

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Members

DR. AKSHAY DESAI

MARK KAPLAN

ROBERTO MARTÍNEZ

JOHN R. PADGET

KATHLEEN SHANAHAN

Dr. Eric J. Smith
Commissioner of Education



April 1, 2011

Dr. Harry La Cava
Indian River County School District
1990 25th Street
Vero Beach, Florida 32960

Dear Superintendent La Cava:

The Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services is in receipt of your district's response to the preliminary findings of its 2010-11 Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Compliance Self-Assessment. This letter and the attached document comprise the final report for Indian River County School District's 2010-11 Level 1 and Fall Cycle Level 2 self-assessment monitoring process.

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

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

On January 5, 2011, the preliminary report of findings from the 2010-11 Level 1 and Fall Cycle Level 2 self-assessment process was released to your district's ESE Director. The preliminary report detailed student-specific incidents of noncompliance that required immediate correction. Districts were required to correct all student-specific noncompliance and to provide evidence to the Bureau no later than March 7, 2011. In addition, districts are required to demonstrate that they are now correctly implementing each of the standards identified as noncompliant (i.e., 100 percent compliance).

BAMBI J. LOCKMAN
Chief

Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services

Superintendent La Cava
April 1, 2011
Page 2

In its 2010-11 Level 1 and Fall Cycle Level 2 self-assessment, Indian River County School District assessed 53 standards. One or more incidents of noncompliance were identified on 13 of those standards (24.5%). In accordance with the October 17, 2008, guidance from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), incidents of noncompliance corrected prior to the Bureau's dissemination of the preliminary report are not reported as findings of noncompliance for the purposes of the SPP/APR. The following summary of the district's timely correction of student-specific incidents of noncompliance has been adjusted for the district's early correction:

Correction of Noncompliance by Student

	Number	Percentage
Records Reviewed/Protocols Completed	12	-
Total Items Assessed	318	-
Noncompliant	2	0.63%
Timely Corrected	2	100%


The attached *Indian River County District Summary Report: Findings of Noncompliance by Standard* contains a summary of the findings reported by the individual standard or regulation assessed. In addition, a Matrix of Services review was required. Indian River County School District reviewed six matrixes for students reported at the 254 or 255 cost factors for weighted funding through the Florida Education Finance Program. No cost factor discrepancies were identified.

In addition to the individual correction(s) reported above, the district was required to demonstrate 100 percent compliance for each standard that was identified as noncompliant through review of a random sample of student records. Your district has provided the required records to demonstrate 100 percent compliance on all of the targeted standards, and no further corrective actions are required.

We understand that the implementation of this self-assessment required a significant commitment of resources and appreciate the time and attention your staff has devoted to the process thus far.

If you have questions regarding this process, please contact your assigned district liaison for monitoring or Patricia Howell, Program Director, at (850) 245-0476 or via electronic mail at patricia.howell@fldoe.org.

Sincerely,



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

Attachment

cc: Larry Harrah
Janet Brashear
Frances Haithcock
Mary Jane Tappen
Kim C. Komisar
Patricia Howell
Liz Conn
Sheila Gritz

Florida Department of Education
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services

2010 – 2011 Self-Assessment
Level 1 and Fall Cycle Level 2
Indian River County District Summary Report: Findings of Noncompliance by Standard

This report provides a summary of the district's results and must be used when developing corrective actions. See the *Student Report: Incidents of Noncompliance* for student-specific findings. Results are reported by standard, and are based on the following:

Number of IEP protocols completed: 6
Number of standards per IEP: 37
Number of T16 protocols completed: 6
Number of standards per T16: 16

Total number of protocols: 12
Total number of standards: 318
Total number of incidents of noncompliance (NC): 29
Overall % incidents of noncompliance: 9.1%

Total number of different standards assessed: 53
Total number of different standards for which noncompliance was identified: 13
% of different standards for which noncompliance was identified: 24.5%
Percent of noncompliance is calculated as the # of incidents of noncompliance for a given standard divided by the # of protocols reviewed for that standard, multiplied by 100.

* **Correctable for the student(s):** A finding which requires immediate action(s) to correct the noncompliance

** **Ensure future compliance:** For findings which cannot be corrected for individual students, corrective actions are required to address how the district will ensure future compliance

Florida Department of Education
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services

**2010 – 2011 Self-Assessment
Level 1 and Fall Cycle Level 2
Indian River County District Summary Report: Findings of Noncompliance by Standard**

Noncompliance (NC)		*Correctable for the Student(s)	**Ensure Future Compliance	# NC	% NC
T16-1	The notice of the IEP team meeting included a statement that a purpose of the meeting was the consideration of postsecondary goals and transition services, that the student would be invited, and identified any agency that would be invited to send a representative. (34 CFR §300.322(b)(2))		X	1	16.7%
T16-3	The student's strengths, preferences, and interests were taken into account. If the student was unable to attend the meeting, other steps were taken to ensure the student's preferences and interests were considered. (34 CFR §§300.43(a)(2) and 300.321(b)(2); Rules 6A-6.03028(3)(c)7. and (g)1. and 6A-6.03411(1)(nn)2.- 4., F.A.C.)	X		2	33.3%
T16-5	In order to ensure quality transition planning and services, IEP teams shall begin the process of identifying transition services needs of students with disabilities, to include consideration of the student's need for instruction or the provision of information in the area of self-determination to assist the student to be able to actively and effectively participate in IEP team meetings and self-advocate, beginning no later than age fourteen (14), so that needed postsecondary goals may be identified and in place by age sixteen (16). (Rule 6A-6.03028(3)(h)9, F.A.C.)	X		3	50.0%
T16-9	There is a measurable postsecondary goal or goals in the designated areas (i.e., education/training, employment, and, where appropriate, independent living skills). (34 CFR §300.320(b)(1); Rule 6A-6.03028(3)(h)10a, F.A.C.)	X		3	50.0%
T16-10	The measurable postsecondary goal was based on age-appropriate transition assessment. (34 CFR §300.320(b)(1); Rule 6A-6.03028(3)(h)10a, F.A.C.)	X		3	50.0%
T16-11	The IEP includes measurable annual goals (and short-term objectives/benchmarks, if applicable) that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the student related to the student's transition services needs. (34 CFR §300.320(a)(2); Rule 6A-6.03028(3)(h)2-3, F.A.C.)	X		3	50.0%

Noncompliance (NC)		*Correctable for the Student(s)	**Ensure Future Compliance	# NC	% NC
T16-12	There are transition services on the IEP to assist the student in reaching the measurable postsecondary goals. (34 CFR §300.320(b)(2); Rule 6A-6.03411(1)(nn), F.A.C.)	X		3	50.0%
T16-13	The transition services include course(s) of study needed to assist the student to reach the postsecondary goals(s). (34 CFR §300.320(b)(2))	X		3	50.0%
T16-16	The IEP includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon: an age-appropriate transition assessment; transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals; and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority. (34 CFR §§300.320(b)-(c) and 300.321(b); Rule 6A-6.03028(3)(b)-(c) and (h), F.A.C.)	X		3	50.0%
IEP-8	If neither parent was able to attend the IEP team meeting, there is evidence and documentation of attempts to ensure parent participation. (34 CFR §§300.322 (c)-(d) and 300.328)		X	1	16.7%
IEP-12	The IEP for a school-age student includes a statement of present levels of academic achievement and functional performance, including how the student's disability affects involvement and progress in the general education curriculum. For a prekindergarten student, the IEP contains a statement of how the disability affects the student's participation in appropriate activities. (34 CFR §300.320(a)(1))	X		1	16.7%
IEP-22	If the IEP team determined that the student will not participate in a particular state- or districtwide assessment, the IEP contains a statement of why that assessment is not appropriate, why the particular alternate assessment is appropriate, and shows notification to the parent of the implications of nonparticipation. (34 CFR §300.320(a)(6)(ii); Section 1008.22(3)(c)8., F.S.; Rule 6A-6.03028(3)(h)5, F.A.C.)	X		2	33.3%
IEP-25	The IEP team considered the strengths of the student; the academic, developmental, and functional needs of the student; the results of the initial evaluation or most recent evaluation; and the results of the student's performance on any statewide and districtwide assessment. (34 CFR §300.324(a)(1); Rule 6A-6.03028(3)(g), F.A.C.)	X		1	16.7%