

FINAL REPORT OF RANDOM MONITORING OF  
EXCEPTIONAL STUDENT EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN

# **GLADES COUNTY**

MAY 13 - 16, 2002



FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
BUREAU OF INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

# 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



June 17, 2003

Mr. Wayne Aldrich, Superintendent  
Glades County School District  
P.O. Box 459  
Moore Haven, Florida 33471-0459

Dear Superintendent Aldrich:

We are pleased to provide you with the Final Report of Random Monitoring of Exceptional Student Education Programs in Glades County. The report from our visit on May 13-16, 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 December 30, 2003 and 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, ESE Program Administration and Quality Assurance Administrator. Mrs. Amy may be reached at 850/245-0476, or via electronic mail at [Eileen.Amy@fldoe.org](mailto:Eileen.Amy@fldoe.org).

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

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Shan Goff in cursive.

Shan Goff, Chief  
Bureau of Instructional Support and Community Services

Enclosure

cc: Mike Pressley, School Board Chairman  
Members of the School Board  
Gavin O'Brien, School Board Attorney  
School Principals  
Kathleen Mathis, ESE Director  
Jim Warford, Chancellor

**SHAN GOFF**

*Chief*

*Bureau of Instructional Support and Community Services*

Glades County Final Monitoring Report  
Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	1
Monitoring Process .....	5
Authority .....	5
Method .....	5
Random Monitoring.....	5
District Selection.....	5
Off-Site Monitoring Activities.....	6
Parent Surveys .....	6
Reviews of Student Records and District Forms .....	6
On-Site Monitoring Activities .....	6
Reporting Process .....	7
Exit Conference .....	7
Preliminary Report.....	7
Final Report .....	7
Background.....	8
Demographic Information.....	8
Reporting of Information .....	9
Sources of Information .....	9
Parent Surveys, Individual Interviews, Case Studies, and Classroom Visits .....	9
General Supervision.....	9
Assessment.....	10
Behavior Management.....	11
Curriculum and Instruction.....	12
Least Restrictive Environment.....	13
Post-School Transition.....	14
Pre-K, Transition from Part C to Part B Programs .....	14
Parent Involvement .....	15
Gifted .....	15
Student Record and District Forms Reviews.....	16
Student Record Reviews: Students with Disabilities.....	16
Student Record Reviews: Gifted.....	18
District Forms Review .....	18
Special Category Record Reviews.....	18
Summary .....	20
System Improvement Plan .....	21
Appendix A: Survey Results.....	27
Appendix B: ESE Monitoring Team Members .....	31
Appendix C: Glossary of Acronyms.....	33
Appendix D: Forms Review .....	35

**Glades County School District  
Random Monitoring Visit  
May 13-16, 2002**

**Executive Summary**

During the week of May 13-16, 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 Glades 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**

Although there was evidence of training for individual teachers, a systematic assessment at the district or school level would enhance the teacher training program. Staff development needs regarding service delivery, teaching strategies, Individual Education Plan (IEP) development or implementation for students with disabilities, would be desirable components of the plan. There was no system in place to track or analyze student progress in order to make program or curricular decisions. The district administrator attends all IEP meetings, and is responsible for compliance with state and federal requirements. Limited extended school year (ESY) services are available to students with disabilities. Procedures for ensuring that parents are communicated with in their native language were not documented. Functional Behavior Assessments (FBAs) and Behavior Intervention Plans (BIPs) were not completed for students who need them.

**Assessment**

It appears that the majority of students with disabilities routinely participate in the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), with a few exceptions taking other assessments. There was wide discrepancy regarding promotion/ retention policies regarding students with disabilities. There is not a clear, consistent, and enforceable district policy regarding promotion and retention. In both schools there was no evidence that accommodations were individualized to meet the unique needs of the students, nor were the accommodations being implemented based on the student's IEP.

### **Behavior Management**

There were generally good behavioral management strategies observed. There is a concern that FBAs and BIPs are not being developed or implemented for students who need them. The possible lack of comprehensive, school-wide discipline plans being implemented at both schools may lead to inconsistent use of suspension options. This is of special concern at the high school where the modified-day, after school instruction program could easily lead to free appropriate public education (FAPE) issues for students with disabilities. Another concern was the lack of a well-defined manifestation determination process at both schools.

### **Curriculum and Instruction**

While most classes for students with disabilities are reported to follow the Sunshine State Standards, they do not appear to follow a scope and sequence that is correlated to the general education curriculum and would facilitate mainstreaming opportunities when appropriate. In other instances, the curriculum did not appear to follow a structured scope and sequence that would allow the student to progress through the Sunshine State Standards at all. Curricular accommodations provided for students in the regular education classroom, for the most part, were generic in nature and did not reflect the individual needs of students with disabilities. This reflects both a curricular and IEP development concern.

### **Least Restrictive Environment**

The district appeared to provide an appropriate range of placement options for students with disabilities. Of concern was, for some the students with disabilities in self-contained settings, the lack of opportunity to have contact with nondisabled peers, even for lunch and electives. Another concern was the modified-day, after school instruction program at the high school. The district had no clearly defined entrance and exit criteria for this program.

### **Post-School Transition**

The lack of agency support, interagency agreements and vocational opportunities for students with disabilities at the middle school and high school is of concern.

### **Pre-K, Transition from Part C to Part B Programs**

Due to the district's small size, it appears that the district is dependent upon the services of other districts for students under the age of three, although there is no formal agreement to provide those services. There is no formal system to identify children under the age of three within the district, which may result in a lapse of services provided to children turning three years old. For children over the age of three, services are provided through contracted services within and outside the county. There is no formal interagency agreement to coordinate those services.

### **Parent Involvement**

The majority of interviews with district and school level administrative staff suggest that parental involvement of students with disabilities is limited. With regard to participation in the planning, development, and implementation of IEPs for students with disabilities, ESE teachers reported good parent participation. It appears that the ESE teachers make good efforts to try to involve parents in the IEP process, however, it appears that there is little effort made to involve parents in the CST process.

### **Gifted**

There is a significant lack of support for the gifted program. There is a severe need for staff, curricula, and staff development for the gifted program.

### **Record and Forms Reviews**

#### **Student Record Reviews**

Systemic findings were identified in adequate present level of educational performance statements, the development of measurable and appropriate annual goals, and short-term objectives and benchmarks. Other district level systemic findings were noted in the reporting of the frequency of accommodations and/or modifications and consideration of results of state and/or district assessments. In addition, there were some systemic findings at the high school level. These included the lack of diploma option decision, failure to identify the purpose of the meeting as transition, and failure to invite the student as a participant in the IEP meeting. Transition components were not in evidence at the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) facility. Individual findings for student records were noted in 14 areas. Non-compliance items were found during IEP reviews of two students that will result in adjustments in the district's federal funding. Neither student had a current IEP at the beginning of the school year. There was also a lack of appropriate prior written notice for change of placement for one of the students. Each finding affects federal funding. Identification of these students was provided under separate cover.

#### **Special Category IEP Reviews**

There were findings in the special category reviews in the areas of appropriate dismissal procedures, transition from Part C to Part B programs, temporary assignments, and initial eligibility.

#### **Positive Observations**

- The Pre-K ESE is 100% mainstreamed all day long
- The Speech and Language Pathologist is a certified STAGES evaluator and has extensive training in autism.
- Performance Based Credit lab is available to the ESE students at the high school who want to work for a regular diploma and catch up with their age appropriate group. It is also available during the summer.
- GAP, an after school program for grade remediation is available for the ESE students in Regular Education and ESE classes.
- Student tutors are available upon request for ESE students as well as regular education students.
- There are full time aides in all ESE classes.
- Behavior management plans seem to be effective in the classrooms observed.

## **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 this 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: examine and evaluate procedures, records, and programs of exceptional student education; provide information and assistance to school districts; and otherwise assist school districts in operating effectively and efficiently (Section 229.565, Florida Statutes). In accordance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (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 (Section 300.600(a)(1) and (2) of Title 34, Code of Federal Regulations).

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 2000-2001 school year. Three types of monitoring processes were established as part of the system of monitoring and oversight. Those monitoring processes are identified as follows:

- 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 the triggers for 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.” Glades 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 188 parents of students with disabilities and 19 parents of gifted students, with 42 (22%) of the parents of students with disabilities and 11 (58%) of the parents of gifted students responding. Forty-one (22%) of the surveys for parents of students with disabilities 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 May 13, 2002. The on-site activities were conducted by a team of four DOE staff. 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: Moore Haven Elementary School, Moore Haven High School, and Florida Environmental Institute, the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) facility in Glades County.

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) and emotionally handicapped/severely emotionally disturbed (EH/SED) programs and an overrepresentation of students in the specific learning disabled (SLD) program. Schools were asked to provide a list of students who were identified as SED, EH, EMH and/or SLD. Case study students were selected from those lists.

## **Reporting Process**

### ***Exit Conference***

The week 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 previously discussed previously in this document, including the following:

- 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.

Within 30 days of the district's receipt of the preliminary report, the district must submit a system improvement plan, including strategies and activities targeting specific findings, to the Bureau for review. A final report including the system improvement strategies will be released and posted on the Bureau's website.

# Background

## Demographic Information

The data contained in this section of the report is a summary of the 2000-2001 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 and from individual districts upon request.

Glades County School District has a total school population (PK-12) of 1,099 with 192 (17%) students being identified as students with disabilities and 18 (2%) as gifted. Glades County is considered a “small” district and is one of 25 districts in this enrollment group. Of the total Glades school population, 46% are White; 25% are Black; and 28% are Hispanic. Of the students with disabilities, 44% are White; 33% are Black; and 21% are Hispanic. Sixty-two percent of the district’s population is eligible for free/reduced lunch.

Glades County School District is comprised of one elementary school, one secondary school, two childcare programs, and one DJJ facility.

A review of the data related to the Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) for 2000-2001 indicates that the rate of participation for students with disabilities in the high school is above the state average. The rates have increased each year. The rates of participation are 91% in math and 82% in reading at the high school level while the rates for the state are 59% in both reading and math. At the elementary level, participation rates for students in Glades County are 83% in math and 92% in reading while the state average is 85% in both math and reading. The percentage of students with disabilities who scored at a level three or above on the FCAT is generally low, although 27% of fifth grade students with disabilities scored at level three or above in math. The rate for eighth grade math decreased from 9% to 8%, while the rate for tenth grade math increased from 0% to 10%. In reading, the percentage of students with disabilities who scored at a level three or above decreased from 11% to 8% in fourth grade, increased from 0% to 7% in eighth grade, and remained unchanged at 0% for tenth grade.

Glades County School District reports a standard diploma graduation rate of 17% for students with disabilities, compared to the enrollment group average of 42% and the state average of 51%. It also reports a higher retention rate for students with disabilities (10%) than the enrollment group (6%) and the state (7%). The dropout rate during the 2000-01 school year for students with disabilities in Glades County was 6%, close to the state average of 5%.

A review of the data on student membership by racial/ethnic category reveals that the district’s African-American population is 25% and the Hispanic population is 28%. Data indicated that Glades has a disproportionate representation of African-American students in EH/SED (44%) and EMH (47%) programs compared to the total school population. In addition, there is an under-representation of African-American (6%) students and Hispanic (0%) students in the gifted population.

# 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 42 parents of students with disabilities
- surveys returned by 11 parents of students identified as gifted
- sixteen individual district and school staff interviews
- four case studies, including six classroom visits
- twelve Individual Educational Plan (IEP) reviews
- review of fifteen special category IEPs

The data generated through the surveys, individual interviews, case studies, and classroom visits are summarized beginning on page 9, while the results from the review of student records and district forms are presented beginning on page 16 of the report. This 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 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 administrator did not report any significant on-going program initiatives during the 2001-2002 school year. The district does hope to develop secondary transition initiatives with Hendry County in the future. The district administrator reported that the district does not track

student progress at the district level. The district tried to participate in a program put together by Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System (FDLRS), but, according to the district administrator, the district is so small it really didn't work. Due to the small number of students, analysis of FCAT scores has proven to be ineffective. The primary monitoring of educational performance occurs at an individual level through annual IEP updates, however the high school principal indicated that she analyzes the school's assessment data to make decisions about overall instruction and curriculum.

Individual teachers have been provided training through FDLRS in the areas of reading, language arts, math, and learning strategies. Two teachers reported receiving training in FCAT preparation. Paraprofessionals at the elementary school have received extensive training in techniques for working with children who have autism.

The Florida Environmental Institute, also called The Last Chance Ranch, is a DJJ facility. It was reported that teachers there have received training in anger management, behavior therapy, and behavior level systems.

The district administrator reported that, while there is no formal plan to oversee quality assurance and monitoring of federal and state requirements, she attends all IEP meetings and serves as the local education agency (LEA) representative. In general, the district does not offer extended school year (ESY) services. The only ESY service reported was for speech and language. It was reported that the district communicates with parents in their native language, but there was no documentation to support this statement.

The district administrator reported that there is an ESE Advisory Council with three active parents. It was reported that the district has tried to generate more interest but has been unsuccessful. There is a high degree of interagency collaboration at the Last Chance Ranch, resulting in students with disabilities receiving significant related services.

Staff has been trained to conduct Functional Behavioral Assessments (FBA) and develop Behavior Intervention Plans (BIPs) but they do not use them. Staff, who were trained, are either no longer employed by the school district or stated that they were too busy to do them.

In summary, although there was evidence of training for individual teachers, a systematic assessment at the district or school level would enhance teacher training. Staff development needs regarding service delivery, teaching strategies, IEP development or implementation for students with disabilities would be important components of such a plan. There was no system in place to track or analyze student progress to make program or curricular decisions. The district administrator attends all IEP meetings, and is responsible for compliance with state and federal requirements. Limited ESY services are available to students with disabilities. Procedures for ensuring that parents are communicated with in their native language were not documented. FBAs and BIPs were not completed for students who need them.

### **Assessment**

The district administrator reported that all elementary students with disabilities take the FCAT and that test and classroom accommodations are determined at the student's IEP meeting.

Testing of all students was confirmed at the elementary school. One of the two teachers interviewed readily identified accommodations used for the FCAT and FCAT preparation materials and strategies. The other was unaware of specific accommodations that were to be provided for students with disabilities and gave general and vague FCAT preparation strategies.

At the high school, all students with disabilities were reported to take the FCAT with ESE teachers. Both ESE teachers interviewed considered the reading ability, intellectual ability of the students, and parent's concerns as to whether or not students take the FCAT. Both teachers stated they used the Department of Education FCAT preparation materials to assist students in preparing for the FCAT. After school FCAT preparation was available to all students during "FCAT season" with transportation to the student's home provided if needed. While interviewees at both schools stated that all of their students take the FCAT, they identified the Brigance as the alternate assessment used for students who do not take the FCAT.

There was some confusion regarding the retention and promotion policies regarding students with disabilities. The district administrator reported that some retention and promotion decisions for students with disabilities are based on the degree of effort exerted by the student. If the student is over age, did not pass the FCAT, but worked hard and made progress on his annual goals, he was promoted. On occasion, the school or IEP team may determine that the annual goals were too difficult and promote the student without the student having demonstrated good progress. The district administrator stated that the district does not generally retain students with disabilities. This conflicts somewhat with the statement made by the child study team (CST) coordinator and the principals of both schools in that they stated they follow the pupil progression plan for all students. However, it was reported at the elementary school that the principal makes the final decision regarding promotion/retention.

In summary, it appears that the majority of students with disabilities routinely participate in the FCAT, with a few exceptions taking other assessments. There was wide discrepancy regarding promotion/retention policies regarding students with disabilities. There is not a clear, consistent, and enforceable district policy regarding promotion and retention. In both schools there was no evidence that accommodations were individualized to meet the unique needs of the students, nor were the accommodations being implemented based on the student's IEP.

### **Behavior Management**

The district administrator reported that the district is not conducting FBAs and developing BIPs and acknowledged that this is a problem. In two of the case studies it was observed that students were in need of FBAs and BIPs and did not have them. Another student was absent for more than 30 consecutive days and did not have a FBA or BIP.

Classrooms observed at the elementary school appeared to have good behavior management systems. The monitoring team's observations, through the case studies, indicated the behavior management plans to be effective, with students engaged and on task.

Overall, the behavior management system at the Last Chance Ranch was good, including a reward system tied to vocational opportunities and release time. The classroom observed through

the case study was found to have an effective behavior management plan with the students engaged and on task.

At the high school there was no evidence of FBAs or BIPs. The district would benefit from and achieve greater consistency for students with the use of a formal manifestation determination process. Evidence of a comprehensive discipline plan was not observed. It should be noted, however, that in the classrooms observed through the case studies, the classroom behavior management seem to be effective with students engaged and on task. The school used a modified-day, after school instruction program for chronic behavior problems. Teachers interviewed suggested that the needs of students with disabilities with severe behavioral issues are not being met through this option.

In summary, there were generally good behavioral management strategies observed. There is a concern that FBAs and BIPs are not being developed or implemented for students who need them. The possible lack of a comprehensive, school-wide discipline plan being implemented at both schools may lead to inconsistent use of suspension options. This is of special concern at the high school where the modified-day, after school instruction program could easily lead to free appropriate public education (FAPE) issues for students with disabilities. Another concern was the lack of a well-defined manifestation determination process at both schools.

### **Curriculum and Instruction**

The district administrator was not familiar with the type of curriculum used in the classrooms for students with disabilities. Child study teams were reported to provide regular education teachers with interventions and strategies for at risk students and students with disabilities.

At the elementary school, it was reported that the primary grades use a structured reading program for regular education students. This reading program will be implemented into the primary ESE classes next year. Intermediate ESE classes use whatever the ESE teacher feels is appropriate. There is no scope and sequence, nor is it correlated to the basic education curriculum, although the teachers state they follow the Sunshine State Standards. The ESE resource teacher uses the regular education curriculum. Regular education teachers use generic instructional accommodations for students with disabilities that do not seem to reflect students' IEPs. In two of the four classrooms observed, lessons, objectives, and procedures were not clearly defined; several students in the class were not engaged; and several students did not appear to be sure of the assignment. However, there appeared to be adequate instructional materials, and individual instructional prompts and assistance were observed. In the other two classes, teaching activities were generally planned and implemented in ways that promoted student learning and ensured access to the appropriate curriculum.

It was reported that the Last Chance Ranch gets no guidance from the district regarding curriculum; consequently, they use a variety of fragmented resources. The Ranch places a strong emphasis on the general educational development (GED) completion track, which limits options for students with disabilities who are pursuing a standard diploma.

The high school principal reported that she leaves it up to the teachers to make curricular decisions. All ESE teachers have the Sunshine State Standards on CD and are directed to follow

them. The principal and teachers reported that students with disabilities in ESE classrooms do not follow the regular education curriculum. Teachers are given the opportunity to review curricular material and make their own selection. There does not appear to be a consistent scope and sequence for students with disabilities, nor does the curriculum lend itself to a smooth transition to the regular education curriculum, thus inhibiting mainstreaming opportunities for students with disabilities. Regular education teachers use generic instructional accommodations for students with disabilities that do not seem to reflect students' IEPs. In the four case studies and classes observed, teaching activities were generally planned and implemented in ways that promoted student learning and ensured access to the appropriate curriculum.

In summary, while most classes for students with disabilities are reported to follow the Sunshine State Standards, they do not appear to follow a scope and sequence that is correlated to the general education curriculum and would facilitate mainstreaming opportunities when appropriate. In other instances, the curriculum did not appear to follow a structured scope and sequence that would allow the student to progress through the Sunshine State Standards at all. Curricular accommodations provided for students in the regular education classroom, for the most part, were generic in nature and did not reflect the individual needs of students with disabilities. This reflects both a curricular and IEP development concern.

### **Least Restrictive Environment**

The district has a full array of placements (varying exceptionalities (VE), full-time, resource, consultation, and modified-day, after school instruction). Placement appears to be strongly based on the strengths and preferences of the regular education teachers. Some of the ESE teachers interviewed at both the elementary and high school indicated that some of their students with disabilities have no interaction with nondisabled peers except at assemblies.

At the high school there are three aides available to go into the regular education classrooms to provide assistance to individual students with disabilities. The principal stated that students with disabilities participate in all non-academic and extracurricular activities. Each regular education teacher receives a list of students with disabilities assigned to their classes. When the principal hears that students are not receiving appropriate accommodations in the regular education classroom, she calls the teacher in and counsels them regarding their responsibility. The review of one student record revealed that the student had been placed on a modified-day, after school instruction program. There were no clearly defined entrance and exit criteria for this program.

At the elementary school, the principal stated that the school follows the guidelines outlined in the IEP. Interviews with other school staff indicated that students with disabilities participate with nondisabled peers at lunch and during non-academic classes. The self-contained teacher reported that her students have no contact with nondisabled peers except at assemblies.

The Last Chance Ranch uses a full inclusion model. All students with disabilities have access to the general education curriculum.

In summary, the district appeared to provide an appropriate range of placement options for students with disabilities. Of concern was, for some the students with disabilities in self-contained settings, the lack of opportunity to have contact with non-disabled peers, even for



lunch and electives. Another concern was the modified-day, after school instruction program at the high school. The district had no clearly defined entrance and exit criteria for this program.

### **Post-School Transition**

The district has no interagency agreements in place. It was reported that Vocational Rehabilitation is an active participant; however, Vocational Rehabilitation does not come to transition meetings until the second semester of the student's senior year. Glades County is grouped with Collier and Lee County, which makes receiving services difficult. Other agencies do not attend. The ESE director expressed a desire to be grouped with Hendry County, a county with which they have more collaborative ties. Transfer of rights is communicated when a student enters the 9<sup>th</sup> grade or turns 18, whichever comes first and is done at the IEP meeting.

One ESE teacher at the high school handles all the transition activities. The high school has virtually no school-to-work transition programs or activities and begins the transition process in the seventh or eighth grade. They report no community support and no agency contacts, but do report that the Vocational Rehabilitation counselor has been helpful with students with severe disabilities.

The Last Chance Ranch has an extensive transition plan that is part of the Juvenile Justice process.

In summary, the lack of agency support, interagency agreements and vocational opportunities for students with disabilities at the middle school and high school is of concern.

### **Pre-K Transition from Part C to Part B Programs**

The district administrator reported that students under the age of three receive services from the Early Intervention Program (EIP) located in Lee County. When they turn three, they are placed in the Glades County school system. The district administrator does not attend the transition meetings. The district administrator stated the district is so small she generally knows who is out there. However, a review of the special category records indicated that there was a three-month delay in providing services to one of the two children whose records were reviewed.

The service delivery model for pre-kindergarten students includes four classrooms for pre-kindergarten students with disabilities through contracts with the Redlands Christian Migrant Association, Washington Park and Child Care of Southwest Florida.

For children, birth to three years of age, the EIP, located in Lee County (serving students from Lee, Hendry, and Glades), provides services in and out of the district through Easter Seals and other therapy agencies. The children served through the EIP are entered into the CHRIS system with FDLRS and the district is made aware of the child through Child Find with FDLRS.

When the child becomes three, the school district provides services through a contract with Redlands Christian Migrant Association (RCMA). RCMA provides a program that is 100% mainstreamed all day long with non-disabled Pre-K students. The IEPs are implemented within the regular Pre-K program. The only time the student might be removed from the Pre-K setting would be for speech/language therapy, although many times it is also provided within the Pre-K classroom.

In summary, due to the district's small size, the district's Early Intervention Program is located in Lee County and serves other districts as well as Glades County children. For children over the age of three, services are provided through contracted services within and outside the county. There is no formal interagency agreement to coordinate those services.

### **Parent Involvement**

The district administrator reported that there is a district advisory council that meets at least quarterly. Principals and CST coordinators at both schools reported that involvement of parents of students with disabilities is limited. However, ESE teachers reported that parent attendance at IEP meetings is high.

The principal at the elementary school reported that the school has a parent/teacher organization (PTO) but not many parents are involved. The CST coordinator reported that parents are not always invited to CST meetings and when they are, only about 10% of parents attend. They are notified after the CST meeting about what has happened. ESE teachers reported that parents are provided written notices, telephone calls, and on occasion, personal contacts with regard to IEP meetings. Transportation is provided to parents who need it.

At the high school, the principal reported that there is no PTO and that parents of students with disabilities participate as much as parents of nondisabled students. The guidance counselor reported that parental involvement is poor. The CST coordinator reported that attendance at CST meetings is poor. The ESE teachers reported that they call the parents the day before IEP meetings and arrange transportation with the school resource officer (SRO) if needed. The ESE teachers report that attendance at IEP meetings is high.

In summary, the majority of interviews with district and school level administrative staff suggest that parental involvement of students with disabilities is limited. With regard to participation in the planning, development, and implementation of IEPs for students with disabilities, ESE teachers reported good parent participation. It appears that the ESE teachers make good efforts to try to involve parents in the IEP process, however, it appears that there is little effort made to involve parents in the CST process.

### **Gifted**

The district administrator reported that the district does not currently provide staff, curricula, or services to students identified as gifted. They have had a variety of service delivery models in the past, including a collaborative program with a neighboring district, and having a teacher in the district provide services one day a week at the elementary and high school. For a period of time, the elementary students in grades 4-6 were transported to Hendry County for one day per week. The district has not been proactive in screening or identifying students as gifted due to the difficulty in securing teachers willing to teach students identified as gifted. The administrator reported that the district does not dismiss the students from the program, but they simply do not provide the services. The district administrator expressed a desire to seek assistance from the Bureau to develop strategies to provide those services.

Parent surveys of students identified as gifted indicated that 38% of the respondents feel that their gifted students are challenged at school. Only 52 % indicated that parents feel that the child has creative outlets at school and 45% of parents who responded indicated that the teachers relate coursework to students' future educational and professional pursuits.

In summary, there is a significant lack of support for the gifted program. There is a severe need for staff, curricula, and staff development for the gifted program.

## **Student Record and District Forms Reviews**

### **Student Record Reviews: Students with Disabilities**

A total of twelve student records of students with disabilities, including case study students, were reviewed by Bureau staff. Records included six from the elementary school, four from the high school, and two from the DJJ. According to random monitoring guidelines, at least one student record identified as a cost factor 254 or 255 from each school was selected for review. A matrix review for each of those students was also conducted. The records were reviewed in the schools during the on-site visits.

Of the twelve IEPs reviewed, all were current at the time of the review. However, two of the records were not current at the beginning of the school year. Compliance with the requirements of federal and state laws in the area of reevaluation was noted on all IEPs reviewed.

Non-compliance items were found during IEP reviews of two students that will result in adjustments in the district's federal funding. Neither student had a current IEP at the beginning of the school year. There was also a lack of appropriate prior written notice for change of placement for one of the students. Each finding affects federal funding. Identification of these students was provided under separate cover.

There were several areas of non-compliance that appeared to be systemic in nature at the school or the district level. For eleven of the twelve records reviewed, at least one goal on the IEP was not measurable. Nine of the twelve records lacked a majority of measurable annual goals and the IEP teams will need to be reconvened to address these shortcomings. These students have been identified under separate cover.

In five of the IEPs, short-term objectives were either vague, not measurable or did not relate to the goal. Some goals did not have the minimum of two related objectives. The present level statement must accurately describe the effects of the student's disability on his or her progress and participation in the general curriculum. It should also be descriptive of what the student can do. Seven of the records contained inadequate present level of performance statements.

In the area of frequency of accommodations and/or modifications, there were nine of the records that listed "as needed" for frequency. The frequency of services must be described with sufficient detail so that all parties are clear regarding the amount of service to be received. "As needed" is only sufficient if there is additional description in the IEP or on conference notes.

None of the records reviewed indicated that the results of the most recent state or district assessment had been considered. It appears that this may be an issue with the IEP form since there is no place on the form to document this information.

Three of the four records reviewed at the high school indicated “N/A” for diploma option. All three of the students were above fourteen years of age. Three of the four records reviewed at the high school also failed to indicate that the purpose of the meeting would be to address transition. Two of the four records at the high school and one of the two at the Department of Juvenile Justice center failed to indicate that the student would be invited to the meeting.

The appropriate transition components were not evident in the IEPs from the DJJ center. It was, however, noted that the DJJ agency has transition plans for their students.

Two matrices were reviewed during the on-site visit. Both students were reported at the 254 cost factor, and supporting evidence provided through observations and interviews confirmed the implementation of services indicated on the matrices. For one student, however, there was no mention on the IEP of the services identified in the health care domain on the matrix. For this student, the IEP team will need to reconvene to address the health care issue on the IEP. All other indicators were evident on the respective IEPs.

Some of the records contained areas of noncompliance that did not appear to be systemic in nature. These findings are as follows:

- parent notice not provided
- participants of IEP meeting not identified on parent participation form
- no documentation that parent participation form was provided in language of the parent
- no documentation of second attempt to notice parents of meeting
- no documentation that procedural safeguards were provided to parents
- no documentation that the parent was provided a copy of the IEP
- lack of initiation/duration dates for services
- lack of initiation/duration dates for accommodations/modifications
- lack of location of accommodations/modifications
- goals, present level of performance, and needs identified did not support services identified on the IEP
- report of progress not reported to parents as often as progress reported to parents of nondisabled students
- lack of statement describing progress toward achieving goal by the end of the year
- prior notice of change of FAPE was not provided
- parents’ concern for enhancing the child’s education not addressed

In summary, systemic findings were identified in adequate present level of educational performance statements, the development of measurable and appropriate annual goals, and short-term objectives and benchmarks. Other district level systemic findings were noted in the reporting of the frequency of accommodations and/or modifications and consideration of results of state and/or district assessments. In addition, there were some systemic findings at the high

school level. These included the lack of diploma option decision, failure to identify the purpose of the meeting as transition, and failure to invite the student as a participant in the IEP meeting. Transition components were not in evidence at the DJJ facility. Individual findings for student records were noted in 14 areas, as noted above. Non-compliance items were found during IEP reviews of two students that will result in adjustments in the district's federal funding. Neither student had a current IEP at the beginning of the school year. There was also a lack of appropriate prior written notice for change of placement for one of the students. Each finding affects federal funding. Identification of these students was provided under separate cover.

### **Student Record Reviews: Gifted**

Glades County currently does not serve students in the gifted program. There were no current gifted Educational Plans available for review.

### **District Forms Review**

Forms representing the thirteen areas identified below were submitted to Bureau staff for a review to determine compliance with federal and state laws. Findings were noted on eight of the forms. The district was notified of the specific findings via a separate letter dated July 29, 2002. An explanation of the specific findings 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*
- *Documentation of Staffing/Eligibility Determination\**
- *Informed Notice of Dismissal\**
- *Notice: Not Eligible for Exceptional Student Placement\**
- *Summary of Procedural Safeguards*
- *Annual Notice of Confidentiality\**

\* indicates findings that require immediate attention

### **Special Category Record Reviews**

Three records were reviewed for appropriate dismissal procedures. One of the records indicated that the IEP reevaluation review meeting was not appropriately constituted. Only one teacher was on the committee. Another record indicated that the student's name was not removed from the full time equivalent (FTE) prior to FTE, however, the FTE generated by the student was at a basic level.

Four records were reviewed for appropriate procedures for students who were referred but determined ineligible for special programs. The district was not out of compliance in any area, but it should be noted that it is considered best practice to identify the purpose of the meeting as "evaluation results" rather than "staffing ineligibility".

Two records of students identified as Limited English Proficient (LEP) were reviewed. For both records, there was no evidence that the parents received notices in their native language.

Two records of students who transitioned from Part C to Part B programs were reviewed. One of the IEPs indicated that the transition did not take place before the child's third birthday.

Two records of students who were temporarily assigned were reviewed. For one of them, there was no indication that the parent was invited. Neither had a copy of a temporary IEP. The district routinely accepts out-of-state IEPs for use until a permanent placement is done. However, this decision was not documented. On one record, the consent for evaluation included vision and hearing screenings, but there was no evidence that they were completed.

Initial eligibility and placement was reviewed for two students. One student was staffed as eligible for a special program on 4/19/01 but the IEP was not developed until 8/27/01. Federal regulations (34 CFR 300.343 (b)(2)) state that a meeting to develop the initial IEP must be held within thirty days of the eligibility determination. Consent for placement is to be obtained after the IEP is developed, but in this case, the parent signed consent to a separate class level of placement prior to the development of the IEP. In the review of the two initially placed students' prereferral, referral, evaluation, and eligibility criteria it was noted that for one student there was no documentation that indicates the educational or attendance records were reviewed. There was no statement in the eligibility information that specifically addressed the eligibility criteria for an emotional handicap. There was evidence in the anecdotal records and psychological report to indicate eligibility.

In summary, there were findings in the special category reviews in the areas of appropriate dismissal procedures, transition from Part C to Part B programs, temporary assignments, and initial eligibility.

## 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
- Behavior Management
- Curriculum and Instruction
- Least Restrictive Environment
- Post-School Transition
- Pre-K, Transition from Part C to Part B Programs
- Parent Involvement
- Gifted
- Student Record Reviews
- Special Category 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.

## Glades County School District 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.

Category	Findings	ESE	All	System improvement Strategy	Evidence of Change (including target date)
General Supervision	1. There is a need for a system of tracking the academic and behavioural performance of students with disabilities in order to make program and/or curricular decisions.	X		Computer printouts will track students with disabilities. Principals analyze school assessment data to make decisions for instruction and curriculum.	The district’s self-assessment will show that there is a system of tracking academic and behavioral performance. The ESE director will randomly review student progress. Ongoing April 2003 to June 2004
Assessment	2. Accommodations do not appear to be based on the individual needs of students, nor are they implemented consistently according to the students’ IEPs.	X		There will be a workshop on accommodations, modifications and Dealing with Difference. 1) Schedule on Saturday through FIN 2) Teachers paid stipend. LEA will conduct classroom observations and interview students.	The district’s self-assessment report will indicate that teachers in all schools are providing individualized accommodations. 80% by June 2003 95% by June 2004



Category	Findings	ESE	All	System improvement Strategy	Evidence of Change (including target date)
Assessment	3. There is a need for a clear, consistent and enforceable district policy regarding promotion and retention.		X	Pupil Progression Plan	Approved Jan. 2003
Behavior/ Discipline	4. There is a need for a consistent comprehensive school-wide discipline plan for both schools, including an array of in-school interventions that employ positive behavioral supports.		X	District Code of Student Conduct 1) Secondary 2) Elementary	District discipline policy will be reviewed by principals for staff at all schools at the beginning of each school year. 2003 and ongoing
	5. FBAs and BIPs are not being developed and implemented for students who require them.	X		FDLRS Heartland staff will provide training on FBAs and BIP. Spring 2003.	District self assessment reveals the presence of FBAs and BIPs when appropriate. 90% by Sept. 2003, 100% by Sept. 2004
	6. The modified-day after-school instruction program may lead to FAPE issues for students with disabilities.		X	The Director and FDLRS will research grant opportunities for alternative ways to provide instruction.	Students will be served during the school day by Aug. 2003
Curriculum and Instruction	7. There is a need for a structured and comprehensive curricular scope and sequence that incorporate the Sunshine State Standards for students with disabilities in both schools.	X		Schedule Summer Institute for ESE teachers to write curriculum K-12.	Secondary Scope and sequence completed by Aug. 2003, elementary by Dec. 2003

Category	Findings	ESE	All	System improvement Strategy	Evidence of Change (including target date)
Least Restrictive Environment	8. Some students with disabilities in self-contained classes had little opportunity for contact with non-disabled peers, apparently due more to scheduling constraints than to the needs of the students.	X		Review students' schedules. Adjust schedules as needed to ensure contact with non-disabled peers.	<p>Student schedules monitored by ESE. Random review:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Elementary-100% of disabled students have access to at least lunch/PE with non-disabled peers;</li> <li>2) Secondary-100% of disabled students have access to lunch and electives with non-disabled peers;</li> <li>3) 25% of formerly self-contained students are now served in main-stream classes 85% of the time.</li> </ol> <p>Instruction &amp; curricular changes for students with disabilities will show a 10% increase in standard diplomas by May 2004.</p>

<b>Category</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>ESE</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>System improvement Strategy</b>	<b>Evidence of Change (including target date)</b>
Post-School Transition	9. There is a need for effective transition services for students with disabilities, including interagency agreements.	X		Glades is developing an interagency agreement in conjunction with Project Connect.	Grant from Project Connect funded July 2002 for 2002/2003 year to develop interagency agreements for transition services within Glades and Hendry counties. District self-assessment will reveal secondary students are involved in appropriate transition services.
Pre-K/Part C to Part B Transition	10. There is no formal system in place to identify children transitioning from Part C into the Part B programs.	X		A representative from FDLRS Heartland meets monthly with EIP Representative.	District self assessment will reveal the district participates in 100% of transition meetings.
Gifted	11. There is no program in place to serve students identified as gifted.		X	Secondary students currently identified as Gifted are served by consultation.	Secondary students currently identified will be served by Aug. 2003.
	12. There is no procedure in place to identify students as gifted.		X	During spring of 2003, students K-6 will be screened for potential gifted candidates	By Dec. 2003, 3% of K-6 population will have been referred and/or evaluated.

Category	Findings	ESE	All	System improvement Strategy	Evidence of Change (including target date)
Records and Form Reviews	13. Nine areas of non-compliance on IEPs were found to be systemic in nature: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• lack of measurable annual goals and objectives</li> <li>• inadequate short-term objectives and benchmarks</li> <li>• inadequate present level of educational performance statements</li> <li>• lack of frequency reported for accommodations/modifications</li> <li>• lack of consideration of results of state and/or district assessments</li> <li>• failure to identify the purpose of the meeting</li> <li>• failure to invite appropriate team members</li> <li>• transition components not in evidence at the DJJ facility</li> </ul>	X		IEP training by DOE staff will be conducted for all ESE teachers in Glades County.	By July 1, 2003, district will provide DOE with 10 randomly chosen IEPs developed after the IEP training. IEPs will be reviewed for compliance.  District self assessment will include a random sample audit of at least 25 IEPs that reveals 95% compliance by Dec. 2003
	14. Findings were reported in the following special category areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• dismissal procedures</li> <li>• transition from Part B to Part C</li> <li>• temporary placement</li> <li>• initial eligibility</li> </ul>	X		Develop an ESE Handbook on IEP development, and completion with assistance from FDLRS Heartland and ISRD	1) Completed Handbook by June 2004 2) District self-assessment including random monitoring of IEP's will reveal 95% compliance with special category areas by Dec. 2003.

Category	Findings	ESE	All	System improvement Strategy	Evidence of Change (including target date)
Record and Forms Reviews (cont.)	<p>15. The following district forms must be revised to meet compliance with state and federal guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parent Notification of Individual Educational Plan (IEP) Meeting*</li> <li>• IEP Forms</li> <li>• Notice and Consent for Initial Placement</li> <li>• Informed Notice and Consent for Evaluation*</li> <li>• Informed Notice of Reevaluation*</li> <li>• Notification of Change of Placement*</li> <li>• Notification of Change of FAPE*</li> <li>• Informed Notice of Refusal</li> <li>• Documentation of Staffing/Eligibility Determination*</li> <li>• Informed Notice of Dismissal*</li> <li>• Notice: Not Eligible for Exceptional Student Placement*</li> <li>• Summary of Procedural Safeguards Annual Notice of Confidentiality*</li> </ul>	X	X	The district will review forms from other districts to assist in revising forms for compliance.	<p>The district has submitted correct revisions for Consent for Formal Individual Evaluation, Parent Invitation to IEP Meeting, and Informed Notice and Consent for Reevaluation.</p> <p>The district will complete form revisions by October 2003.</p>

## **Appendix A- Survey Results**

**Glades County School District  
Random Monitoring Report  
Parent Survey Results**

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 Glades County monitoring activities, the parent survey was sent to parents of the 188 students with disabilities for whom complete addresses were provided by the district. A total of 42 parents (PK, n=1; K-5, n=19; 6-8, n=14; 9-12, n=8) representing 22% of the sample, returned the survey. 41 surveys were returned as undeliverable, representing 22% 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.

	<b>% Yes</b>
1. Overall, I am satisfied with the exceptional education services my child receives.	66
2. Overall, I am satisfied with my child's academic progress.	39
3. Overall, I am satisfied with the amount of time my child spends with regular education students.	68
4. Overall, I am satisfied with the effect of exceptional student education on my child's self-esteem.	45
5. Overall, I am satisfied with the level of knowledge and experience of school personnel.	61
6. Overall, I am satisfied with the way I am treated by school personnel.	58
7. Overall, I am satisfied with the way special education teachers and regular education teachers work together.	63
8. Overall, I am satisfied with how quickly services are implemented following an IEP (Individualized Educational Plan) decision.	68
9. My child is usually happy at school.	75
10. My child spends most of the school day involved in productive activities.	74
11. My child has friends at school.	78
	<b>% Yes</b>

12. My child is learning skills that will be useful later on in life.	69
13. My child is aiming for a standard diploma.	74
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.	55
16. At my child's IEP meetings we have talked about which diploma my child may receive.*	53
17. At my child's IEP meetings we have talked about the requirements for different diplomas.*	45
18. At my child's IEP meetings we have talked about whether my child would take the FCAT (Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test).	66
19. At my child's IEP meetings we have talked about whether my child should get accommodations (special testing conditions), for example, extra time.	59
20. My child's teachers set appropriate goals for my child.	68
21. My child's teachers expect my child to succeed.	74
22. My child's teachers give homework that meets my child's needs.	53
23. My child's teachers call me or send me notes about my child.	72
24. My child's teachers are available to speak with me.	85
25. My child's teachers give students with disabilities extra time or different assignments, if needed.	55
26. My child's school wants to hear my ideas.	56
27. My child's school encourages me to participate in my child's education.	66
28. My child's school informs me about all of the services available to my child.	45
29. My child's school addresses my child's individual needs.	67
30. My child's school makes sure I understand my child's IEP.	75
31. My child's school explains what I can do if I want to make changes to my child's IEP.	56
32. My child's school sends me information written in a way I understand.	74
33. My child's school sends me information about activities and workshops for parents.	53
34. My child's school encourages acceptance of students with disabilities.	49
35. My child's school involves students with disabilities in clubs, sports, or other activities.	42



	<b>% Yes</b>
36. My child's school provides students with disabilities updated books and materials.	72
37. My child's school offers a variety of vocational courses, such as computers and business technology.*	65
38. My child's school provides information to students about education and jobs after high school.*	40
39. My child's school does all it can to keep students from dropping out of school.	45
40. My child's school offers students with disabilities the classes they need to graduate with a standard diploma.	61
41. I have attended one or more meetings about my child during this school year.	87
42. I participate in school activities with my child.	60
43. I am a member of the PTA/PTO.	5
44. I belong to an organization for parents of students with disabilities.	28
45. I have used parent support services in my area.	37
46. I am comfortable talking about my child with school staff.	85
47. I attend School Advisory Committee meetings concerning school improvement.	37

**Appendix B- ESE Monitoring Team Members**

**Glades County School District  
Random Monitoring Visit  
May 13-16, 2002**

**ESE Monitoring Team Members**

**Department of Education Staff**

Iris Anderson, Program Specialist IV, Program Administration and Evaluation  
Gail Best, Program Specialist IV, Program Administration and Evaluation  
Lee Clark, Program Specialist IV, Program Administration and Evaluation  
Kim Komisar, Program Specialist IV, Program Administration and Evaluation

## **Appendix C- Glossary of Acronyms**

## **Glossary of Acronyms**

BIP	Behavior Intervention Plan
Bureau	Bureau of Instructional Support & Community Services
CST	Child Study Team
DJJ	Department of Juvenile Justice
DOE	Department of Education
EIP	Early Intervention Program
EH	Emotionally Handicapped
EMH	Educable Mentally Handicapped
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
FTE	Full Time Equivalent
GED	General Educational Development
IDEA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
IEP	Individual Educational Plan
LEA	Local Education Agency
LEP	Limited English Proficient
Pre-K(PK)	Prekindergarten
PTO	Parent Teacher Organization
RCMA	Redlands Christian Migrant Association
SED	Severely Emotionally Disturbed
SLD	Specific Learning Disability
SP&P	Special Program and Procedures for Exceptional Students
SRO	School Resource Officer
VE	Varying Exceptionalities

## **Appendix D- Forms Review**

**Glades County School District  
Random Monitoring Report  
Forms Review**

This forms review was completed as a component of the random monitoring visit conducted on May 13-16, 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 Parent Invitation to Exceptional Student Education Meetings*

**Source Book/Work Paper - IEP**

**Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulation Section 300.345**

**The following must be addressed.**

- The statement listed for the parent to sign that they “waive my right to a 10 day notice” should be removed. There is no authority for a “10” day notice; federal and state laws require that a “reasonable” time must be given to allow the parent to respond to the notice. There is nothing in federal or state law that provides for parents to “waive” any of their procedural safeguards.
- The statement, “The people in attendance may include but not be limited to,” must be changed. The notice must reflect, by name or title, all of those invited to attend.

**The following comments are made regarding this form:**

It is assumed that when the meeting is to consider reevaluation results, and/or develop a transition IEP, the information is indicated under “Other” for the purpose of the meeting. If the purpose of the meeting is to consider transition services, the agency representative invited to the meeting must be identified.

**Individual Educational Plan (IEP) Meeting**

*Form Individual Educational Plan*

**Source Book/Work Paper - IEP**

**Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulation Section 300.347**

This form contains the components for compliance.

**The following comments are made regarding this form:**

- It is assumed that when the IEP team determines that a student with disabilities requires extended school year (ESY), the ESY services are included in the IEP under the appropriate sections.
- Although the IEP form is not required to have a section in which to record the results of recent state and district-wide assessments, there must be documentation somewhere in the student’s record that the IEP team did consider these results.

**Notice and Consent for Initial Placement**

**Form** *Informed Notice of Eligibility and Consent for Educational Placement in an Exceptional Education Program*

**Source Book/Work Paper - Program Areas**

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

This form contains the components for compliance, however, at the time of the next preprinting of this form, the wording “The Coordinator...*approved*...” will need to be revised to “The Coordinator...*reviewed*...” This change conforms to the requirement identified in the most recent Special Programs and Procedures document.

**Informed Notice and Consent for Evaluation**

**Form** *Consent for Formal 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 fails to provide a section for addressing the description of any other factors relevant to the district’s proposal or refusal.

**Informed Notice and Consent for Reevaluation**

**Form** *Informed Notice and Consent for Reevaluation*

**Source Book/Work Paper - Reevaluation**

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

**The following must be addressed.**

- The form fails to address that the IEP team, and other qualified professionals, reviewed existing evaluation data, including evaluations and information provided by the parent, current classroom based assessments, and teacher and related providers’ observations.
- This form fails to include a section that describes each evaluation procedure, test, record, or report that the district used as a basis for the proposal.



- The form fails to include a section that describes the recommendations by the review team. The recommendations would include the specific assessments, if any, that the team has recommended.

**Notification of Change in Placement/Change in Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE)**  
**Form *Informed Notice of Staffing and Educational Placement***  
**Source Book/Work Paper - IEP**  
**Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulation Section 300.503**

**The following must be addressed.**

- While the form contains the basic requirements for change of placement, the form confuses recommendations made by the IEP committee and recommendations made by the staffing committee. Parts of the requirements for change of placement are listed under IEP committee recommendations and other parts are listed under staffing committee recommendations.
- There is not a section on this form or on any other form that addresses change of FAPE.

**Informed Notice of Refusal**  
**Form *Notice of Refusal to Take a Specific Action***  
**Source Book/Work Paper – IEP**  
**Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulation Section 300.503**

This form contains the components for compliance.

**Informed Notice of Ineligibility**  
**Form *Informed Notice of Staffing and Educational Placement***  
**Source Book/Work Paper - Ineligible**  
**Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulation Section 300.503**

**The following must be addressed.**

- On this form, the determination of ineligibility is listed as a recommendation by the IEP committee. The determination of ineligibility is a function of the staffing committee.
- The form confuses recommendations made by the IEP committee and recommendations made by the staffing committee. Parts of the requirements for notice of ineligibility are listed under IEP committee recommendations and other parts are listed under staffing committee recommendations.

**Informed Notice of Dismissal**

*Form Informed Notice of Staffing and Educational Placement*  
**Source Book/Work Paper - Dismissal**  
**Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulation Section 300.503**

**The following must be addressed:**

- While this form contains the basic components for compliance for notice of dismissal, and correctly identifies the determination of dismissal as a function of the IEP committee, the form confuses recommendations made by the IEP committee and recommendations of the staffing committee. Parts of the requirements for notice of dismissal are listed under IEP committee recommendations and other parts are listed under staffing committee recommendations.
- The form fails to provide evidence of a reevaluation prior to dismissal.

**Documentation of Staffing/Eligibility Determination**

*Form Informed Notice of Staffing and Educational Placement*  
**Source Book/Work Paper - Staffing, IEP**  
**Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulation Section 300.534**

**The following must be addressed:**

- This form is used for several purposes in the district. In attempting to have the form provide compliance components for notice for several activities occurring as a result of IEP committee recommendation, and staffing committee recommendations, the form has become confusing.
- For most of the required notice components, parts of the requirements are listed under IEP committee recommendations and other parts are listed under staffing committee recommendations. For example, the form indicates that the eligibility or ineligibility was both a recommendation of an IEP committee, and a recommendation of a staffing committee.
- Used as documentation for staffing, the form does not contain a review of student information.
- After the initial review of this form by the Bureau, the district provided a second form with the same title that had been revised in July of 2001. It was noted that the second form had been corrected to state that the Coordinator had “reviewed” rather than “approved/disapproved” the recommendations of the IEP and Staffing committees.

## **Confidentiality of Information**

**Form *Student Handbooks for Moore Haven Elementary and Middle/Senior High*  
Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, Part 99 Title 34 of the Code of Federal  
Regulation  
Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulation Section 300.503**

The information from Moore Haven Middle/High School contains the components for compliance.

**The following must be addressed for the information from Moore Haven Elementary School.**

- The notice of confidentiality provided does not include the right to seek amendment of the student's educational records if the parent or eligible student believes they are inaccurate, misleading, or otherwise in violation of the student's privacy rights, including the procedures to request an amendment.
- The notice does not include the right to file a complaint with the U.S. Department of Education concerning alleged failures by the district to comply with the requirements of FERPA.
- The notice does not include that if the educational agency has a policy of disclosing education records to school officials determined to have a legitimate educational interest, the specification for determining who constitutes a school official and what constitutes a legitimate educational interest is specified.

It was noted that the district utilizes the procedural safeguards form produced by the Bureau.