

FINAL REPORT OF FOCUSED MONITORING OF
EXCEPTIONAL STUDENT EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN

LAFAYETTE COUNTY

OCTOBER 7 - 9, 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



May 30, 2003

Mr. Fred Ward, Superintendent
Lafayette County School District
Route 2, Box 5
Mayo, Florida 32066-9248

Dear Superintendent Ward:

We are pleased to provide you with the Final Report of Focused Monitoring of Exceptional Student Education Programs in Lafayette County. The report from our visit on October 7-9, 2002, includes the system improvement plan proposed by your staff.

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

If my staff can be of any assistance as you continue to implement the system improvement plan, please contact Eileen L. Amy, 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.

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Shan Goff".

Shan Goff, Chief
Bureau of Instructional Support and Community Services

Enclosure

cc: Henry McCray, School Board Chairman
Members of the School Board
Leenette McMillan, School Board Attorney
School Principals
Debra Land, ESE Director
Jim Warford, Chancellor

SHAN GOFF
Chief
Bureau of Instructional Support and Community Services

Lafayette County Final Monitoring Report
Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Executive Summary | 1 |
| Monitoring Process | 4 |
| Authority | 4 |
| Method | 4 |
| Focused Monitoring | 4 |
| Key Data Indicators | 5 |
| District Selection | 5 |
| On-Site Monitoring Activities | 5 |
| Off-Site Monitoring Activities | 6 |
| Parent Surveys | 6 |
| Teacher Surveys | 6 |
| Student Surveys | 6 |
| Reviews of Student Records and District Forms | 6 |
| Reporting Process | 6 |
| Exit Conference | 6 |
| Preliminary Report | 7 |
| Final Report | 7 |
| Background | 8 |
| Demographic Information | 8 |
| Reporting of Information | 10 |
| Sources of Information | 10 |
| Surveys, Focus Groups, Individual Interviews, Case Studies, and Classroom Visits | 11 |
| Staff Knowledge and Training | 11 |
| Placement | 11 |
| Curriculum | 13 |
| Behavior/Discipline | 14 |
| Opinions | 14 |
| Student Record and District Form Reviews | 14 |
| IEP Reviews | 14 |
| District Forms Review | 15 |
| Summary | 16 |
| System Improvement Plan | 17 |
| Appendix A: Survey Results | 22 |
| Parent Survey Results | 23 |
| Teacher Survey Results | 26 |
| Student Survey Results | 29 |
| Appendix B: ESE Monitoring Team Members | 32 |
| Appendix C: Glossary of Acronyms | 34 |
| Appendix D: Forms Review | 36 |

**Lafayette County School District
Focused Monitoring Visit
October 7-9, 2002**

Executive Summary

During the week of October 7-9, 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 Lafayette County Public Schools. In its continuing efforts to focus the monitoring process on student educational outcomes, the Bureau identified four key data indicators. Lafayette County was selected for monitoring on the basis of its low percentage of students with disabilities who spend 80% or more of their day with nondisabled peers. The results of the monitoring process are reported under five categories or related areas that are considered to impact or contribute to the key data indicator.

Summary of Findings

Focus Groups, Individual Interviews, Case Studies, and Classroom Visits

Staff Training and Knowledge

Lafayette County Public Schools provides extensive opportunities for district and school level administrators and teachers to participate in staff development opportunities. Many of the training activities are designed to foster placement in less restrictive and more inclusive environments for students with disabilities.

Placement

The district provides a full continuum of placements for students with disabilities. Students with disabilities appear to be appropriately placed and interact with non-disabled peers at every opportunity. The district's early intervention activities, especially related to reading, appear to meet the needs of students that are traditionally identified as mildly disabled, thus accounting for a lower percentage of students identified as students with disabilities than other districts in their enrollment group. Because of this, the district serves only students who require more intensive services, which may, in part, explain their identification for this key data indicator. It appears that the scheduling of a ninety-minute block of reading at the elementary school level and block scheduling at the secondary level may also contribute to the district being identified for this key data indicator. Due to the scheduling used at both the elementary and the high school levels, the district needs to make sure that Individual Educational Plan (IEP) teams carefully examine students' schedules to ensure that every opportunity to interact with non-disabled peers in academic settings is explored. This is especially important for reading and math at the elementary school level.

Curriculum and Instruction

Students with disabilities generally have access to the regular education curriculum in both general education and special education classes. While accommodations are usually provided to

students with disabilities at the elementary level, it was not consistently reported that students with disabilities at the high school level received all the accommodations listed on the IEP. Students with disabilities at the elementary level in segregated classrooms did not appear to receive appropriate FCAT preparation materials or training. However, it must be noted that the district was addressing this.

Behavior/Discipline

The elementary and high school do not seem to have behavior problems, however, there are resources available, including a contracted psychologist to do functional behavior assessments (FBAs) and behavior intervention plans (BIPs); a behavior analyst from Gainesville; and the White Foundation (to deal with behavior and academics).

Stakeholder Opinions Related to the Key Data Indicator

When asked what could lead to the district being targeted as having a disproportionate number of students with disabilities not interactive with non-disabled peers, stakeholders gave the following responses:

- block scheduling
- district size
- FCAT requirements
- the attitude of regular education teachers are barriers to LRE
- the opinion (of some teachers) was that it was a data error
- teachers and administrators believe that they are serving students appropriately
- regular education teacher says ESE teachers are so qualified and provide such a quality program that they do not want to take students out of the ESE program
- Success for All (SFA) block of time is a barrier to more inclusion
- frustration of regular education teachers is a barrier to more inclusion

Record and Forms Reviews

There were no areas of noncompliance that will result in funding adjustments or requiring a reconvened IEP meeting. In all seven of the IEPs submitted, the IEP is used to provide documentation of progress by indicating whether each objective has been achieved or should be continued, rather than referencing the annual goal. Stating whether an objective has been met does not meet the requirement of reporting sufficient progress towards the annual goal. Other areas of noncompliance included lack of indication of transition as a purpose of meeting, lack of transition page and diploma option decision, and lack of indication that results of state or district assessment were considered in the development of the IEP.

Findings were noted on nine of the forms sent to the Bureau for review prior to the visit.

System Improvement Plan

In response to these findings, the district is required to develop a system improvement plan for submission to the Bureau. These strategies must include activities and strategies intended to address specific findings, as well as measurable indicators of change. In developing the system improvement strategies plan, every effort should be made to link the system improvement activities resulting from this focused 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 programs; 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 2000-01 school year. Three types of monitoring processes were established as part of the system of monitoring and oversight. Those monitoring processes are identified as follows:

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

During the 2000-01 school year, the Bureau developed and piloted activities for focused monitoring in four districts, examining programs and services for students with disabilities and students identified as gifted. Based on staff and peer monitor feedback, along with further suggestions from the work group, the focused monitoring procedures were further developed and/or revised. It was also determined that the focused monitoring activities will examine only programs and services for students with disabilities.

Focused Monitoring

The purpose of the focused monitoring process is to implement a methodology that targets the Bureau's monitoring intervention on key data indicators that were identified as significant for educational outcomes for students. Through this process, the Bureau will use such data to

inform the monitoring process, thereby, implementing a strategic approach to intervention and commitment of resources that will improve student outcomes.

Key Data Indicators

Beginning in the 2000-01 school year, the following key data indicators were recommended by the monitoring restructuring work group and were adopted for implementation by the Bureau. The indicators and their sources of data are

- percentage of students with disabilities participating in regular classes (i.e., spending at least 80% of the school day with their nondisabled peers) [Data source: Survey 9]
- dropout rate for students with disabilities [Data source: Survey 5]
- percentage of students with disabilities exiting with a standard diploma [Data source: Survey 5]
- participation in statewide assessments by students with disabilities [Data sources: performance data from the assessment files and Survey 3 enrollment data].

It is anticipated that these indicators will continue to inform the Bureau's focused monitoring process over a period of several years.

District Selection

Lafayette County Public School District was selected to be monitored based on a review of data from the 2000-01 school year that was submitted electronically to the Department of Education (DOE) Information Database for Surveys 2, 3, 5, 9, and from the assessment files. The district was selected due to its having the second lowest percentage (23%) of students with disabilities spending 80% or more of their day with nondisabled peers when all the districts in the state were rank ordered from highest to lowest.

On-Site Monitoring Activities

On-site monitoring activities occurred over the course of the visit during the week of October 7-9, 2002. These on-site activities were conducted by a team composed of three DOE staff. On-site monitoring activities consisted of:

- interviews with district-level representatives, school-based administrators, ESE teachers, and general education teachers, designed to gather information about the regular class placement key data indicator from multiple sources offering different points of view
- focus groups with parents, students, and teachers to provide a more in-depth perspective about the regular class placement indicator
- student case studies involving classroom visits to investigate classroom practices and interventions that might contribute to the amount of time an individual student spends in a setting with nondisabled peers

Prior to the on-site visit, Bureau staff notified district staff of the selection of the following schools to be visited based on data related to the percentage of students with disabilities in regular class placement: Lafayette Elementary School and Lafayette High School.

The on-site selection of students for the case studies was based on criteria that have been identified as being characteristic of students who may be expected to receive instruction in the regular classroom for the majority of the day. Schools were asked to provide a listing of students in the school, including the following information:

- area of eligibility
- placement
- participation in statewide assessment

Off-Site Monitoring Activities

Surveys were designed by the University of Miami research staff in order to provide maximum opportunity for input from parents of students with disabilities, ESE and regular education teachers, and students with disabilities in grades 9-12. 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 parents of the 125 students with disabilities for whom complete addresses were provided by the district. A total of 21 parents (PK, n=1; K-5, n=9; 6-8, n=6; 9-12, n=5) representing 17% of the sample, returned the survey. Five percent of the surveys (6) were returned as undeliverable. The survey that was sent to parents was printed in English and Spanish and included a cover letter and postage paid reply envelope.

Teacher Surveys

Surveys were received from 48 teachers, representing 66% of the total number of Exceptional Student Education (ESE) and General Education teachers in the district. Data are from both of the district's schools.

Student Surveys

A sufficient number of surveys were provided to allow all students with disabilities, grades 9-12, to respond. For each class or group of students, a teacher conducted the student survey following a written script. Surveys were received from 30 students, representing 100% of high school students with disabilities in the district. Data are from the district's only high school.

Reviews of Student Records and District Forms

At the DOE, Bureau staff members conducted a compliance review of student records that were randomly selected from the population of students with disabilities prior to the on-site monitoring visit. In addition, Bureau staff reviewed selected district forms and notices to determine if the required components were included. The results of the review of student records and forms will be described in this report.

Reporting Process

Exit Conference

Following the last day of 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

Subsequent to the on-site visit, Bureau staff prepares a preliminary 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 in this document, including the following:

- LEA profile
- parent, teacher, and student surveys
- reviews of student records
- reviews of forms
- parent, teacher, and student focus groups
- case studies, including corresponding parent phone calls
- classroom visits
- interview with district and school staff

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 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, a system improvement plan, including strategies and activities targeting specific findings, must be submitted to the Bureau for review. Within 30 days of the Bureau's receipt, a final report including the system improvement plan will be released.

Background

Demographic Information

The data contained in this section of the report is a summary of the 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.

Lafayette County Public Schools has a total school population (PK-12) of 1,030 with 12% being identified as students with disabilities and 2% identified as gifted. The district is considered to be a “small” district and is one of 25 districts in this enrollment group. Of the total Lafayette County Public Schools population, 77% are White, 12% are Black, 10% are Hispanic, and <1% are Asian/Pacific Islander. Of the students with disabilities, 74% are White, 17% are Black, 9% are Hispanic, and 0% are Asian/Pacific Islander. Fifty-one percent of the district’s population is eligible for free/reduced lunch.

Lafayette County Public Schools is comprised of one elementary school and one middle/high school.

According to the 2000-01 data, 0% of Lafayette County’s students with disabilities were reported as dropping out of school as compared to 5% for districts of similar enrollment and 5% for the State’s average. Data indicated a decrease (1999-00 to 2000-01) in the dropout rate for students with disabilities as well as for the student population as a whole. In addition, the retention rate in Lafayette County Public Schools is lower than its enrollment group and statewide for both student populations.

The data also indicate that the proportion of students with disabilities in Lafayette County Public Schools who graduate with a standard diploma is somewhat lower than the proportion in other districts of similar size or in the state as a whole. Regarding students with disabilities in Lafayette County Public Schools, 33% graduate with a standard diploma, compared to 42% and 51% in similar enrollment districts and the state, respectively. Through the Continuous Improvement Monitoring Plan procedures, Lafayette County will explore the difference in the percentage of students with disabilities who graduate with a standard diploma and a special diploma and the reasons for the difference.

For the 2000-01 school year, Lafayette County Public Schools reports that 23% of its students with disabilities (ages 6-21) spend 80% or more of their school week with their nondisabled peers. This rate is lower than both the State rate of 48% and the similar enrollment group rate of 44%. For students identified as educable mentally handicapped, the rate of separate class placement (59%) is slightly higher than the enrollment group (56%) and slightly lower than the state (61%). However, data for the 2001-02 school year indicate that the rate of separate class placement for students identified as educable mentally handicapped in Lafayette County has increased from 59% to 94%, while the enrollment group and state rates have remained relatively steady. The district also reports 0% of prekindergarten children ages three through five who receive all of their special education and related services in a natural environment.

The data also indicate a lower in-school suspension and higher out-of-school suspension rate for students with disabilities than their nondisabled peers for the 2000-01 school year. Lafayette County's in-school suspension rate for students with disabilities (14%) is slightly lower than that of its enrollment group (16%) and the state rate (13%). Lafayette's out-of-school suspension rate for students with disabilities (11%) is considerably lower than the enrollment group and state rates (14% and 15% respectively).

A review of the data related to the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) indicates that the participation rate for students with disabilities has decreased from the 1999-00 school year to the 2000-01 school year, in both reading and math across all grade levels reported. At the elementary level, participation rates for Lafayette County (math, 55%; reading, 67%) are lower than both the enrollment group and the state. At the eighth grade level, the Lafayette County participation rate in both reading and math (30%) is lower than the comparison groups (enrollment group, 75%; state, 76%). This pattern continues at the tenth grade level, with 30% participation in Lafayette County compared to 63% in the enrollment group and 59% at the state.

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. This data includes

- compliance review of seven student records
- review of district forms
- surveys returned by 21 parents
- surveys returned by 48 teachers representing two schools
- surveys completed by 30 students from one school
- one focus group with six parents representing six students with disabilities from elementary to high school level
- one focus group with eight school personnel representing elementary, middle, and high school levels
- one student focus group of nine students preparing for a special diploma and one student focus group with nine students preparing for a standard diploma at Lafayette High School
- four interviews with district-level staff
- 14 interviews with school-based staff
- 12 classroom visits, including 6 case studies

The data generated through the surveys, focus groups, individual interviews, case studies, and classroom visits are summarized in this report beginning on page 11, while the results from the review of student records and district forms are presented beginning on page 14 of the report. This report provides conclusions with regard to the time in regular education indicator and specifically addresses related areas that may contribute to or impact the indicator. These areas include

- staff knowledge and training
- placement
- curriculum and instruction
- behavior/discipline
- stakeholder opinions related to the key data indicator

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 the 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.

Surveys, Focus Groups, Individual Interviews, Case Studies, and Classroom Visits

Staff Knowledge and Training

Bureau staff encountered evidence that the district has made great efforts to address problematic students through regular education intervention initiatives, especially in the area of reading.

District and school staff reported having received training in the following areas:

- Creating Independence *through* Student-Owned Strategies (CRISS) training
- Florida Reading Initiative (FRI)
- Success For All (SFA) updates every year
- PASS Port training (parent liaison provides this training to parents as well as to teachers)
Parents Assuring Student Success—components include homework, organizational skills, test taking...
- ESOL (even ESE teachers are trained in ESOL strategies)
- CRISS training, learning style, and multiple intelligences were reported by Principal, however, this was not verified by staff
- Reaching the Tough to Teach (Bay Point Institute) for Dean of Students and one ESE teacher
- Technology trainings
- IEP training for one ESE teacher
- Gifted training for one regular education teacher who also teaches gifted

Training opportunities did not appear as extensive at the middle/high school level as at the elementary level.

Both principals reported that teachers are required to document the use of CRISS strategies or FRI strategies in their lesson plans.

In summary, Lafayette County Public Schools provides extensive opportunities for district and school level administrators and teachers to participate in staff development opportunities. Many of the training activities are designed to foster placement in less restrictive and more inclusive environments for students with disabilities.

Placement

The district has few, if any, students identified in the consultative or regular class placement category. Typically a district would have students in these categories with a significant amount of their time with non-disabled peers. In Lafayette County School District, when students get to this level, they are usually dismissed from the program and placed into one of the regular education support initiatives. This may account for this district having the lowest percentage ESE placement in their enrollment group (12%), and, in part, account for their being targeted for this indicator.

It appears that the district makes a concerted effort to mainstream students for the maximum amount of time appropriate to the student's needs and ability. Placement decisions are made at the IEP meetings and based on student needs, recommendations of teachers, parents, and student stress level. However, one regular education teacher and one ESE teacher reported that the

psychologist makes placement decisions. ESE teachers reported that they meet regularly to monitor student progress and placement

At the elementary school there is a required Reading/Language Arts block in which students are placed based on reading level. During this block, ESE teachers teach most students with disabilities with only other students with disabilities. This “block of time” results in moving a student from “regular class” placement to “resource” placement.

The Pre-K handicapped class has three students and participates with Kindergarten for recess, lunch, and special school-wide activities.

Staff at the high school is not familiar with the terms of placement. They describe self-contained without using “time” references. They are not self-contained but are separate class. One case study student was reported to have passed the reading and writing portions of the FCAT, however, was scheduled to take Language Arts in the ESE setting rather than the regular education setting.

At the middle/high school, all students with disabilities are included in all school-wide activities including lunch, and electives. ESE paraprofessionals had a positive impact on placement options at the middle/high school level by providing supports to the students with disabilities in the regular education classrooms. Case studies indicated that students were appropriately placed, received appropriate ESE and regular classes, and had appropriate interaction in academic and non-academic settings with non-disabled peers.

Teacher and student focus groups support the data indicating that students are placed appropriately, receive appropriate ESE and regular education classes, and have appropriate interaction with nondisabled peers. Parents in the focus group had mixed perceptions of the integration of their children with regular education students.

In summary, the district provides a full continuum of placements for students with disabilities. Students with disabilities appear to be appropriately placed and interact with non-disabled peers at every opportunity. The district's early intervention activities, especially related to reading, appear to meet the needs of students that are traditionally identified as mildly disabled thus accounting for a lower percentage of students identified as students with disabilities than other districts in their enrollment group. Because of this, the district serves only students who require more intensive services, which may, in part, explain their identification for this key data indicator. Due to the scheduling used at both the elementary and high school levels, the district needs to make sure that IEP teams carefully examine students' schedules to ensure that every opportunity to interact with non-disabled peers in academic settings is explored. This is especially important for reading and math at the elementary school level.

Curriculum

At the elementary school, ESE teachers work with general education teachers throughout year to provide strategies for accommodations, academic, and behavior interventions. Teachers and administration report that SRA curriculum and FRI strategies are used in ESE classes. SFA, used in regular education classes, and SRA are compatible curricula allowing for smooth transition of ESE students from more to less restrictive settings. The elementary school has a reading coach and a reading facilitator who provide consultative services to teachers and tutorial assistance to students. QRI – III (Qualitative Reading Inventory), Brigance, FCAT, Gates-McGinnis, and Stanford 9 are examples of assessments used to group students for instruction and to track progress. There appears to be a concerted effort to mainstream students to science and social studies.

Students with disabilities in separate class placements spend little time on FCAT prep, however, this year, materials (Blast Off) have been purchased for their use. Accommodations for students with disabilities are communicated to general education teachers through page 4 of the IEP and their attendance at IEP meetings. ESE teachers regularly discuss accommodations and strategies for implementation with regular education teachers. Teacher and parent focus groups indicate that students are receiving appropriate curriculum based on needs.

Middle and high school students have access to the general curriculum and use supplemental, parallel materials for lower functioning students. Middle and high school regular education students and students with disabilities have access to numerous technology software programs through a technology grant. These were observed in use through case studies and classroom observations and were identified through student focus groups. Progress is monitored through grade reports at the end of every three weeks, five weeks (if student has not shown improvement), and nine weeks. For regular education students, this may lead to referral to school based intervention team and if intervention strategies prove unsuccessful leads to referral to ESE. After school tutoring is provided two days per week, with transportation provided for students in need of transportation. The school provides special classes for both regular education and students with disabilities who score Level 1 on FCAT.

While it was reported that ESE teachers provide accommodations, and strategies for implementing them, to regular education teachers in core academic areas, it was also reported by ESE teachers that some regular education teachers did not implement them for individual students.

In summary, students with disabilities generally have access to the regular education curriculum in both general education and special education classes. While accommodations are usually provided to students with disabilities at the elementary level, it was not consistently reported that students with disabilities at the high school level received all the accommodations listed on the IEP. Students with disabilities at the elementary level in segregated classrooms did not appear to receive appropriate FCAT preparation materials or training. However, it must be noted that the district was addressing this.

Behavior/Discipline

It was reported and observed that ESE teachers work with general education teachers throughout the school year to provide strategies for accommodations, academic, and behavior interventions. Teachers use their own behavior plans. Most teachers rely on parent phone calls for chronic or severe misbehavior.

It was also reported at the elementary school that corporal punishment and in-school suspension (ISS) was used on rare occasions. ISS was frequently used at the high school.

In summary, the elementary and high school do not seem to have behavior problems, however, there are resources available, including a contracted psychologist to do FBAs and BIPS; a behavior analyst from Gainesville; and the White Foundation (to deal with behavior and academics).

Opinions

When asked what could lead to the district being targeted as having a disproportionate number of students with disabilities not interactive with non-disabled peers, stakeholders gave the following responses:

- block scheduling
- district size
- FCAT requirements
- the attitude of regular education teachers are barriers to LRE
- the opinion (of some teachers) was that it was a data error
- teachers and administrators believe that they are serving students appropriately
- regular education teacher says ESE teachers are so qualified and provide such a quality program that they do not want to take students out of the ESE program
- Success for All (SFA) block of time is a barrier to more inclusion
- frustration of regular education teachers is a barrier to more inclusion

Student Record and District Form Reviews

IEP Reviews

Seven IEPs were reviewed as a part of the focused monitoring visit to Lafayette District Schools. Of those seven, all were in compliance with regard to being current on the day of the review, on the first day of school, on the day of the last Federal count and during the last FTE count. However, there were some areas of non-compliance that appeared to be systemic in nature.

All IEPs indicated that the parents were invited to the meeting. However, there was one area of non-compliance related to the parent notices that appears to be systemic. Three of the IEPs did not indicate transition as a purpose of the meeting. The other four IEPs were for students who were not old enough to have need of transition IEPs. Two of the three IEPs in which transition should have been included did not contain a transition page and did not indicate a diploma option.

For all of the IEPs, the documentation of progress was noted by indicating whether each objective had been achieved or should be continued, rather than by referencing the annual goal. Stating whether an objective has been met does not meet the requirements of reporting sufficient progress towards the annual goal.

Of the seven IEPs, four were for students who were of the age to have taken the FCAT or other standardized state or district assessment. All four of those IEPs failed to indicate that the results of any state or district assessment were considered in development of the IEP.

There were several instances of noncompliance that did not appear to be systemic in nature. They are as follows:

- One IEP indicated that there was not a general education teacher present at the meeting.
- Two IEPs had at least one annual goal that was not measurable.
- One IEP did not have criteria for mastery, evaluation procedures, or schedule for objectives.
- Two IEPs did not accurately reflect special education services. One indicated “developmentally delayed” and the other listed accommodations under special education services.

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 nine of the forms. The district was notified of the specific findings via a separate letter dated August 9, 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

Summary

Based on the findings stated in this report, the district is expected to develop system improvement strategies in collaboration with Bureau staff. These strategies should specify activities and strategies to address the identified findings in the following areas:

- Staff Training and Knowledge
- Placement
- Curriculum and Instruction
- Behavior/Discipline
- Stakeholder Opinions Related to the Key data indicator
- Student Records Review
- 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 strategies.

Lafayette County School District Focused Monitoring System Improvement Plan

This section includes the issues identified by the Bureau as most significantly in need of improvement. The district is required to provide a system improvement plan to address identified findings, which may include a 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 students with disabilities. Findings identified as “All” are those findings that reflect issues related to the student population as a whole, including students with disabilities.

17

| Category | Findings | ESE | All | System Improvement Strategy | Evidence of Change (Including target date) |
|------------------------------|--|------------|------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Staff Knowledge and Training | 1. There are no findings in this area. | | | | |
| Placement | 2. There are no findings in this area. | | | | |

| Category | Findings | ESE | All | System Improvement Strategy | Evidence of Change (Including target date) |
|----------------------------|---|-----|-----|--|---|
| Curriculum and Instruction | 3. Instructional accommodations are not provided consistently to students with disabilities at the high school level. | X | | Teachers will be provided with professional development on instructional accommodations. | District staff will randomly visit five high school classes to determine the use of accommodations. Report of district self-assessment reveals that 100% of ESE students in randomly selected classes were being provided accommodations as specified on their IEPs. June, 2003 January, 2004 |

| Category | Findings | ESE | All | System Improvement Strategy | Evidence of Change (Including target date) |
|-------------------------------------|---|-----|-----|--|--|
| Curriculum and Instruction (con't.) | 4. Students with disabilities at the elementary level in segregated classrooms did not appear to receive appropriate FCAT preparation materials or training | X | | FCAT preparation materials and training in their use will be provided to ESE teachers. | <p>District staff will make five random visits to segregated ESE classrooms to determine the use of FCAT preparation materials.</p> <p>Report of district self-assessment reveals that the use of FCAT preparation materials was in evidence in 100% of the visits.</p> <p>June, 2003</p> <p>January, 2004</p> |
| Behavior/ Discipline | 5. There are no findings in this area. | | | | |

| Category | Findings | ESE | All | System Improvement Strategy | Evidence of Change (Including target date) |
|---------------------------|---|-----|-----|---|--|
| Records and Forms Reviews | <p>6. Four areas of non-compliance were found to be systemic in nature</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lack of indication of transition as a purpose of meeting • lack of transition page and diploma option decision • lack of documentation of progress toward annual goal • lack of indication that results of state or district assessment were considered in the development of the IEP | X | | <p>Training for teachers will be held on the systemic areas of non-compliance.</p> <p>Forms will be updated to include a statement regarding consideration of assessment.</p> | <p>District staff will randomly sample 10 IEPs. Report of district self-assessment reveals that areas identified in system improvement plan were in 100% compliance.</p> <p>June, 2003; January, 2004</p> <p>Forms revised by 4/30/03.</p> |

| Category | Findings | ESE | All | System Improvement Strategy | Evidence of Change (Including target date) |
|-----------------------------------|---|-----|-----|--|--|
| Records and Forms Reviews (con't) | 7. Forms review findings that require immediate attention: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notification of Change of Placement (and FAPE) • Informed Notice of Dismissal • Notice and Consent for Initial Placement • Informed Notice of Reevaluation • Informed Notice of Refusal • Notice of Ineligibility • Staffing/Eligibility Determination • Confidentiality of Information | X | | District will revise designated forms. | Forms submitted to DOE by 4/30/03. |

Appendix A- Survey Results

**Lafayette County School District
 Focused 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. At the time of this analysis, it had been administered to seven districts in 2002.

In conjunction with the 2002 Lafayette County monitoring activities, the parent survey was sent to parents of the 125 students with disabilities for whom complete addresses were provided by the district. A total of 21 parents (PK, n = 1; K-5, n = 9; 6-8, n = 6; 9 - 12, n = 5) representing 17% of the sample, returned the survey. Six surveys were returned as undeliverable, representing 5% of the sample.

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

| | % Yes |
|---|--------------|
| Staff Training and Knowledge | |
| • Overall, I am satisfied with the level of knowledge and experience of school personnel. | 78 |
| • Overall, I am satisfied with the way special education teachers and regular education teachers work together. | 80 |
| Placement | |
| • Overall, I am satisfied with the amount of time my child spends with regular education students. | 79 |
| • Overall, I am satisfied with the exceptional education services my child receives. | 80 |
| • My child spends most of the school day involved in productive activities. | 84 |
| • At my child's IEP meetings we have talked about ways that my child could spend time with students in regular classes. | 72 |
| • My child's school addresses my child's individual needs. | 82 |
| • My child's school encourages acceptance of students with disabilities. | 82 |
| • My child's school involves students with disabilities in clubs, sports, or other activities. | 83 |

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

| Curriculum and Instruction | % |
|--|----------|
| • Overall, I am satisfied with my child's academic progress. | 65 |
| • My child is learning skills that will be useful later on in life. | 84 |
| • My child is aiming for a standard diploma. | 79 |
| • My child's teachers set appropriate goals for my child. | 84 |
| • My child's teachers give homework that meets my child's needs. | 73 |
| • My child's teachers give students with disabilities extra time or different assignments, if needed. | 75 |
| • My child's school provides students with disabilities updated books and materials. | 88 |
| • My child's school offers a variety of vocational courses, such as computers and business technology.* | 73 |
| • My child's school offers students with disabilities the classes they need to graduate with a standard diploma. | 88 |

Behavior/Discipline

- N/A

Stakeholders Opinion Related to the Key data indicator/Other Items

| | |
|---|-----|
| • Overall, I am satisfied with the effect of exceptional student education on my child's self-esteem. | 74 |
| • Overall, I am satisfied with the way I am treated by school personnel. | 84 |
| • Overall, I am satisfied with how quickly services are implemented following an IEP (Individualized Educational Plan) decision. | 80 |
| • My child is usually happy at school. | 78 |
| • My child has friends at school. | 89 |
| • At my child's IEP meetings we have talked about whether my child needed services beyond the regular school year. | 58 |
| • At my child's IEP meetings we have talked about which diploma my child may receive.* | 55 |
| • At my child's IEP meetings we have talked about the requirements for different diplomas.* | 42 |
| • At my child's IEP meetings we have talked about whether my child would take the FCAT (Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test). | 63 |
| • At my child's IEP meetings we have talked about whether my child should get accommodations (special testing conditions), for example, extra time. | 61 |
| • My child's teachers expect my child to succeed. | 88 |
| • My child's teachers call me or send me notes about my child. | 72 |
| • My child's teachers are available to speak with me. | 100 |
| • My child's school wants to hear my ideas. | 82 |
| • My child's school encourages me to participate in my child's education. | 74 |
| • My child's school informs me about all of the services available to my child. | 65 |
| • My child's school makes sure I understand my child's IEP. | 89 |

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

| Stakeholders Opinion Related to the Key Data Indicator/Other Items (cont.) | % |
|---|----------|
| • My child's school explains what I can do if I want to make changes to my child's IEP. | 88 |
| • My child's school sends me information written in a way I understand. | 95 |
| • My child's school sends me information about activities and workshops for parents. | 71 |
| • My child's school provides information to students about education and jobs after high school.* | 50 |
| • My child's school does all it can to keep students from dropping out of school. | 81 |
| • I have attended one or more meetings about my child during this school year. | 100 |
| • I participate in school activities with my child. | 63 |
| • I am a member of the PTA/PTO. | 0 |
| • I belong to an organization for parents of students with disabilities. | 11 |
| • I have used parent support services in my area. | 0 |
| • I am comfortable talking about my child with school staff. | 100 |
| • I attend School Advisory Committee meetings concerning school improvement. | 12 |

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

Teacher Survey Results

MIDDLE (cont.)

(More than 25% but fewer than 75% of the respondents reported consistency in these areas.) %

| | |
|---|----|
| • To provide students with disabilities access to the general curriculum, my school addresses each student's individual needs. | 64 |
| • To encourage students with disabilities to stay in school, my school implements an IEP transition plan for each student. | 63 |
| • To keep students with disabilities from dropping out, my school provides positive behavioral supports. | 60 |
| • To keep students with disabilities from dropping out, my school ensures that classroom material is culturally appropriate. | 57 |
| • To ensure that as many students with disabilities as possible graduate with a standard diploma, my school encourages students to aim for a standard diploma when appropriate. | 57 |
| • To help students with disabilities who take the FCAT, my school gives students in ESE classes updated textbooks. | 57 |
| • To ensure that as many students with disabilities as possible graduate with a standard diploma, my school informs students through the IEP process of the different diploma options and their requirements. | 56 |
| • To ensure that as many students with disabilities as possible graduate with a standard diploma, my school provides extra help to students who need to retake the FCAT. | 56 |
| • To keep students with disabilities from dropping out, my school ensures that students are taught strategies to manage their behavior as needed. | 51 |
| • To provide students with disabilities access to the general curriculum, my school ensures that the general education curriculum is taught in ESE classes to the maximum extent possible. | 51 |
| • To provide students with disabilities access to the general curriculum, my school encourages collaboration among ESE teachers, GE teachers, and service providers. | 50 |
| • To help students with disabilities who take the FCAT, my school aligns curriculum for students with the standards that are tested on the FCAT. | 49 |
| • To encourage students with disabilities to stay in school, my school provides students with information about options after graduation. | 45 |
| • To provide students with disabilities access to the general curriculum, my school ensures that students with disabilities feel comfortable when taking classes with general education students. | 44 |
| • To keep students with disabilities from dropping out, my school provides social skills training to students as needed. | 43 |
| • To provide students with disabilities access to the general curriculum, my school provides adequate support to GE teachers who teach students with disabilities. | 42 |

Teacher Survey Results

MIDDLE (cont.)

(More than 25% but fewer than 75% of the respondents reported consistency in these areas.) %

| | |
|---|----|
| • To provide students with disabilities access to the general curriculum, my school offers teachers professional development opportunities regarding curriculum and support for students with disabilities. | 36 |
| • To encourage students with disabilities to stay in school, my school teaches transition skills for future employment and independent living. | 31 |
| • To encourage students with disabilities to stay in school, my school provides students with job training. | 25 |

LOW

(Fewer than 25% of the respondents reported consistency in these areas.) %

| | |
|---|----|
| • To encourage students with disabilities to stay in school, my school coordinates on-the-job training with outside agencies. | 24 |
|---|----|

**Lafayette County School District
 Focused Monitoring Report
 Student Survey Results**

In order to obtain the perspective of high school students with disabilities who receive services from public school districts, the Florida Department of Education, Bureau of Instructional Support and Community Services, contracted with the University of Miami to develop and administer a student survey in conjunction with the Bureau’s focused monitoring activities. The survey was administered for the first time during the 2002 monitoring year.

Surveys and administration scripts were sent to all schools in Lafayette County with students in grades 9-12. A total of 30 surveys were returned, representing 100% of the high school students with disabilities in the district. Data are from the only district high school. The percentage of students who replied “yes” is reported below.

HIGH

(More than 75% of the respondents replied with “yes.”)

| | % |
|--|----|
| • I am taking the following ESE classes: Math. | 93 |
| • At my school, ESE teachers believe that ESE students can learn. | 93 |
| • At my school, Regular education teachers believe that ESE students can learn. | 93 |
| • At my school, ESE students get the help they need to do well in school. | 90 |
| • At my school, ESE students are encouraged to stay in school. | 90 |
| • I am taking the following ESE classes: English. | 87 |
| • At my school, ESE teachers give students extra time or different assignments, if needed. | 87 |
| • At my school, ESE teachers give students extra help, if needed. | 87 |
| • Teachers help ESE students prepare for the FCAT. | 87 |
| • At my school, ESE students spend enough time with regular education students. | 86 |
| • I know the difference between a regular and a special diploma. | 86 |
| • At my school, ESE students participate in clubs, sports, and other activities. | 86 |
| • I know what courses I have to take to get my diploma. | 86 |
| • At my school, ESE teachers teach students in ways that help them learn. | 83 |
| • At my school, ESE teachers teach students things that will be useful later on in life. | 83 |
| • I took the FCAT this year. | 83 |
| • At my school, regular education teachers teach ESE students things that will be useful later on in life. | 83 |
| • At my school, ESE students are treated fairly by teachers and staff. | 82 |
| • At my school, ESE students fit in at school. | 82 |
| • At my school, regular education teachers teach ESE students in ways that help them learn. | 79 |
| • At my school, ESE teachers understand ESE students’ needs. | 79 |
| • At my school, regular education teachers understand ESE students’ needs. | 76 |

Student Survey Results

HIGH (cont.)

(More than 75% of the respondents replied with “yes.”) **%**

- I had a say in the decision about which diploma I would get. 76
- I agree with the type of diploma I am going to receive. 76

MIDDLE

(More than 25% but fewer than 75% of the respondents replied with “yes.”) **%**

-
- At my school, ESE teachers provide ESE students with updated books and materials. 73
 - At my school, ESE students can take vocational classes such as computers and business technology. 72
 - In my English/reading classes, we work on the kinds of skills that are tested on the reading part of the FCAT. 72
 - At my school, regular education teachers give ESE students extra help if needed. 71
 - I am taking the following regular/mainstream classes: Science. 70
 - I will probably graduate with a regular diploma. 70
 - In my math classes, we work on the kinds of problems that are tested on the math part of the FCAT. 70
 - At my school, ESE students get work experience (on-the-job training) if they are interested. 67
 - I am taking the following regular/mainstream classes: Electives (physical education, art, music) 66
 - At my school, ESE students get information about education after high school. 63
 - I am taking the following regular/mainstream classes: Social Studies. 62
 - I received accommodations (special testing conditions) for the FCAT. 62
 - I was invited to my IEP meeting this year. 57
 - I am taking the following regular/mainstream classes: Vocational (woodshop, computers). 47
 - At my school, regular education teachers give ESE students extra time or different assignments if needed. 46
 - I attended my IEP meeting this year. 38
 - I had a say in the decision about whether I need to take the FCAT or a different test. 34
 - I am taking the following ESE classes: Electives (physical education, art, music). 33
 - I had a say in the decision about special testing conditions I might get for the FCAT or other tests. 33
 - I had a say in the decision about which classes I would take. 31
 - I am taking the following ESE classes: Social Studies. 26

Student Survey Results

LOW

(Fewer than 25% of the respondents relied with “yes.”)

| | % |
|--|----|
| • I am taking the following regular/mainstream classes: English. | 24 |
| • I am taking the following regular/mainstream classes: Math. | 21 |
| • I am taking the following ESE classes: Science. | 19 |
| • I am taking the following ESE classes: Vocational (woodshop, computers). | 11 |

Appendix B- ESE Monitoring Team Members

**Lafayette County School District
Focused Monitoring Report
ESE Monitoring Team Members**

October 7-9, 2002

Department of Education Staff

Iris Anderson, Program Specialist, ESE Program Administration and Quality Assurance

Gail Best, Program Specialist, ESE Program Administration and Quality Assurance

Lee Clark, Program Specialist, ESE Program Administration and Quality Assurance

Contracted Staff

Maria Elena Arguelles, Researcher, University of Miami

Christopher Sarno, Researcher, University of Miami

Appendix C- Glossary of Acronyms

Glossary of Acronyms

| | |
|------------|---|
| Bureau | Bureau of Instructional Support and Community Services |
| CBI | Community Based Instruction |
| CRISS | Creating Independence <i>through</i> Student-Owned Strategies |
| DOE | Department of Education |
| EH | Emotionally Handicapped |
| ESE | Exceptional Student Education |
| FAPE | Free Appropriate Public Education |
| FCAT | Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test |
| FDLRS | Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System |
| FRI | Florida Reading Initiative |
| GE | General Education |
| IDEA | Individuals with Disabilities Education Act |
| IEP | Individual Educational Plan |
| LRE | Least Restrictive Environment |
| MIS | Management Information Systems |
| OJT | On-the-Job Training |
| Pre-K (PK) | Prekindergarten |
| SED | Severely Emotionally Disturbed |
| SFA | Success for All |
| SLD | Specific Learning Disability |

Appendix D- Forms Review

**Lafayette County School District
Focused Monitoring Report
Forms Review**

This form review was completed as a component of the focused monitoring visit conducted on October 7-9, 2002. We have compared the following forms to the requirements of applicable State Board of Education Rules, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), applicable sections of Title 34 of the 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.

Individual Educational Plan (IEP) Meeting

Form *Individual Educational Plan/Transition 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:

- There is not a place on the IEP that specifically reflects that the IEP has considered the results of recent state and district-wide assessments. While this information is not included as a part of the required content of the IEP, there must be documentation in the student record that the IEP committee has considered this information. It is suggested that at the next printing of this form, the district add a line to document the consideration of the results of recent state and district-wide assessments.
- It is assumed that when an IEP committee has determined that the student will need extended school year (ESY) services, the decision and the services that will be needed, if any, are included in the IEP under special education and related services. Currently there is a checkbox to indicate that the committee considered ESY, but not a section to document the committee's decision or the services needed, if any.

Parent Notification of Individual Educational Plan (IEP) Meeting

Form *Notice of Conference*

Source Book/Work Paper - IEP

Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulation Section 300.345

This form contains the components for compliance.

The following comments are made regarding this form:

- It is assumed that if the meeting is to review transition services, an agency representative(s) will be identified as one of the participants.

Documentation of Notice and Consent for Initial Placement

Form Informed Notice of Eligibility and Consent for Educational Placement.

Source Book/Work Paper - Program Areas

Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulation Sections 300.503, 300.505 and 300.534

The following must be addressed:

- The form provides only one source for the parent to contact to obtain assistance in understanding the provisions of IDEA, while the compliance component requires that two sources must be given.

Informed Notice and Consent for Evaluation

Form Informed Notice and Consent for Evaluation

Source Book/Work Paper - Evaluation

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

This form contains the components for compliance.

Informed Notice of Reevaluation

Form Informed Notice and Consent for Re-evaluation

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 provides only one source for the parent to contact to obtain assistance in understanding the provisions of IDEA, while the compliance component requires that two sources must be given.

The following comment is made regarding this form:

- This form does not have a place to document when the IEP team has determined that no additional testing will be recommended, nor a place to document that the parent is in agreement with that decision.

Notification of Change in Placement

Form Informed Notice of Change in Educational Placement

Source Book/Work Paper - IEP

Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulation Section 300.503

The following must be addressed:

- The form provides only one source for the parent to contact to obtain assistance in understanding the provisions of IDEA, while the compliance component requires that two sources must be given.

Notification of Change in FAPE

Form None provided

Source Book/Work Paper - IEP

Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulation Section 300.503

The following must be addressed:

- Section 300.503 of Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations (Title 34) requires, in part, that parents be given written notice a reasonable time before the district proposes to initiate or change the identification, evaluation, or educational placement of the child or the provision of FAPE to the child. The district must either develop a form or revise an existing form to meet the compliance components.

Informed Notice of Refusal

Form Informed Notice of Refusal to Take a Specific Action

Source Book/Work Paper - IEP

Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulation Section 300.503

The following must be addressed:

- This form documents notice to a parent when the district is going to refuse to initiate a formal evaluation, or to inform a parent when the district is going to refuse to change a student's educational placement. However, the form will need to be revised to document refusals for other actions.
- The form provides only one source for the parent to contact to obtain assistance in understanding the provisions of IDEA, while the compliance component requires that two sources must be given.

Documentation of Notice of Ineligibility

Form Informed Notice of Ineligibility

Source Book/Work Paper - Program Areas

Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulation Sections 300.503, 300.505 and 300.534

The following must be addressed:

- The form provides only one source for the parent to contact to obtain assistance in understanding the provisions of IDEA, while the compliance component requires that two sources must be given.
- The section of the form that states, “The ESE Administrator reviewed *and approved* this recommendation,” must either be revised to read, “The ESE Administrator reviewed this recommendation,” or deleted from this form. The statement is not required on the parental notice of ineligibility.

Documentation of Notice of Dismissal

Form Informed Notice of Dismissal

Source Book/Work Paper - Program Areas

Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulation Sections 300.503, 300.505 and 300.534

The following must be addressed:

- The section of the form that identifies dismissal as a result of a staffing committee could only be used for students identified as gifted. Since the reevaluation process must be used for students with disabilities prior to dismissal, and this process is the obligation of the IEP team, a decision regarding dismissal must be the result of the IEP meeting.

Documentation of Staffing/Eligibility Determination

Form ESE Staffing Committee Process Documentation

Source Book/Work Paper - Program Areas

Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulation Sections 300.503, 300.505 and 300.534

The following must be addressed:

- The section of the form that identifies dismissal as a result of a staffing committee could only be used for students identified as gifted. Since the reevaluation process must be used for students with disabilities prior to dismissal, and this process is the obligation of the IEP team, a decision regarding dismissal must be the result of the IEP meeting.
- The wording “The recommendation of the staffing committee was reviewed and: ‘Is Approved’ ‘Is Disapproved’.” will need to be revised to “The recommendation of the staffing committee was reviewed.” This will be followed by the “ESE Administrator or Designee” signature, and the date.

Confidentiality of Information

**Form *Notification of Rights under FERPA (Elementary School)* and *Hornet News (High School)*
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 form used by Lafayette Elementary School contains the components for compliance.

The following must be addressed:

- The form for Lafayette High School does not contain the required component of notifying parents if the district has a policy of disclosing educational 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 wording provided by the Bureau of Instructional Support and Community Services.