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT). Based on classroom observations and case studies, accommodations for the most part appear to be individualized to meet the needs of the individual student. PASS-D (Performance Assessment System for Students with Disabilities) is the alternative assessment used by the district and is primarily used by students in cluster-site settings. There is a concern that students at some schools who fail the FCAT in the tenth grade do not have the opportunity to take the FCAT again.

Curriculum and Instruction

It appears that students with disabilities are receiving meaningful instruction, and in many instances the instruction is exemplary. However, due to students having poorly defined goals and objectives on their IEPs, it is not possible to determine if the instruction is designed to meet their individual needs or to determine if they are making adequate progress towards their goals.

Discipline

Discipline did not appear to be a problem in the district. Staff at most schools were familiar with functional behavior assessments (FBAs) and behavior intervention plans (BIPs). The use of both FBAs and BIPs were observed in the case study students. Behavior intervention plans were included in IEPs when appropriate.

Least Restrictive Environment

At most school sites a limited continuum of services was available to students ranging from consultative to resource services. Students needing more intensive services were categorically placed in cluster-sites. There was a concern that students placed at the cluster-sites did not have clearly defined exit criteria to enable them to return to their home school. There was also concern that many students sent to cluster-sites could have received appropriate services in their home school, especially students with mild disabilities. For example, a teacher of ESE reported that students who had been classified as educable mentally handicapped (EMH) automatically received full-time services. Another example involved students who had been classified as specific learning disabled (SLD) who were removed to a cluster program if their needs extended beyond full inclusion at some schools, or beyond resource pull-out programs at other schools.

Post-School Transition

There was a wide discrepancy between secondary schools in regard to meeting transition needs of students with disabilities. Transition IEPs of students with disabilities in the Duval County School District were found to lack adequate statements of the needed transition services based on the individual needs of the student. There was little involvement by vocational agency representatives in the transition individual educational plan (IEP) meetings. Of great concern was the failure of some schools to address any of the transition needs of ESE students.

Pre-K Transition from Part C to Part B Programs

It was reported that the transition of Pre-K students from Part C to Part B resulted in excellent services, and that there was good interagency involvement. However, interviewees reported that in the past there were delays, sometimes significant, in the placement of children once they were determined to be eligible for Part B services.

Parent Involvement

Most schools reported good contact with parents, and strong parental involvement. Those schools that did not, appeared to follow the minimum requirements for seeking parental input.

Gifted

There are a variety of delivery models for gifted services at the elementary school level, including pullout programs, an inclusion class, a co-teaching model, and a full-time program.

Student Records and District Forms Reviews

Student Record Reviews

A review of student records found systemic problems with the completion of IEPs. Funding adjustments will be made for 7 noncompliance items. Lack of measurable goals on the 57 IEPs reviewed at the schools will result in the district reconvening these IEP meetings. There were 13 other IEP areas of noncompliance found that, while not requiring fund adjustments or reconvenes, do appear systemic in nature. These errors are listed in the body of the report. There were errors found in the calculation of the matrix cost factor for 14 students. The Bureau has requested the district to investigate the unique noncompliance issue regarding IEP development at Lee Senior High School.

The review of 13 gifted Educational Plans (EPs) revealed systemic findings in the areas of parent invitation to the EP meeting, no evaluation criteria, procedures and/or schedules. In addition, review of the EPs across schools revealed that the goals and objectives were not individualized to the needs of the specific students.

Special Category IEP Reviews

In a compliance review of student records relating to special categories, there were findings in the following areas: Dismissal; Limited English Proficient/Eligible for Program for Students with Disabilities; Limited English Proficient/Not Eligible for Gifted; and, Services to Parentally Placed Private School Students.

District Forms Reviews

Forms were submitted to Bureau staff for a review to determine compliance with federal and state laws. Findings were noted on the forms submitted for the following compliance items: *Parent Notification of IEP Meeting; the IEP document; Notice and Consent for Initial Placement; Informed Notice and Consent for Evaluation; Informed Notice and Consent for Reevaluation; Notification of Change in Placement; Notification of Change of FAPE [Free Appropriate Public Education]; Informed Notice of Refusal; Not Eligible for Exceptional Student Placement; Informed Notice of Dismissal; and, Documentation of Staffing/Eligibility Determination.*

System Improvement Plan

In response to these findings, the district is required to develop a system improvement plan for submission to the Bureau. The plan must include activities and strategies intended to address specific findings, as well as measurable evidence of change. In developing the system improvement plan, every effort should be made to link the system improvement activities resulting from this random monitoring report to the district's continuous improvement monitoring plan. The format for the system improvement plan, including a listing of the critical issues identified by the Bureau as most significantly in need of improvement, is provided at the end of the report.

Monitoring Process

Authority

The Florida Department of Education, Bureau of Instructional Support and Community Services, in carrying out its roles of leadership, resource allocation, technical assistance, monitoring, and evaluation is required to oversee the performance of district school boards in the enforcement of all laws and rules (Sections 1001.03(8) and 1008.32, Florida Statutes (F.S.)). In fulfilling this requirement, the Bureau conducts monitoring activities of the exceptional student education (ESE) programs provided by district school boards in accordance with Sections 1001.42 and 1003.57, F.S. Through these monitoring activities, the Bureau examines and evaluates procedures, records, and programs of exceptional student education (ESE); provides information and assistance to school districts; and otherwise assists school districts in operating effectively and efficiently. One purpose of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is to assess and ensure the effectiveness of efforts to educate children with disabilities (Section 300.1(d) of the Title 34, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), and districts are required to make a good faith effort to assist children with disabilities to achieve their stated goals and objectives in the least restrictive environment (34 CFR §§300.350(a)(2) and §300.556). In accordance with the IDEA the Department is responsible for ensuring that the requirements of IDEA are carried out and that each educational program for children with disabilities administered in the state meets the educational requirements of the state (34 CFR §300.600(a)(1) and (2)).

The monitoring system established to oversee exceptional student education (ESE) programs reflects the Department's commitment to provide assistance and service to school districts. The system is designed to emphasize improved outcomes and educational benefits for students while continuing to conduct those activities necessary to ensure compliance with applicable federal and state laws, rules, and regulations. The system provides consistency with other state efforts, including the State Improvement Plan required by the IDEA.

Method

With guidance from a work group charged with the responsibility of recommending revisions to the Bureau's monitoring system, substantial revisions to the Bureau's monitoring practices were initiated during the 2000- 01 school year. Three types of monitoring processes were established as part of the system of monitoring and oversight. Those monitoring processes are identified as

- focused monitoring
- continuous improvement/self assessment monitoring
- random monitoring.

Random Monitoring

The purpose of random monitoring is to continue to ensure school districts' compliance with federal and state laws, rules, and regulations regarding exceptional student education programs and projects, as well as to assess the districts' implementation of procedures related to the requirements. Additionally, the random monitoring process is intended to assist districts in the development of improvement plans related to compliance and implementation of exceptional student services.

District Selection

In order for districts to be involved in the monitoring process in the most effective manner, a system was developed for the selection of districts for participation. After a review of the data associated with focused monitoring, seven districts were selected for the focused monitoring process. The remaining districts, except those who had been involved in monitoring activities during the previous three years, were eligible for selection for random monitoring. The selection process was based on a “random drawing.” Duval County School District was selected to be involved in the random monitoring process.

Off-Site Monitoring Activities

Surveys were designed by the University of Miami research staff in order to provide maximum opportunity for input about the district’s ESE services from parents of students with disabilities and parents of gifted students. Results of the surveys will be discussed in the body of this report. Data from each of the surveys are included as appendix A.

Parent Surveys

Surveys were mailed to 20,344 parents of students with disabilities and 3,678 parents of gifted students, with 2,684 (13%) of the parents of students with disabilities and 1,353 (37%) of the parents of gifted students responding. Surveys from 1,762 (9%) parents of students with disabilities and 124 (3%) of the surveys for parents of students who are gifted were returned as undeliverable. The surveys that were sent to parents were printed in both English and Spanish and included a cover letter and postage paid reply envelope.

Reviews of Student Records and District Forms

At the Department of Education (DOE), Bureau staff members conducted a compliance review of selected district forms and notices to determine if the required components were included. Bureau staff also conducted reviews of “special category” student records and procedures. The results of the review of student records, special categories, and district forms will be described in this report.

On-Site Monitoring Activities

The on-site monitoring visit occurred during the week of October 28, 2002. A team of four DOE staff, two contracted staff, and 12 DOE trained peer monitors conducted the on-site activities.

On-site monitoring activities consisted of

- interviews with district and school level staff to gather information from multiple sources offering different points of view
- student case studies involving classroom visits to investigate classroom practices and interventions
- on-site reviews of selected student records.

Prior to the on-site visit, Bureau staff notified district staff of the selection of the following schools to be visited: Henry Kite Elementary, Samuel Hull Elementary, Oceanway Elementary, Hendricks Avenue Elementary, Mandarin Oaks Elementary, Brookview Elementary, Ortega Elementary, Joseph Stilwell Middle, Darnell-Cookman Middle, Arlington Middle, Baldwin Middle/Senior, School of Success (SOS) Academy, Mt. Herman Exceptional Student Center, PACE Center for Girls, Robert E. Lee High, Mandarin High, Edward White High, Nathan Forrest High, and Duncan Fletcher High. Paxon High School was added as a visitation site during the on-site visit.

The on-site selection of students for the case studies at each school was based on data indicating an overrepresentation of African-American students in educable mentally handicapped (EMH) program and data indicating a high rate of dropout and a low rate of standard diploma graduation. Schools were asked to provide a list of students who were identified as gifted, emotionally handicapped (EH), severely emotionally disturbed (SED), EMH and/or SLD. Case study students were selected from those lists and were to include one student identified as a matrix cost factor of 254 or 255, one student identified as gifted, one student initially placed within the past twelve months, and one student randomly chosen. IEP reviews of the case study students were conducted.

Reporting Process

Exit Conference

Regular debriefings were held with the district ESE administrator and district staff throughout the visit. After the monitoring visit, a phone conference was held with the district ESE administrator and district staff. Preliminary findings and concerns were shared at this time.

Preliminary Report

Following the on-site visit, Bureau staff prepares a written report. The preliminary report is sent to the district, and Bureau program specialists are assigned to assist the district in developing appropriate system improvements for necessary areas. Data for the report are compiled from sources that have been discussed previously in this document, including

- LEA profile
- parent surveys
- reviews of student records
- reviews of forms
- case studies and classroom visits
- interviews with district and school staff
- review of special category IEPs.

The report is developed to include the following elements: a description of the monitoring process, background information specific to the district, reported information from monitoring activities, and a summary. Appropriate appendices with data specific to the district will accompany each report.

Final Report

In completing the system improvement section of the report, every effort should be made to link the system improvement activities for random monitoring to the district's continuous improvement monitoring plan. In collaboration with Bureau staff, the district is encouraged to develop methods that correlate activities in order to utilize resources, staff, and time in an efficient manner in order to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

Subsequent to the district's receipt of the preliminary report, a system improvement plan, including strategies and activities targeting specific findings, is submitted to the Bureau for review. Within 30 days of the Bureau's receipt of the district's proposed system improvement plan, a final report is prepared for distribution, and is additionally be made available to the public via the Bureau's web site.

Background

Demographic Information

The data contained in this section of the report is a summary of the 2000-01 data presented in the annual data profile provided to each district. Each element is reported over a period of three years and is presented with comparison data from the state and enrollment group for the district. Profiles are available from the Bureau for individual districts upon request.

Duval County School District has a total school population (PK-12) of 126,919 with 16% of the students being identified as students with disabilities and 3% identified as gifted. Duval County is considered a “very large” district and is one of seven districts in this enrollment group. Of the total Duval school population, 48% are White; 43% are Black; 4% are Hispanic; 3% are Asian/Pacific Islander; and 2% are multiracial. Of the students with disabilities, 49% are White; 45% are Black; and 3% are Hispanic. Forty-six percent of the district’s population is eligible for free/reduced lunch.

A review of the data related to the Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) for 2000-01 indicates that the rate of participation for students with disabilities at the high school level is above the enrollment group and the state average. The rates of participation are 71% in math and 70% in reading at the high school level while the rates for the enrollment group are 58% and for the state are 59% in both reading and math. The rate of participation at the elementary and middle school level is comparative with the state and enrollment group rate. While 19% of fifth grade students with disabilities scored at level three or above in math, the rate for eighth grade math decreased to 13% and the rate for tenth grade was 14%. In reading, the percentage of students with disabilities who scored at a level three or above was 26% in fourth grade, decreased to 11% in eighth grade and decreased again at tenth grade to 6%.

Duval County School District reports a standard diploma graduation rate of 39% for students with disabilities, compared to the enrollment group average of 52% and the state average of 51%. The standard diploma graduation rate has consistently fallen well below the enrollment group and state rates for the past three years. Duval also reports a higher retention rate for students with disabilities (11%) than the enrollment group (8%) and the state (7%). The dropout rate during the 2000-01 school year for students with disabilities in Duval County was 8%, higher than the enrollment group (6%) and state (5%). In-school suspension (15%) and out-of-school suspension (19%) rates for Duval students with disabilities are higher than rates for nondisabled students (11% and 12% respectively) in Duval County. The rates are also higher than the enrollment group (12% and 14%) and the state (13% and 15%).

Data related to regular class placement indicate that Duval’s regular class placement (80% or more of the school week with nondisabled peers) for students with disabilities indicate a much higher rate (61%) than the enrollment group (47%) and the state (48%). Separate class placement (less than 40% of the day with nondisabled peers) of EMH students in Duval is lower (26%) than the enrollment group (64%) and the state (62%).

A review of the data on student membership by selected disabilities indicates that the district has an overrepresentation of African American students identified as EMH. Data indicates 43% of all students in Duval County are African American; however, 75% of students identified as EMH are African American.

Reporting of Information

Sources of Information

Data for this report are compiled from a variety of sources accessed before and during the on-site visit including

- review of district forms
- surveys returned by 2,684 parents of students with disabilities
- surveys returned by 1,353 parents of students identified as gifted
- 20 school visits
- 138 individual district, regional, and school staff interviews
- 57 IEP reviews
- 13 Educational Plan (EP) reviews
- review of 33 special category IEPs.

The data generated through these sources is summarized in the body of this report. The report provides conclusions with regard to the areas related to the educational benefit for children and compliance with federal and state guidelines. These areas include

- general supervision
- assessment
- behavior management
- curriculum and instruction
- least restrictive environment
- post-school transition
- Pre-K, transition from Part C to B programs
- parent involvement
- gifted

To the extent possible, this report focuses on systemic issues rather than on isolated instances of noncompliance or need for improvement. Systemic issues are those that occur at a sufficient enough frequency that the monitoring team could reasonably infer a system-wide problem. Findings are presented in a draft preliminary report, and the district has opportunity to clarify items of concern. In a collaborative effort between the district and Bureau staff, system improvement areas are identified. Findings are addressed through the development of strategies for improvement, and evidence of change will be identified as a joint effort between the district and the Bureau.

Parent Surveys, Individual Interviews, Case Studies, and Classroom Visits

General Supervision

The district is to be commended for its administrative structure. The district provides each region with program and admissions representatives to assist schools with training, and administrative and programmatic concerns. The district is also to be commended in its allocation of resources to the regions for direct and immediate purchase of services and other resources.

The district has developed procedures to monitor the prereferral, referral, IEP, and eligibility process at the regional and school level. The child study team (CST) plays a key role in the

implementation of these processes. In many schools, a prereferral team looks at the number of parent conferences, the observations and the interventions that have been completed. CST members may complete observations in the classroom. Then the CST members meet to review the information collected and to determine the need for more in-depth assessments. The CST determines eligibility, and meets as the IEP team to determine placement. The use of the term “child study team” to represent both the staffing committee and the IEP team, in addition to the common usage as a general education intervention team, resulted in some confusion during the record and form reviews conducted by the Bureau. This is addressed further in the forms review section of this report.

The Student Information Management System (SIMS) provides data to monitor processes i.e. dates, IEPs reevaluations, etc. Training occurs district-wide from the district to the schools. The Superintendent has stated that all decisions will be based on data. The district publishes an Annual Report for ESE students, which is modeled after a similar report for general education. Topics in the Annual Report include attendance, retention, overage, discipline, FCAT, and PASS-D. In Duval county there is a school-based management system. It must be noted that there were discrepancies between district and school data sources of information for some students (e.g. matrix ratings).

The district provides extensive training including: PASS-D; accommodations; modifications; differentiated instruction; behavioral and social/emotional training; assistive technology; pre-school sensory integration; transition; classroom management instructional strategies; administrative training in EXCENT (customized computer IEP program); and, matrix training. Training in inclusion models included action plans for starting the programs in the schools.

Under the direction of the Regional Superintendents and the district level Directors and Supervisors in Exceptional Student Education and Student Services, Regional ESE and Student Services Coordinators assume leadership and decision-making roles for each of the five geographic regions within the district, and are responsible for teacher training, CST procedures, monitoring referrals, and IEP development. The district reviews various documents such as psychological reports and referral forms to ensure compliance. It must be noted that throughout the monitoring visits to schools, Bureau staff had the opportunity to interact with many district and regional ESE specialists. During, these interactions, the specialists did not consistently provide accurate information regarding policies and procedures for the implementation of state and federal requirements (e.g. change of placement; transition team participants; LEA representation).

Interviews at the elementary school level revealed that at most elementary and middle schools, the guidance counselor monitored IEPs and pre-referral activities, with assistance from the ESE teacher. Both work as a team to coordinate the IEP and CST activities. The instruction/program support staff from the district assists with IEPs and programmatic concerns. The regional staffing specialist is responsible for eligibility. In some schools, the principal was involved in the monitoring of IEPs, in parent contacts, and tracking the progress of the students. Most ESE teachers were knowledgeable of the compliance issues.

The training provided at elementary and middle schools throughout the district included

- pre-referral interventions to faculty
- Woodcock Johnson
- accommodations and modifications

- inclusion
- gifted educational plans
- strategies for teaching gifted students
- IEP writing
- CRISS (Creating Independence through Student Owned Strategies)
- direct instruction
- EXCENT for ESE teachers
- topics appropriate to Pre-K.

At Mt. Herman Center School, the EXCENT program is used for developing IEPs, and appears to have some “non-measurable goals” programmed into the program. The EXCENT program uses a statement that “...parents of students with disabilities will be notified of their child’s progress at least as often as parents of nondisabled peers...” This statement does not apply at this center school. The district sends out monthly reminders to teachers of students taking PASS-D to ensure they keep current data, and the “Daily Task Data Sheet” is used school-wide to communicate with parents. The use of NCR forms ensures a permanent record is kept. The Site Director for Autism at this site receives monthly training and then communicates this information directly to school staff. This position was created after the district engaged in a system improvement plan for the autistic programs. Training included Mobility Orientation Via Education (MOVE) training, and matrix training.

At PACE Center School for Girls, a DJJ early intervention program for girls in grades 7-12, has four ESE students. The Academic Coordinator and LEA representative monitor the IEPs. Students are served on a consultative basis. Accommodations for students needing more services are made on an “as needed” basis. Training that has been provided includes

- accommodations training provided to faculty
- Link (Computerized IEPs) provided to Academic Coordinator
- PACE (Practical Academic Cultural Education) curriculum training provided to all.

At the high schools, interviews revealed that the guidance counselor and ESE department chair, for the most part, are responsible for monitoring all compliance activities related to IEPs and CST activities. In some instances the student’s homeroom teacher has responsibility for IEP monitoring and the monitoring of reevaluations, with assistance from regional staff as needed.

Training at the middle and high schools included

- writing IEPs, specifically EXCENT
- 504 and ESE compliance presented by the school board attorney
- reading and technology training; every teacher has a laptop
- FAT CITY training by the principal for the faculty re: individual differences and accommodations
- topics addressed frequently through faculty meetings and grade group meetings, especially information and updates on providing accommodations for instruction and testing.

There was one noted exception regarding general supervision at the secondary level. At Robert E. Lee High School, there was a significant lack of general supervision where it was noted that

- over 200 IEPs written on the same date (10/1/02)
- no evaluation interpreter at any of the meetings

- guidance counselor signing as the LEA and attending only meetings when the parent was present
- no progress reports for IEP annual goals
- multiple students with identical goals and objectives
- goals not measurable
- IEPs not individualized
- parent signature dates differ from the IEP meeting date.

With a few exceptions, district and regional support is readily available to support school personnel regarding program and compliance issues related to exceptional student education (ESE). School-based staff appeared to be knowledgeable of compliance responsibilities, with a few exceptions. In discussion with monitoring staff, it was noted that some district and regional ESE specialists did not consistently provide accurate information regarding policies and procedures for the implementation of state and federal requirements (e.g. change of placement; transition team participants; LEA representation). In reviewing data, the monitoring team found discrepancies between district and school data sources of information for some students (e.g. matrix ratings). The Bureau has requested the district to investigate the unique noncompliance issue regarding IEP development at Lee Senior High School.

Assessment

The district reported that the decision of whether the student with disabilities takes the FCAT or the alternate PASS-D assessment is determined at the IEP meeting. The information considered in the decision includes

- attendance
- whether or not the student requires intensive individualized instruction all day long (does not automatically eliminate the student in a self-contained classroom all day)
- the student's potential success in meeting the Sunshine State Standards with accommodations or modification.

Interviews and classroom observations at the elementary school revealed that all ESE students who are not at cluster schools take the FCAT. A full range of FCAT accommodations is provided. All students have the same FCAT preparation and the ESE teachers do extra preparation for students with disabilities. There are on-line practice tests for the FCAT. ESE teachers have many supplemental materials and the school pays for tutors to work with the students who need extra help. Most EMH students are routinely exempted from FCAT and are routinely served in cluster school settings.

Regarding promotion and retention, elementary students with disabilities must follow the same pupil progression plan as the other students. Most students with disabilities are working on the regular Sunshine State Standards. It must be noted that, at some elementary schools, there is some confusion on pupil progression/promotion and retention. In many elementary schools, retention/promotion appears to be decided by the ESE teacher with input from the general education teacher and the principal, who reported they seldom retain ESE students.

At the middle and high schools, interviews and observations revealed that virtually all ESE students take the FCAT through tenth grade, in order to keep all available options open. FCAT preparation is the same for students with disabilities as it is for general education students. Accommodations on FCAT are those allowed by the test manual. Promotion/retention for ESE students is the same as for the general education students. Assessment decisions are based on

reading level and parent choice. Flexible time, setting, and schedules are accommodations used for FCAT and class instruction/tests. Regular education teachers were observed implementing accommodations. At some schools, if the student fails the tenth grade FCAT, the student does not have to take it again and that is the extent of that student's standardized testing. PASS-D is the alternate assessment used for students who do not take the FCAT.

With regard to promotion/retention, at some schools there is an attendance requirement for promotion for all students. Even students working on functional standards face retention if they do not meet attendance requirements and fail to pass a teacher-made comprehensive test on class work appropriate for the student. It appears that at most schools, diploma options are not seriously reconsidered after the initial placement determination.

All students at Mt. Herman Center School meet the criteria for alternate assessment. The Learning Accomplishment Profile-E (E-LAP) is used for pre-K; the PASS-D is used for second grade through age 22. The staff report using the results of the alternate assessment to write IEPs and to ensure that they are teaching appropriate skills and concepts. Teachers use tracking cards to record student's performance.

At PACE Center School for Girls all students with disabilities take the FCAT. Teachers meet frequently to ensure that classroom and assessment accommodations are met.

In summary, it appears that most students with disabilities take the FCAT. Based on classroom observations and case studies, accommodations for the most part appear to be individualized to meet the needs of the individual student. PASS-D is the alternative assessment used by the district and is primarily used by students in cluster-site settings. There is a concern that students at some schools who fail the FCAT in the tenth grade do not have the opportunity to take the FCAT again.

Curriculum and Instruction

The district reported that students with disabilities start with the general education curriculum with accommodations. If not successful they then use the general education curriculum with modifications. If the student continues to be unsuccessful, the district uses an alternative such as State or district-developed curriculum that is correlated to the Sunshine State Standards. Supports for students include all general education curriculum supports, and tutoring before and after school and on Saturdays.

The district has a reading initiative that has been in place district-wide for a year (six-year plan). Sixty ESE teachers are trained to teach reading through research-based strategies. The district utilizes America's Choice School Design in some of its schools. America's Choice is a comprehensive school reform model for grades k-12, designed by the National Center on Education and the Economy. The Science Research Associates (SRA) curriculum is used in many schools. It was reported that the America's Choice model and the SRA curriculum conflict at times.

At the elementary school level there is extensive use of the inclusion model. Students with lower ability are taught through direct instruction methods using the same content with alternative output expectations. At some schools, the IEP and performance on the PASS-D drive the curriculum for EMH students. Resource teachers use the regular curriculum with accommodations. Regular education teachers report using supplemental materials. Supports

available include: a safety net (print out list) program of strategies and programs; after school tutoring; in-school tutoring; and volunteers. Pre-K uses Learning Accomplishment Profile-D (LAP-D) for each student.

For the most part, classroom observations in the elementary schools revealed a high level of quality instruction in all classes observed. However, due to the lack of measurable goals on the student IEPs, it was not always possible to determine if the individual needs of students with disabilities were being met or if the student's instructional program was being adequately explained to the parent.

At Mt. Herman Center School, the MOVE curriculum is implemented throughout the school. The "On-Track" curriculum is used for autistic students. The district has developed alternative curricula for students in grades 6-8 and 9-12, which aligns with the Sunshine State Standards. The elementary version is under development. Teachers were involved in the development of the alternative curricula, and report that it is very effective. The school has established three Snozelen Labs designed for sensory development for students with visual impairments. The Snozelen Labs are now used with almost all students, and many teachers have implemented the program on a smaller scale in their classrooms. The staff at Mt. Herman Center School report having extensive support and resources from the school and the district related to instructional issues.

The PACE Center School for Girls uses the Practical Academic Cultural Education curriculum and a standards-based curriculum. Students with disabilities are fully mainstreamed. Meetings are held every two weeks to discuss academic progress and concerns. Academic supports for all students include English and math tutors.

Secondary students with disabilities working towards a special diploma use the district's alternate curricula. Students working towards a standard diploma have access to the regular education curricula with accommodations and in some instances, modifications. Most secondary school teachers were aware of student's accommodations with few exceptions. Curricular supports for students with disabilities and regular education students varied from school to school but most schools had FCAT preparation supports, after school tutoring, and significant in-class supplemental materials.

Classroom observations, for the most part, revealed a high level of quality instruction in all classes observed. However, due to the lack of measurable goals and poorly written transition plans, it was not always possible to determine if the individual needs of students with disabilities were being met or if the instructional program was being adequately explained to the parent.

In summary, it appears that students with disabilities appear to be getting meaningful instruction. In many instances it appears to be exemplary. However, due to students having poorly defined goals and objective on their IEPs, it is not possible to determine if the instruction is designed to meet their individual needs or determine if they are making adequate progress towards their goals.

Discipline

The district reported that there is a district-wide Code of Student Conduct, which addresses students with disabilities. The district is working toward a district-wide behavior management plan. Each region has interventionists to support students with academic and/or behavioral

difficulties. They observe and provide strategies to schools and teachers. They include behavioral interventionists, two per region, whose primary role is behavioral support, and Instructional Program Support (IPS) specialists, three per region, who concentrate on instructional strategies that may be academic in nature. These positions often work as a team and also serve as parent liaisons in the schools. They work with teachers and families to minimize problems from the beginning. Each of these special areas are represented within each region and may contribute to the minimal number of complaints against the district. Each of the schools has its own discipline plan, and classrooms have their own behavior management plan. The district has published clear guidelines for discipline and all teachers and schools receive training in these guidelines. Teachers also receive training in Professional Crisis Management (PCM).

In summary, based on interviews with school staff and classroom observations, discipline did not appear to be a problem in the district. Staff at most schools were familiar with functional behavior assessments (FBAs) and behavior intervention plans (BIPs). Both FBAs and BIPs were observed in use in case study students. Behavior intervention plans were included in IEPs when appropriate.

Least Restrictive Environment

The district monitors LRE through the Student Information Management System (SIMS). The priority is to keep students in regular education classes with supports. Alternative placements are determined through the IEP process.

At the School of Success Academy Charter School, students with disabilities spend most of the time with nondisabled peers.

In grades K-1 at Kite Elementary School, IEP teams have the option of placing students in inclusion classes, pull-out classes, or putting the students on consultation. Classes in grades 2-5 are all inclusion classes. Some students receive classroom accommodations and modifications. Students who need additional services that cannot be provided in regular classes must go to another school.

At Samuel Hull Elementary School the regional admissions representative was unclear about what constituted a change of placement and agreed that parent notice of change of placement only went out when students went to a self-contained classroom. If the students need more service than what is available through the resource room, they are transferred to other schools. There are self-contained Pre-K classes. They also have self-contained language classes up to the second grade at which time the students are reevaluated to see if other services are needed.

At Oceanway Elementary School the placement options included full-time, separate class, resource, or full inclusion with the resource teacher acting primarily as an aide in the classroom. Most of the full-time SLD and EMH students are placed here as a cluster-site; it is not their home zone school. It was reported that placement changes to a less restrictive setting would be done on a trial basis with parental approval. If the student were successful, the IEP would be rewritten. It is unclear if this has ever occurred.

Mandarin Oaks Elementary School, a cluster school for severely impaired Pre-K students, receives students from other schools. Students with mild disabilities are sent to another site. There is not a waiting list this year for Pre-K, but there was last year due to safety reasons. There

is a mechanism in place to move students to a less restrictive setting. Regular education students interact with severe/profound students as an incentive.

Ortega Elementary School has inclusion classes, co-teaching and pullout programs. No student is out of the regular class for more than three hours per week. Students who need more intensive services are re-evaluated and sent to other schools.

At Brookview Elementary School, gifted students go to another school one day per week. Otherwise, there is a complete continuum of service delivery models at Brookview.

At Joseph Stilwell Middle School, it is unclear whether placement options were determined by ESE category or were parent-driven. School staff used non-standard terms to describe placements and/or service delivery models. It was also unclear as to when diploma options were considered. Several of those interviewed said that it was determined at seventh grade. It was reported that regional and school staff meet with the parents to explain diploma options, and school staff agreed that the option selected was based on parental choice.

At Mt. Herman Center School, the Admission Specialists attend placement meetings. Teachers from Mt. Herman are not involved in the IEP meetings of students coming to the school. School staff reported that students in this school who have been determined to be eligible for the special programs for students who are profoundly mentally handicapped, who are orthopedically impaired, who are autistic (severe) or students with traumatic brain injury (severe), are appropriately placed. On occasion, staff have initiated a change to a less restrictive environment for students who no longer require this level of service. For reverse inclusion experiences, students from a nearby DJJ facility and a Catholic school come to Mt. Herman Center School weekly.

At the PACE program, students are served on a consultation model with more services provided if needed. The appropriateness of the delivery model and services are verified at the intake meeting. Future placement is discussed at the transition meeting.

At Baldwin Middle/High School, many students with disabilities receive services in the general education setting. However, classroom visits indicated that even more students could be served in general education classes. The diploma option is considered in the spring of the student's seventh grade year.

At Robert E. Lee High School, diploma options were reported to be based on parental choice. There is a mechanism in place to change from more restrictive to less restrictive settings. Students with more severe needs are sent to another school. Only consultation ninth and tenth graders are in regular homerooms.

At Mandarin High School, parent input and choice seems to be a big factor in placement but academic and behavioral standards must be met as well. Placement options include consultation, elective classes such as learning strategies or content classes for regular diploma courses, or students may take one to four ESE academic courses for Special Diploma Option 1. No students are totally self-contained but may rotate among three ESE teachers for academics and one regular teacher for an elective. The classes in this school are all varying exceptionalities (VE) classes. Students who are more highly involved were sent to cluster-sites before they reached ninth grade.

At Edward White High School students are able to earn 32 credits in their four years, enabling them to take special education and general education courses regardless of their chosen diploma option. Students are encouraged to offer input when determining course selection. Students with disabilities who are working towards a special diploma are encouraged to take an after-school GED prep course so that they can attempt to attain a GED diploma. There is not a great deal of articulation between middle and high school. Students who are classified as trainable mentally handicapped are only with general education students at lunch, because there are no general education elective courses available to them.

At Nathan Forrest High School students with disabilities are served in a VE model, from consultative through separate class. Time with nondisabled peers is recorded accurately on the IEPs. Special diploma students have electives in the general education setting. On occasion, students with disabilities are included in general education classes, if their grades warrant it.

Placement options at Duncan Fletcher High School include consultative model for regular diploma students, learning strategies electives for regular diploma students, and academic content classes in ESE for special diploma students. Parent/student input is a major factor in placement decisions. Multiple persons mentioned that the diploma option was primarily student/parent choice, at least at the beginning of ninth grade.

In summary, at most school sites a limited continuum of services was available to students ranging from consultative to resource services. Students needing more intensive services were placed in cluster-sites. There was a concern based on multiple interviews with school staff that many students at cluster-sites could have received appropriate services in their home school, especially students with mild disabilities. For example, an ESE teacher reported that students staffed into the EMH program automatically receive full-time services. Another example involved students in the SLD program who were removed to a cluster program if their needs extended beyond full inclusion at some schools.

Post-School Transition

The district and region representatives spoke highly of the district transition coordinator who monitors and/or participates in transition planning for all students, including those in the Hospital Homebound program.

At Mt. Herman Center School, the social worker is responsible for transition planning. There is an annual open house with agency representatives to make families aware of available support. Most students are “Medicaid waiver” students, so the caseworkers visit the classrooms monthly or bimonthly. An annual family night is held with lawyers and advocates available to talk to parents regarding their rights, including the transfer of rights at the age of majority. The Florida Diagnostic Learning and Resources System (FDLRS) and Developmental Disabilities Services are readily available to the school staff.

At the PACE center, transition and transfer of rights are discussed with the parents and agencies at age 14. The outside agency providing the DJJ placement is involved. PACE transition staff automatically track students for three years once students exit the program.

At Baldwin Middle/Senior High School no agencies participate in transition meetings. There are limited vocational classes at Baldwin (Business and Home Economics). OJT is offered at this school, but it was not clear as to the extent of involvement by students with disabilities.

At Robert E. Lee High School no agency was invited to the IEP meetings. It was reported that it was the parents' responsibility to invite the agency if they wanted them to attend. This was also reported at Forrest High School. No one interviewed at Robert E. Lee High School had knowledge of the "Transfer of Rights" procedures. Staff interviews also revealed conflicting information regarding on-the-job training (OJT), supervision, and acquisition of jobs. Only three students had jobs, which they had to secure on their own.

At Mandarin High School the transition IEPs address outside agency involvement, but the agency representatives were not at the meetings. The ESE teacher reported that primarily Vocational Rehabilitation staff were invited but wouldn't come until the student's senior year and then they wanted to do their "own thing." Students were invited and attended their IEP meetings. Based on the IEP reviews, the transition goals were weak and not necessarily connected to the students' post school outcome. There are on-the-job training and school-to-work programs for students with disabilities. The Distributed Educational Cooperative Agreement (DECA) program is for general education students and includes ESE students. Vocational and prevocational courses are available as electives for students with disabilities.

At Edward White High School, students with more limited skills have a business technology program. The job coaches find jobs for these students. The transitional activities for the other special diploma students are limited to OJT if the student can find a job. Students can apply to be in the Distributed Cooperative Training (DCT) program if accepted by the teacher. The Division of Vocational Rehabilitation becomes involved during the students' senior year.

At Nathan Forrest High School, school staff report that there is a single district contact person for transition services. One ESE teacher indicated that inviting agencies to participate in transition IEPs is left up to the parents. The guidance counselor reported that she has just been informed of the requirement to involve agencies in all transition IEPs as appropriate. Transition is addressed in a limited and inconsistent manner.

At Duncan Fletcher High School, all personnel were knowledgeable of the transition process. Parent and student attendance at IEP meetings was good, and agency representatives were invited. It was reported that they did not attend.

A review of student records indicated that in virtually all schools, transition was not adequately addressed in the IEPs. While there is general compliance with the procedures related to the development of transition IEPs, there often is no correlation between the statement of needed services and projected student outcomes for many students. A review of the transition IEPs at several high schools found that some statements of the student's preferences and interests simply read that the student wanted to graduate from high school and socialize with friends.

In summary, there was a wide discrepancy between secondary schools in regard to meeting transition needs of students with disabilities. Transition IEPs of students with disabilities in the Duval County School District were found to lack adequate statements of the needed transition services based on the individual needs of the student. There was little involvement by vocational agency representatives in the transition IEP meetings. Of great concern was the failure of some schools to address any of the transition needs of students.

Pre-K Transition from Part C To Part B Programs

Interviews with district staff indicated that the district does not directly serve students with disabilities age birth to three. They have interagency agreements with the Early Intervention Program and Head Start to provide necessary services. The district uses the Children's Registry and Information System (CHRIS) and Child Find and has two transition specialists whose primary jobs are to refer students who need transition meetings, and to attend the transition meetings. The district reported that they are opening up ten new classrooms to provide services; however, there is still a delay in the provision of services for some students.

In summary, it was reported that the Pre-K transition services were excellent and that there was good interagency involvement; however, interviews suggested that there were delays, sometimes significant, in the placement of some children once they were determined eligible.

Parental Involvement

The district's reports regarding parental involvement were mixed. Some district and regional staff reported compliance in inviting parent participation and attendance, although they were not always successful. A special grant was discussed by the Supervisor of Instructional Support and ESE Curriculum, which was used in low income areas to foster parent involvement with community support. She also mentioned newsletters are sent from each region. Parent training is often attached to teacher training opportunities.

At the School of Success Academy, the ESE coordinator assures parental involvement by holding extra parent meetings, calling parents, sending notes home to the parents, and making home visits.

At the elementary schools, parental involvement in the IEP process was reported to be good. Most of the IEPs reviewed indicated parental participation. Teachers reported a lot of parental contact. Many schools reported providing childcare for parents so they could attend meetings and related functions.

At Mt. Herman Center School, teachers reported 70%-80% parent participation at IEP meetings. Teachers send questionnaires to parents asking what they would like their child to learn. This information and the teacher's list are brought to the IEP meeting. If a parent does not attend the IEP, and has not told the school to hold the meeting without them, the meeting is re-scheduled. If a parent indicates that they absolutely cannot attend the IEP meeting, the teachers often send a "draft" home prior to the meeting. Daily notes go home for all students, and the social worker often makes home visits.

Parent involvement at the PACE Center is consistently high. There is almost 100% participation. Parents must meet monthly with the PACE team. The social worker is sent to those few parents who do not attend, to seek input and encourage participation.

Parent participation at the secondary schools varied from poor to excellent. Those reporting high participation included Baldwin Middle/Senior and Duncan Fletcher High. Those reporting satisfactory contact were Mandarin High and Robert E. Lee High, and those reporting poor parental involvement included Edward White High and Nathan Forrest High.

The schools that reported high parental involvement appear to take extra measures to involve parents such as extra telephone contact, more frequent progress reports, more personal contact,

faxed daily reports, and use of paraprofessionals to maintain contact. In schools with high parental contact, the parents' input into the IEP process was evident.

In summary, most schools reported good parental contact and involvement. Those that did not followed minimum requirements for seeking parental input.

Gifted

The district reported that there are a variety of delivery models for gifted services at the elementary school level, including pullout programs, an inclusion class, a co-teaching model, and a full-time program. In general, the middle schools offer gifted services through the core curriculum courses, depending on the population of gifted students. If there are no gifted services available at the neighborhood school, the parents can ask for a special assignment to another school. The high schools offer content courses and/or consultant services. There are three high schools that have gifted services, while the remaining schools offer students such programs as International Baccalaureate (IB), and advanced placement (AP). The high schools that have programs are all magnet lottery schools.

It was reported by the district that the elementary curriculum has five strands including social processes, creative expression, research methods, critical appreciation, and scientific approach. The middle schools have a supplemental guide that enhances the content courses. There is not a separate curriculum at the high school.

While gifted programs were reviewed at several schools, this report focused primarily on findings at Hendricks Avenue Elementary, Darnell-Cookman Middle, and Paxon Senior High School.

At Hendricks Avenue Elementary School it is the guidance counselor's responsibility to identify students for referral. The Otis Lennon is the primary screening instrument in use. Parent and teacher recommendations are the driving force for gifted screening. The gifted teacher is responsible for all EP reviews and supplies goals and objectives for initial placements completed at feeder schools. She attends all initial placements completed at Hendricks Elementary.

The school uses the Resource Enrichment Model, and the teacher of gifted students says she uses "Blooms Taxonomy." The teacher of gifted students stated that she makes use of her local and personal resources to enrich the curriculum, including going on many field trips. The curriculum for gifted students is centered on technology, and the teacher did not report attempts to develop the curriculum in response to student interests, strengths or other data.

The basic education teacher reports that no specific adaptations are made for gifted learners in the basic education classes, although the teacher does make a special effort to make certain that a gifted student does not miss instructional elements covered during his or her absence due to attending gifted classes. There is strong parental involvement as stated by the principal, teacher of the gifted and the guidance counselor. Parents are invited to initial staffings and reviews.

Darnell-Cookman Middle School is a magnet school for the gifted and talented. Students are selected using the lottery system. There are 12 teachers endorsed in gifted education who teach in four teams. One guidance counselor assumes most of the duties for the half of the school serving gifted students. Each teacher of the gifted students has two planning periods per day.

Based on interviews and observations, there is little collaboration between the gifted programs in the school and the talented programs in the school.

It was reported that the gifted curriculum at Darnell-Cookman Middle School is standards-driven. Teachers of the gifted adapt the standards-driven curriculum to meet the needs of their students, and teach all the core courses. The teachers of gifted students are very sensitive to the affective needs of the gifted students. Gifted teachers report the use of many hands-on activities, emphasize high order thinking, field trips as part of the curriculum, and frequent guest speakers. It is reported that there is high parent involvement. Parents participate in EP meetings, conferences and serve as mentors.

In eighth grade another lottery takes place for students wanting to attend Paxon or Stranton Magnet Schools.

Paxon High School has a gifted coordinator. When the school gets the list of gifted students, the gifted coordinator contacts the parents for making course choices. If this course fills up, or it is not of interest to the student, they are put into a pullout consultative course. She teaches two classes per day plus a 15-minute pull-out/consultative period every other day for students who are not enrolled in the gifted classes. The gifted coordinator does the gifted paperwork. A gifted endorsed teacher teaches a content English course at ninth grade and a social studies course at tenth grade. The endorsed gifted teachers have a good understanding of the characteristics of giftedness. Little, if any, assessment is done at the high school level. No specific teaching strategies were reported to be used for the gifted students. Some accommodation for the uniqueness of the gifted student was reported.

In summary, there are a variety of delivery models for gifted services at the elementary school level, including pullout programs, an inclusion class, a co-teaching model, and a full-time program.

Student Records and District Form Reviews

Student Record Reviews: Students with Disabilities

Bureau staff reviewed a total of 57 student records of students with disabilities. According to random monitoring guidelines, at least one student record identified as a cost factor 254 or 255 from each school may be selected for review. Matrix reviews completed were conducted for a total of five matrix reviews, which included a computation review of the IEP, the services implemented in the classroom, and the matrix form. In addition, there were students with incorrect matrix calculations, and students reported with cost factors of 254 or 255, who had no matrices. The records were reviewed in the schools during the on-site visits. As a result of these reviews, 14 students were determined to have been incorrectly claimed for a matrix cost factor of 254.

Funding adjustments will be made for student records that

- lacked documentation of notice of change of placement (three records)
- lacked an IEP at the beginning of the school year (two records)
- lacked an IEP on December 1, 2001 (one record)
- lacked eligibility determination for student on temporary placement since January 2001 (one record).

Of the 57 student IEPs reviewed, all of the IEPs lacked measurable annual goals, requiring that the district reconvene IEP meetings for these students.

A review of the IEPs also indicated that there were 13 noncompliance items that appeared systemic in nature.

- The parental notice of the IEP meeting did not include a description of the purpose of the meeting (including transition services, when appropriate).
- There was a lack of documentation that the procedural safeguards were sent to parents at the same time the parents were sent the notice of the IEP meeting.
- There was a lack of documentation that the parent was provided a copy of the IEP.
- The short-term objectives were inappropriate.
- Special education services were not written to specifically identify the nature of the services received.
- There was no explanation of the extent, if any, to which the student will not participate with non-disabled students in the regular class.
- The initiation/duration dates of services were unclear.
- The initiation/duration dates of accommodations and/or modifications were unclear.
- There was a lack of documentation that the report of progress was provided to parents as often as a report of progress was reported to the nondisabled population.
- The report of progress did not describe progress towards annual goals.
- The report of progress did not describe the extent to which that progress is sufficient to enable the student to achieve the goal by the end of the year.
- There was a lack of documentation that the IEP team considered the concerns of the parents for enhancing the education of their children.
- There was a lack of documentation that the IEP team considered the results of the student's performance on any state- or district-wide assessment.

During the record reviews, it was found that one student who had been determined eligible for the special programs for student who are mentally handicapped did not clearly meet the criteria for this program and no justification was given for the eligibility determination. The district was asked to review this student's eligibility.

In addition, there were other noncompliance items found that, while not systemic, were relatively frequent.

- The parental notice of the IEP meeting did not include a listing of persons attending the meeting.
- There was a lack of correspondence between the annual goals, short-term objectives, and the needs identified on the present level of educational performance statement.
- There was a lack of documentation that the IEP team considered the results of the initial evaluation or most recent evaluation of the student.

Student Record Reviews: Gifted

Bureau staff reviewed a total of 13 records of students identified as gifted, including case study students. Systemic errors included

- lack of required components in the parent invitation to the EP meeting (10 records)
- lack of evaluation criteria, procedures, and/or schedules on the IEPs (nine records)
- lack of individualization of goals and objectives.

District Forms Review

Forms were submitted to Bureau staff for a review to determine compliance with federal and state laws. Findings were noted in 11 areas on the forms. The district was notified of the specific findings via a separate letter dated September 17, 2002. An explanation of the specific finding may be found in appendix D.

- *Parent Notification of Individual Educational Plan (IEP) Meeting**
- *IEP Forms**
- *Notice and Consent for Initial Placement**
- *Informed Notice and Consent for Evaluation**
- *Informed Notice of Reevaluation**
- *Notification of Change of Placement**
- *Notification of Change of FAPE**
- *Informed Notice of Refusal**
- *Informed Notice of Dismissal**
- *Notice: Not Eligible for Exceptional Student Placement**
- *Documentation of Staffing/Eligibility Determination**
- *Summary of Procedural Safeguards*
- *Annual Notice of Confidentiality*

* Indicates findings that require immediate attention

Special Category Record Reviews

Bureau staff reviewed a total of 33 student records for compliance.

- *Dismissal:* For four of the six files reviewed for compliance for dismissal procedures, there was no documentation provided to indicate that an IEP team made the determination of dismissal after reviewing the IEP. For three of the six student files reviewed, there was no documentation that the parent had been given an opportunity to provide information during the reevaluation process.
- *Student Referred but Determined Ineligible.* There were no significant findings.
- *Limited English Proficient/Eligible for Program for Students with Disabilities, and Limited English Proficient/Not Eligible for Gifted.* A review of the documentation submitted for these files indicated that only one student evaluation report out of the nine files submitted was evaluated in his/her native language. Even in situations where the school psychologist noted difficulties in language, the tests were administered in English. There was no evidence that those parents identified as non-English speaking received written notice in their native language.
- *Services to Parentally Placed Private Students.* There was no documentation provided that a representative from the private schools had been invited to the IEP meetings.
- *Transition from Part C to Part B Preschool Programs.* There were no significant findings.
- *Temporary Assignment.* There were no significant findings.

Positive Observations

At each school visited, the monitoring team, faculty, and administrative staff noted positive influences impacting the services for students with disabilities at the school.

Kite Elementary School

- strong ESE teachers
- positive attitude of the general education teachers towards inclusion
- principal - strong leadership
- guidance counselor- strong support
- faculty takes a genuine interest in the students-really know strengths and weaknesses
- regular Education teachers - willingness to work with ESE students
- feels lots of support and resources from school and outside sources
- gifted teacher
- felt Kite Elementary supportive, many of the faculty taking gifted endorsement courses.

Samuel Hull Elementary School

- excellent Pre-K self-contained unit
- neighborhood school with small classes and community support
- faculty seen as a family, warm and nurturing in support of all students
- commitment to working with the parents, students and the community
- opportunities for students to receive tutoring.

Oceanway Elementary School

- very supportive faculty
- inclusion students treated as nondisabled peers.

Mandarin Oaks Elementary School

- proactive leadership at the school
- proactive teachers
- close-knit faculty
- regular education teachers are accepting of ESE students
- good communication and collaboration
- immaculately kept facility.

Brookview Elementary

- strong leadership
- stable faculty
- strong communication between faculty
- faculty respects students
- children are happy here
- communicate well with parents
- parent involvement in general.

Ortega Elementary School

- strong leadership and support from principal
- strong faculty
- “A” school

- flexible ESE teacher serving as resource teacher, a co-teacher, and consultation
- high expectations for all students.

Joseph Stilwell Middle School

- warm and nurturing atmosphere
- highly supportive of the students faculty
- strong community involvement
- high praise for ESE program by regular faculty
- use of America's Choice Design resulting in major improvements
- opportunities for tutoring through "Teams and Tutoring" program.

Arlington Middle School

- administration is trying to provide supports, materials and training
- new ESE guidance counselor
- teachers relating well to students
- teachers meeting needs of students.

Baldwin Middle/Senior High School

- teacher choosing to teach here
- dedicated faculty.

Charter School – School of Success Academy

- great school – 500 students and a waiting list.

Mt. Herman Exceptional Student Center

- significant family support
- team work among the teachers
- dedicated, devoted faculty with little turnover
- many services are available.

PACE Center School for Girls

- faculty committed to students' well-being
- many supports available to students
- low teacher pupil ratio.

Robert E. Lee High School

- faculty diversity
- caring (family) atmosphere of faculty.

Mandarin High School

- ESE student participation in athletics and clubs
- good ESE student graduation rates
- high expectations of students and staff
- good rapport with ESE teachers
- competent certified teachers
- supportive involved parents
- supportive community involvement with opportunities for employment
- good district support for ESE

Edward White High School

- strong commitment to student achievement
- principal accessible to students and parents
- students earning 32 credits in high school
- available FCAT preparation materials and participation activities
- strong business technology program for students to work in the community

Nathan Forrest High School

- improved staff morale/attitude with winning football team
- close-knit faculty

Duncan Fletcher High School

- ESE students included in all activities
- great principal
- acceptance of diversity
- good provision of accommodations
- excellent district support

Summary

Based on the findings described in this report and summarized in the following section, the district is expected to develop a system improvement plan in collaboration with Bureau staff. This plan should specify activities and strategies to address the identified findings in the following areas:

- General Supervision
- Assessment
- Curriculum and Instruction
- Post-School Transition
- Pre-K, Transition from Part C to Part B Programs
- Gifted
- Special Category Record Reviews
- Student Record Reviews
- District Forms Review

Following is a summary of the findings in each of the identified areas that requires an improvement plan, as well as a format for completion of the system improvement plan.

Duval County School District Random Monitoring System Improvement Plan

This section includes the issues identified by the Bureau as most significantly in need of improvement. The district is required to provide system improvement strategies to address identified findings, which may include an explanation of specific activities the district has committed to implementing, or it may consist of a broader statement describing planned strategies. For each issue, the plan also must define the measurable evidence of whether or not the desired outcome has been achieved. Target dates that extend for more than one year should include benchmarks in order to track interim progress. Findings identified as “ESE” are those findings that reflect issues specific to ESE students. Findings identified as “All” are those findings that reflect issues related to the student population as a whole, including ESE students.

29

Category	Findings	ESE	All	System Improvement Strategy	Evidence of Change (Including target date)
General Supervision	Findings in this area are addressed through the record reviews and special category record review sections of this plan.	X			
Assessment	Many students in cluster-site settings who did not clearly meet exemption criteria under State Board rule 6A-1.09401, FAC were given an alternate assessment rather than taking the FCAT.	X		A review team consisting of selected cluster site principals, ESE staff and the ESE Director will review policies regarding student participation in the FCAT. Policy revisions to reflect compliance will be made and communicated to all schools and other staff as appropriate	Random sampling of 20 student records at cluster sites will reveal 100% compliance with exemption criteria. A written summary of findings will be provided to DOE. May 2004 May 2005

Category	Findings	ESE	All	System Improvement Strategy	Evidence of Change (Including target date)
Assessment (Cont.)	Some students who fail the FCAT at 10 th grade are not given the opportunity to take the FCAT again.	X		A plan will be developed to address the issue of training teachers to provide students with continued opportunities to re-take the FCAT. A computer program for FCAT practice has been purchased and placed in all high schools. Teachers were provided with training in March, 2003.	Random sampling of 20 student records at 10 th grade sites will document that students failing the FCAT have been provided an opportunity to re-take the FCAT. A goal of 100% compliance will be established. A written summary of findings will be provided to DOE. May 2004 May 2005
Curriculum and Instruction	It is not possible to determine if students are receiving instruction designed to meet their individual needs or to determine if they are making adequate progress towards their goals due to the lack of measurable goals in their IEPs.	X		IEP training provided re: curriculum connection to measurable annual goals. Regional ESE support staff will follow-up training with school contacts and review of training with school staff. Revise the EXCENT IEP program goal banks, and revise training manual/materials.	A random sampling of 40 IEPs will provide evidence of measurable goals on IEPs. A goal of 100 % compliance will be established. A written summary of findings will be provided to DOE. May 2004 May 2005
Post School Transition	Several high schools failed to address the transition needs of students with disabilities. Many IEPs were lacking appropriate information regarding transition and did not appear to be individualized.	X		Review/revise the current transition training to include emphasis on agency involvement, and determining transition services based on individual student needs. Review/revise Transition manual as needed to emphasize required components of the TIEP	A random sampling of 20 student records will be conducted to assess required components. The goal will be 100 % compliance. A written summary of findings will be provided to DOE. May 2004 May 2005

Category	Findings	ESE	All	System Improvement Strategy	Evidence of Change (Including target date)
Pre-K/Part C to B Transition	There was a delay, sometimes significant, in the placement of children once they were determined to be eligible for Part B services	X		A district level preschool planning committee will continue to address transition procedures to identify strategies and resources that will support a timely provision of services to children transitioning from Early Intervention Programs to Preschool programs. Monthly placement data will be shared with ESE and Student Services staff	Monthly reports identifying the number of children who are not placed by their third birthdays will be reviewed by the Admissions staff from September 2003 through May 2004. The goal is to achieve 100% success in assuring that the IEP is implemented by the 3 rd birthday. A summary of the results will be provided to DOE. May 2004 May 2005
Gifted	Goals and objectives on the EPs for gifted students are not always individualized	X		Expand current EP goals and objectives in the data banks of the EXCENT Program. Develop and deliver training for teachers of the gifted that addresses the goal banks of the EP (9/03). Assign district staff to train and provide school assistance for EP development.	A random sampling of 10 EPs will be conducted, with a goal of 100% compliance for measurable and individualized goals. A summary of findings will be provided to DOE. May 2004 May 2005
Special Category Records Reviews	Findings were reported in the following special category areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dismissal: No documentation was provided for four records to indicate that an IEP team made the determination of dismissal after reviewing the IEP. 	X		The district will review local procedures related to findings, and will provide written clarification to district, regional and school level staff regarding compliance issues.	A sampling of student records will document that procedures are in compliance. Copies of two records in each category will be provided to DOE by January 2004 (procedures implemented prior to 12/31/03)

Category	Findings	ESE	All	System Improvement Strategy	Evidence of Change (Including target date)
Special Category Records Reviews (Cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited English proficient/eligible for programs for students with disabilities and limited English proficient/ineligible for gifted: • Eight of nine files submitted indicated that limited English students were not always evaluated in their native language. Parents who were non-English speaking were not always provided written notice in their native language. • Services to parentally placed private school students: No documentation was provided that a representative from the private school was invited to attend the SP meetings. 				<p>Follow-up samplings will be conducted of 2 records in each targeted category, with a goal of 100% compliance. A summary of findings will be provided to DOE.</p> <p>May 2004 May 2005</p>
Student Record Reviews	<p>A review of IEPs indicated that there were 13 noncompliance items that appeared systemic in nature:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The parental notice of the IEP meeting did not include a description of the purpose of the meeting (including transition services, when appropriate). • There was a lack of documentation that the procedural safeguards were sent 	X		<p>Review all elements referenced in monitoring team report with corresponding Duval County Public School forms (January, 2004).</p> <p>Develop correspondence to clarify issues, by February, 2004</p> <p>Develop revised forms where correction/clarification is</p>	<p>A random sampling of 40 IEPs will be reviewed by district staff, with a goal of 100% compliance. A summary of findings will be provided to DOE.</p> <p>May 2004 May 2005</p>

Category	Findings	ESE	All	System Improvement Strategy	Evidence of Change (Including target date)
Student Record Reviews (Cont.)	<p>to parents at the same time the parents were sent the notice of the IEP meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a lack of documentation that the parent was provided a copy of the IEP. • The short-term objectives were inappropriate. • Special education services were not written to specifically identify the nature of the services received. • There was no explanation of the extent, if any, to which the student will not participate with non-disabled students in the regular class. • The initiation/duration dates of services were unclear. • The initiation/duration dates of accommodations and/or modifications were unclear. • There was a lack of documentation that the report of progress was provided to parents as often as a report of progress was reported to the nondisabled population. • The report of progress did not describe progress towards 			<p>indicated, by April, 2004</p> <p>Distribute revised forms to staff, and review in training/staff meetings, by April, 2004.</p>	

Category	Findings	ESE	All	System Improvement Strategy	Evidence of Change (Including target date)
Student Record Reviews (Cont.)	annual goals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report of progress did not describe the extent to which that progress is sufficient to enable the student to achieve the goal by the end of the year. • There was lack of documentation that the IEP team considered the concerns of the parents for enhancing the education of their children. • There was lack of documentation that the IEP team considered the results of the student's performance on any state- or district-wide assessment. 				
	Fifty seven IEP teams will be required to reconvene. Fund adjustments will be required for 7 students.	X		Provide ESE/Student Services Regional Coordinators with lists of IEPs that must reconvene. District staff assigned to inform schools of IEPs to reconvene. Review reconvened IEPs in the fall for compliance.	Student Records will document that IEPs were reconvened, and that the annual goals are measurable. Copies of IEP coversheets and annual goals for each student will be sent to DOE. November 2003.
	Matrix errors were reported for 14 students.	X		Provide matrix training to district and school staff: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to ensure matrices are calculated correctly 	A random sampling of Matrices will be reviewed by district staff, with a goal of 100% compliance. A summary

Category	Findings	ESE	All	System Improvement Strategy	Evidence of Change (Including target date)
Student Record Reviews (Cont.)				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to ensure they are reported to DOE as calculated 	of findings will be provided to DOE. May 2004 May 2005
District Forms Reviews	<p>The following district forms must be revised to meet compliance with state and federal guidelines (*indicates findings that require immediate attention).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parent Notification of Individual Educational Plan (IEP) Meeting* IEP Forms* Notice and consent for Initial Placement* Informed Notice and Consent for Evaluation* Informed Notice of Reevaluation* Notification- Change of Placement* Notification- Change of FAPE* Informed Notice of Refusal* Informed Notice of Dismissal* Notice: Not Eligible for Exceptional Student Placement* Documentation of Staffing/Eligibility Determination 	X		<p>Review all elements referenced in monitoring team report with corresponding Duval County Public School forms, by January, 2004.</p> <p>Develop correspondence to clarify issues, by February 2004.</p> <p>Develop revised forms where correction/clarification is indicated, by April 2004.</p> <p>Distribute revised forms to staff, and review in training/staff meetings, by April, 2004</p>	Submit forms to DOE for review and approval. April, 2004

Category	Findings	ESE	All	System Improvement Strategy	Evidence of Change (Including target date)
Lee High School	Lee High School had numerous findings in regard to the IEP process. The district was requested to conduct an investigation, which they began upon notification, in concert with DOE staff.	X		<p>Meet with Principal, Regional staff, ESE Director and district staff.</p> <p>Develop a plan to address non-compliance issues.</p> <p>Identify training needs for staff involved in IEP reviews.</p> <p>Develop a plan with the principal to identify and address personnel issues.</p>	<p>A written summary of activities to address school level issues has been provided to DOE October 2003.</p> <p>A random sampling of records at Lee High will document that the compliance issues have been addressed.</p> <p>January 2004.</p>

Recommendations

- Request a data quality review from Education Information and Accountability Services to check accuracy of data.
- Conduct a review of IEPs and matrices for students with reported matrix ratings of 254-255 using review packets provided by Bureau staff.
- Provide update training to the appropriate staff involved in matrix completion.
- Consider developing clearly defined exit criteria for students placed at cluster-sites.
- Consider training school level staff on LRE and the decision-making on an individual basis.
- Address equal access to services for gifted students so that no gifted student is denied access based on a lottery system or over-crowded classes.
- Review the process of developing EP goals for grades 5 and 6 to ensure there is not a lapse in the EP.
- Ensure that district and regional specialists continue to have access to accurate information relative to federal and state requirements.

Appendix A- Survey Results

**2002 Parent Survey Report
Students with Disabilities
Duval County**

Responding to the need to increase the involvement of parents and families of students with disabilities in evaluating the educational services provided to their children, the Florida Department of Education, Bureau of Instructional Support and Community Services contracted with the University of Miami to develop and administer a parent survey in conjunction with the Bureau's district monitoring activities. In 1999, the parent survey was administered in 12 districts; in 2000, it was administered in 15 districts and two special schools; and, in 2001, it was administered in four districts.

In conjunction with the 2002 Duval County monitoring activities, the parent survey was sent to parents of the 20,344 students with disabilities for whom complete addresses were provided by the district. A total of 2,684 parents (PK, n=187; K-5, n=1,435; 6-8, n=605; 9-12, n=457) representing 13% of the sample, returned the survey. Surveys from 1,762 parents were returned as undeliverable, representing 9% of the sample.

Parents responded "yes" or "no" to each survey item, indicating that they either agreed or disagreed with the statement. The district response for each item was calculated as the percentage of respondents who agreed with the item.

	% Yes
1. Overall, I am satisfied with the exceptional education services my child receives.	72%
2. Overall, I am satisfied with my child's academic progress.	71%
3. Overall, I am satisfied with the amount of time my child spends with regular education students.	77%
4. Overall, I am satisfied with the effect of exceptional student education on my child's self-esteem.	72%
5. Overall, I am satisfied with the level of knowledge and experience of school personnel.	74%
6. Overall, I am satisfied with the way I am treated by school personnel.	83%
7. Overall, I am satisfied with the way special education teachers and regular education teachers work together.	72%
8. Overall, I am satisfied with how quickly services are implemented following an IEP (Individualized Educational Plan) decision.	72%
9. My child is usually happy at school.	82%
10. My child spends most of the school day involved in productive activities.	76%
11. My child has friends at school.	92%

- These questions answered by parents of students grade 8 and above.

	% Yes
12. My child is learning skills that will be useful later on in life.	83%
13. My child is aiming for a standard diploma.	82%
14. At my child's IEP meetings we have talked about ways that my child could spend time with students in regular classes.	56%
15. At my child's IEP meetings we have talked about whether my child needed services beyond the regular school year.	58%
16. At my child's IEP meetings we have talked about which diploma my child may receive. *	56%
17. At my child's IEP meetings we have talked about the requirements for different diplomas. *	46%
18. At my child's IEP meetings we have talked about whether my child would take the FCAT (Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test).	49%
19. At my child's IEP meetings we have talked about whether my child should get accommodations (special testing conditions), for example, extra time.	53%
20. My child's teachers set appropriate goals for my child.	81%
21. My child's teachers expect my child to succeed.	88%
22. My child's teachers give homework that meets my child's needs.	74%
23. My child's teachers call me or send me notes about my child.	77%
24. My child's teachers are available to speak with me.	89%
25. My child's teachers give students with disabilities extra time or different assignments, if needed.	74%
26. My child's school wants to hear my ideas.	73%
27. My child's school encourages me to participate in my child's education.	83%
28. My child's school informs me about all of the services available to my child.	62%
29. My child's school addresses my child's individual needs.	73%
30. My child's school makes sure I understand my child's IEP.	82%
31. My child's school explains what I can do if I want to make changes to my child's IEP.	67%
32. My child's school sends me information written in a way I understand.	81%
33. My child's school sends me information about activities and workshops for parents.	60%
34. My child's school encourages acceptance of students with disabilities.	78%

- These questions answered by parents of students grade 8 and above.

	% Yes
35. My child's school involves students with disabilities in clubs, sports, or other activities.	67%
36. My child's school provides students with disabilities updated books and materials.	67%
37. My child's school offers a variety of vocational courses, such as computers and business technology. *	61%
38. My child's school provides information to students about education and jobs after high school. *	43%
39. My child's school does all it can to keep students from dropping out of school.	74%
40. My child's school offers students with disabilities the classes they need to graduate with a standard diploma.	71%
41. I have attended one or more meetings about my child during this school year.	92%
42. I participate in school activities with my child.	72%
43. I am a member of the PTA/PTO.	48%
44. I belong to an organization for parents of students with disabilities.	14%
45. I have used parent support services in my area.	23%
46. I am comfortable talking about my child with school staff.	90%
47. I attend School Advisory Committee meetings concerning school improvement.	24%

- These questions answered by parents of students grade 8 and above.

**2002 Parent Survey Report
Students Identified as Gifted
Duval County**

Responding to the need to increase the involvement of parents and families of students identified as gifted in evaluating the educational services provided to their children, the Florida Department of Education, Bureau of Instructional Support and Community Services contracted with the University of Miami to develop and administer a parent survey in conjunction with the Bureau’s district monitoring activities.

In conjunction with the 2002 Duval County monitoring activities, the parent survey was sent to parents of the 3,678 students identified as gifted for whom complete addresses were provided by the district. A total of 1,353 parents (K-5, n=711; 6-8, n=523; 9-12, n=119) representing 37% of the sample, returned the survey. Surveys from 124 parents of students identified as gifted were returned as undeliverable, representing 3% of the sample.

Parents responded “yes” or “no” to each survey item, indicating that they either agreed or disagreed with the statement. The district response for each item was calculated as the percentage of respondents who agreed with the item.

	% Yes	% Yes
1. Overall, I am satisfied with the gifted services my child receives.	84%	
2. Overall, I am satisfied with my child's academic progress.	89%	
3. Overall, I am satisfied with the effect of gifted services on my child’s self-esteem.	89%	
4. Overall, I am satisfied with how quickly services were implemented following an initial request for evaluation.	83%	
5. Overall, I am satisfied with gifted teachers’ subject area knowledge.	91%	
6. Overall, I am satisfied with regular teachers’ subject area knowledge.	84%	
7. Overall, I am satisfied with gifted teachers’ expertise in teaching students identified as gifted.	87%	
8. Overall, I am satisfied with regular teachers’ expertise in teaching students identified as gifted.	71%	
	Regular Classes	Gifted Classes
9. My child is usually happy at school.	91%	93%
10. My child has his/her social and emotional needs met at school.	87%	90%
11. My child has friends at school.	97%	97%
12. My child is academically challenged at school.	63%	89%

	% Yes	% Yes
	Regular Teachers	Gifted Teachers
13. My child has creative outlets at school.	77%	91%
14. My child is learning skills that will be useful later on in life.	92%	95%
15. My child's teachers set appropriate goals for my child.	78%	90%
16. My child's teachers expect appropriate behavior.	95%	98%
17. My child's teachers call me or send me notes about my child.	63%	65%
18. My child's teachers are available to speak with me.	93%	94%
19. My child's teachers give homework that meets my child's needs.	74%	81%
20. My child's teachers provide coursework that includes representation of diverse ethnic, racial and cultural materials.	88%	91%
21. My child's teachers have access to the latest information and technology.	71%	81%
22. My child's teachers relate coursework to students' future educational and professional pursuits.	68%	81%
	Home School	2nd School
23. The school wants to hear my ideas.	75%	76%
24. The school implements my ideas.	62%	63%
25. The school treats me with respect.	93%	94%
26. The school encourages me to participate in my child's education.	88%	85%
27. The school addresses my child's individual needs.	71%	78%
28. The school provides students identified as gifted with appropriate books and materials.	72%	83%
29. The school informs me about all of the services available to my child.	63%	67%
30. The school sends me information written in a way I understand.	90%	89%
31. The school sends me information about activities and workshops for parents.	66%	63%
32. The school involves me in developing my child's Educational Plan (EP or IEP).	61%	65%
33. The school makes sure I understand my child's EP or IEP.	67%	67%
34. The school explains what I can do if I want to make changes to my child's EP or IEP.	54%	56%

	% Yes
35. Students identified as gifted have the option of taking a variety of vocational courses.	42%
36. Students identified as gifted are provided with information about options for education after high school.	77%
37. Students identified as gifted are provided with career counseling.	64%
38. Students identified as gifted are provided with the opportunity to participate in externships or mentorships.	47%
39. I have attended one or more meetings about my child during this school year.	80%
40. I participate in school activities with my child.	88%
41. I am a member of the PTA/PTO.	84%
42. I belong to an organization for parents of students identified as gifted.	6%
43. I have used parent support services in my area.	9%
44. I attend School Advisory Committee meetings concerning school improvement.	23%

Appendix B- Monitoring Team Members

**Duval County
Random Monitoring Visit
October 28-31, 2002**

ESE Monitoring Team Members

Department of Education Staff

Eileen Amy, Administrator, Program Administration and Quality Assurance
Iris Anderson, Program Specialist IV, Program Administration and Quality Assurance
Gail Best, Program Specialist IV, Program Administration and Quality Assurance
Lee Clark, Program Specialist IV, Program Administration and Quality Assurance
Kim Komisar, Program Specialist IV, Program Administration and Quality Assurance

Peer Monitors

Patti Burrows, Pinellas County Schools
Ronald Cooley, Broward County Schools
Kim Dots-Hoehnle, Alachua County Schools
Jim Fowler, Broward County Schools
Cathy Hedbawny, Jackson County Schools
Willis Henderson, Escambia County Schools
Nancy Pope, Wakulla County Schools
Mary Ann Ratliff, Hillsborough County Schools
Jeanne Salgado, Hillsborough County Schools
Martha Scott, Gadsden County Schools
Cara Sipel, Indian River County Schools
Jo Wilson, Gilchrist County Schools

Contracted Staff

Hope Nieman, Consultant
Denise Stewart, Consultant

Appendix C- Glossary of Acronyms

Glossary of Acronyms

BIP	Behavior Intervention Plan
Bureau	Bureau of Instructional Support & Community Services
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CHRIS	Children’s Registry and Information System
CRISS	Creating Independence through Student-Owned Strategies
CST	Child Study Team
DCT	Distributed cooperative training
DJJ	Department of Juvenile Justice
DOE	Department of Education
DRA	Direct Reading Assessment
EH	Emotionally Handicapped
EMH	Educable Mentally Handicapped
EP	Educational Plan
ESE	Exceptional Student Education
ESY	Extended School Year
FAPE	Free Appropriate Public Education
FBA	Functional Behavioral Assessment
FCAT	Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test
FDLRS	Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System
IDEA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
IEP	Individual Educational Plan
IPS	Instructional Program Support
KBIT	Kaufman Brief Intelligence Test
LEA	Local Education Agency
MOVE	Mobility Orientation via Education
OJT	On-the-job Training
PACE	Practical Academic and Cultural Education
PASS-D	Performance Assessment System for Students with Disabilities
PMH	Profoundly Mentally Handicapped
Pre-K (PK)	Pre-kindergarten
SED	Severely Emotionally Disturbed
SIMS	Student Information Management System
SLD	Specific Learning Disability
SRA	Science Research Associates
SSS	Sunshine State Standards
TMH	Trainable Mentally Handicapped
VE	Varying Exceptionalities

Appendix D- Forms Review

**Duval County
Random Monitoring Report
Forms Review**

This forms review was completed as a component of the random monitoring visit conducted on October 28-31, 2002. The following district forms were compared to the requirements of applicable State Board of Education rules, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), applicable sections of Part 300, Code of Federal Regulations, and the Monitoring Work Papers/Source Book for 2002. The review includes recommended revisions based on programmatic or procedural issues and concerns. The results of the review are detailed below and list the applicable sources used for the review.

Parent Notification of Individual Educational Plan (IEP) Meeting

Form Meeting Notice

Source Book/Work Paper - IEP

Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulation Section 300.345

The following must be addressed:

- The form does not inform the parents that the IEP meeting is to be scheduled at a mutually agreeable time.
- The form does not provide the parents with the opportunity of requesting that the meeting be rescheduled.
- There is no statement on the form to indicate that a copy of the procedural safeguards is being provided upon notification of the IEP meeting.
- This form will need revision.

The following comment is made regarding this form.

If the purpose of the IEP meeting is to consider transition services, the notice must also indicate this purpose, and identify any other agency that will be invited to send a representative. This information is not included on the sample meeting notice. At this time, the Bureau is assuming that this information will printout on the computer-generated form. If not, the revision of this form must include adding this information.

Individual Educational Plan (IEP) Meeting

Form Transitional Individual Educational Plan

Source Book/Work Paper - IEP

Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulation Section 300.347

The following must be addressed:

- There is not a place on the form to indicate the projected beginning date of the services and modifications described.
- This form must be revised.

Notice and Consent for Initial Placement

Form Parent ESE 032 Revised 6/94 *Consent for Placement*

ESE 021 Revised 2/96 *Notification of Eligibility/Non-Eligibility Staffing Form*

Source Book/Work Paper - Program Areas

Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulation Sections 300.503 and 300.505

The following must be addressed:

- The form provided, entitled, “Consent for Placement,” is a signature page, and does not contain the components for notice.
- The form provided to document the notice requirements for notice and consent for initial placement instead documents notice requirements for eligibility. While there is a reference to placement, it does not reflect that placement was determined by an IEP committee. (See comments on the “Notification of Eligibility/Non-Eligibility Staffing Form.”)

Informed Notice and Consent for Evaluation

Form ESE 010 Revised 7/1/2000 *Consent for Individual Evaluation*

Source Book/Work Paper - Evaluation

Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulation Sections 300.503 and 300.505

The following must be addressed:

- The form does not contain the required notice component of “a description of any options the district considered and the reasons why those options were rejected.”
- The form does not contain a description of “any other factors relevant to the district’s proposal.”
- The form does not contain “information on sources [more than one] that the parent may contact to obtain assistance in understanding the provisions of IDEA.” There is a statement that says, “Please call,” however, there is no name or no number supplied.
- This form must be revised.

Informed Notice and Consent for Reevaluation

Form ESE 012 Revised 02/01/2001 *Notice of Reevaluation/Placement Review*

Source Book/Work Paper - Reevaluation

Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulation Sections 300.503 and 300.505

The following must be addressed:

- In regard to the required notice components, this form does not provide “a description of other factors relevant to the district’s proposal.”
- This form does not contain a statement that the parents of a child with a disability have “protections under the procedural safeguards of the IDEA.”

- The form gives only one source for the parents to contact if they need “assistance in understanding the provisions of IDEA.”
- The form does not provide a place for the parents to sign consent for the recommended evaluations.
- If this form is to serve as notice and consent for reevaluation, it must be revised.

The following comment is made regarding this form.

In regard to the reevaluation review to determine the need for conducting evaluations, there is no indication on this form that the parents have an opportunity to provide information. The district is also reminded that if the review is conducted in a formal meeting, the parents must be invited.

Notification of Change in Placement

Form ESE 021 Revised 2/96 *Notification of Eligibility/Non-Eligibility Staffing Form*
Source Book/Work Paper - IEP
Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulation Section 300.503

The following must be addressed.

- The form provided for notification of change of placement is the same form used by the district to notify the parents of eligibility. The form does not inform the parent that the action proposed is a change of placement.
- The form does not provide an explanation of why the district is proposing a change in placement.
- The form does not provide parents with “a description of other factors relevant to the district’s proposal.”
- The form gives only one source for the parents to contact if they need “assistance in understanding the provisions of IDEA.”
- If this form is to serve as a notification of change of placement it must be revised.

Notification of Change of FAPE

Form ESE 021 Revised 2/96 *Notification of Eligibility/Non-Eligibility Staffing Form*
Source Book/Work Paper - IEP
Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulation Section 300.503

The following must be addressed:

- The form provided for notification of change of FAPE is the same form used by the district to notify the parents of eligibility. The form does not inform the parent that the action proposed is a change of FAPE.

- While this form does contain some notice requirements, and does address placement, it is not appropriate for addressing other changes in services such as individual counseling, provision of assistance by an aide, or provisions of health services.
- The form gives only one source for the parents to contact if they need “assistance in understanding the provisions of IDEA.”
- At this time, this form is not appropriate for notification of change of FAPE.

Informed Notice of Refusal

Form ESE 021 Revised 2/96 *Notification of Eligibility/Non-Eligibility Staffing Form*
Source Book/Work Paper - IEP
Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulation Section 300.503

The following must be addressed:

- The form provided for notification of change of FAPE is the same form used by the district to notify the parents of eligibility. The form does not inform the parents that the action they have proposed is being refused by the district.
- This form is not appropriate for informed notice of refusal.

Notice: Not Eligible for Exceptional Student Placement

Form ESE021 Revised 2/96 *Notification of Eligibility/Non-Eligibility Staffing Form*
Source Book/Work Paper - Ineligible
Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulation Section 300.503

The following must be addressed:

- The form does not provide parents with “a description of other factors relevant to the district’s proposal.”
- The form gives only one source for the parents to contact if they need “assistance in understanding the provisions of IDEA.”
- This form must be revised.

The following comment is made regarding this form.

The form must also contain “an explanation of why the district proposed or refused to take the action.” There is a section entitled “Comments,” where that information could be recorded. If not, the form must be revised to include that required component.

Notice: Informed Notice of Dismissal

Form ESE021 Revised 2/96 *Notification of Eligibility/Non-Eligibility Staffing Form*
Source Book/Work Paper - Dismissal
Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulation Section 300.503

The following must be addressed.

- The form provided for notification of notice of dismissal is the same form used by the district to notify the parents of eligibility. The form does not inform the parents that the purpose of meeting was to consider dismissal.
- The form implies that a staffing was held. The recommendations are given as recommendations from a “child study team.” Since the reevaluation process must be used for students with disabilities prior to dismissal, and this process is the obligation of the IEP team, a decision regarding dismissal must be the result of an IEP meeting.
- While the form does list evaluations, there is no mention on the form that a reevaluation was conducted.
- The form does not provide parents with “a description of other factors relevant to the district’s proposal.”
- The form gives only one source for the parents to contact if they need “assistance in understanding the provisions of IDEA.”
- If this form is to be used for notification of dismissal it must be revised.

Documentation of Staffing/Eligibility Determination

Form ESE021 Revised 2/96 *Notification of Eligibility/Non-Eligibility Staffing Form*
Source Book/Work Paper - Staffing, IEP
Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulation Sections 300.534, 300.503

The following must be addressed:

- One required component of this form is that there is a “recommendation for eligibility.” This form does have a section indicating a recommendation for placement, but does not specifically indicate the program eligibility of the student, unless that is the intent of the section entitled “Recommended Programs.”
- The recommendations on this form reference the “Child Study Team,” which implies that one of the responsibilities of the child study team is to serve as the staffing committee. If serving as the staffing committee is not listed as one of the functions of the child study team, that section must be revised.
- This form addresses placement determination. With the exception of ineligibility, it is the IEP team that makes the placement decision after an IEP meeting has been held to develop the student’s IEP. This form makes no reference to an IEP meeting being held. The placement decisions on this form are referred to as being determined by “the Committee.” There is no indication of what committee (staffing, child study team, or IEP team) is making the recommendations. This form must be revised to indicate that placement decisions are made by the IEP team.
- The wording “reviewed and approved” by the ESE Director or designee must be revised to eliminate the phrase “*and approved.*” This change conforms to the requirement identified in the most recent Special Programs and Procedures document.

The forms provided for procedural safeguards and confidentiality of student records were also reviewed, and these documents contain the components for compliance.