

FINAL REPORT: FOCUSED MONITORING
EXCEPTIONAL STUDENT EDUCATION PROGRAMS

MONROE COUNTY

APRIL 12 - 15, 2005



FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF EXCEPTIONAL EDUCATION AND STUDENT SERVICES

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

telephone: (850) 245-0477

FAX: (850) 245-0987

Suncom: 205-0477

e-mail: cicbiscs@fldoe.org

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

Monroe County School District Focused Monitoring System Improvement Strategies

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 Strategies	Evidence of Change and Reporting Date
Administration and Policy	<p>There are no findings of noncompliance.</p> <p>Recommendations are included in the respective section of this report and/or under <i>General Recommendations and Technical Assistance</i>.</p>				
Curriculum and Instruction	<p>At Coral Springs High School a teacher was assigned responsibility for the operation of the school’s childcare center at the same time the teacher was responsible for an ESE algebra course.</p> <p>Recommendations are included in the respective section of this report and/or under <i>General Recommendations and Technical Assistance</i>.</p>	X		<p>The district is required to make alternate arrangements for the operation of the school’s childcare center; a teacher with assigned teaching duties during a given period may not simultaneously operate the program.</p>	<p>Documentation of the resolution of this situation (e.g., teacher schedules) must be submitted to the Bureau by December 15, 2005.</p> <p>Schedule and changes made prior to the start of the August 2005 school year.</p>

Category	Findings	ESE	All	System Improvement Strategies	Evidence of Change and Reporting Date
Discipline and Classroom Management	There are no findings of noncompliance. Recommendations are included in the respective section of this report and/or under <i>General Recommendations and Technical Assistance</i> .				
Staff Development	There are no findings of noncompliance. Recommendations are included in the respective section of this report and/or under <i>General Recommendations and Technical Assistance</i> .				
Parental Involvement	There are no findings of noncompliance.				
DJJ Facilities	There are no findings of noncompliance. Recommendations are included in the respective section of this report and/or under <i>General Recommendations and Technical Assistance</i> .				
Charter Schools	Two IEPs were not current on the day of review. Recommendations are included in the <i>Recommendations and Technical Assistance</i> section of this report.	X		Director of Student Services and Charter School Directors to meet and discuss requirements. The LEA will organize coordinated and ensure IEPs are reviewed annually IEP and facilitate meetings for the Charter	District report of self-assessment indicates that ESE records are current and accurate for all ESE students enrolled in the district's charter school(s).

Category	Findings	ESE	All	System Improvement Strategies	Evidence of Change and Reporting Date
Charter Schools (continued)				<p>Schools. The LEA's Charter School contact will monitor the compliance issues related to Charter Schools. The Charter School will be responsible for development and implementation of each student IEP.</p> <p>The charter school will be required to develop and implement a coordinated plan for ensuring IEPs are reviewed annually.</p> <p>School and/or district staff will conduct quarterly reviews of student enrollment at the school to verify that all ESE records are current and accurate.</p>	<p>May 2006</p> <p>May 2007</p>
Counseling as a Related Service	<p>The record of one SED student did not have counseling documented on the IEP.</p> <p>Recommendations are included in the respective section of this report and/or under <i>General Recommendations and Technical Assistance</i>.</p>	X		The district will be required to reconvene the IEP team of the student in question to address the identified deficiency.	The district has provided documentation of completion of the reconvene requirement effective October 5, 2005.
Speech and Language	<p>There are no findings of noncompliance.</p> <p>Recommendations are included in the respective section of this report and/or</p>	X			

Category	Findings	ESE	All	System Improvement Strategies	Evidence of Change and Reporting Date
	under <i>General Recommendations and Technical Assistance</i> .				
Transition	<p>Lack of separate and distinct notice of transfer of rights.</p> <p>Recommendations are included in the respective section of this report and/or under <i>General Recommendations and Technical Assistance</i>.</p> <p>We request that the #13t transfer form that has been approved by the FDOE be accepted rather than requiring a self assessment. Based upon the memo 2005-35 sent on April 1, 2005 with the audit held April 11, 2005.</p>	X		<p>The district will be required to establish a procedure to ensure that a separate and distinct notice that rights have transferred is provided at the time a student turns 18, including a procedure for self-assessment of this requirement.</p> <p>The self-assessment procedure must include periodic sampling of the records of students age 18 and older.</p>	<p>District report of self-assessment indicates that appropriate notice of transfer of rights is provided to students with disabilities at the time of their 18th birthday (for 100% of records reviewed).</p> <p>May 2006 May 2007</p>
Gifted	<p>The EPs of students at Coral Shores High School and Key West High School inaccurately indicate that they are served through consultation.</p> <p>Services provided to students at the two high schools visited were not individualized to meet the specific needs of the students stemming from their giftedness.</p> <p>Recommendations are included in the respective section of this report and/or under <i>General Recommendations and Technical Assistance</i>.</p>	X		<p>The district is required to conduct a review of the service delivery models available by school, and to develop and implement a coordinated plan to ensure that sufficient supports and services are available for gifted students at all grade levels.</p>	<p>A plan for this review will be submitted to the Bureau by November 2005.</p> <p>The results of the review, including a plan for service delivery, will be provided to the Bureau by May 2006.</p>

Category	Findings	ESE	All	System Improvement Strategies	Evidence of Change and Reporting Date
Review of Student Records	<p>Systemic findings of noncompliance on IEPs were related to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inadequate statement of the student's present level of educational performance • inadequate statement of remediation needed to pass FCAT <p>Individual or non-systemic findings of noncompliance were noted on 28 additional IEP components.</p> <p>For 12 IEPs more than 50% of the annual goals were not measurable.</p> <p>Three IEPs were not current on the day of the on-site visit.</p> <p>The services identified on five of the 11 matrix of services documents reviewed were not in evidence on the students IEPs (45%), although provision of the services was confirmed through classroom visits.</p> <p>Systemic findings of noncompliance on EPs were related to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lack of a statement that parents had the right to bring someone with special knowledge and expertise about their child to the 	X		<p>Twelve IEP teams must reconvene to address specific findings described in a letter dated June 17, 2005.</p> <p>The district will be required to target noncompliant elements included under "Findings" in its training on IEP and EP development and conduct a self-evaluation using protocols developed by the Bureau to ensure compliance.</p> <p>Pre- and post- training surveys will be conducted to determine perceived effectiveness of the training.</p> <p>Using protocols developed by the Bureau, school and/or district staff will conduct compliance reviews of a random sample of 15 IEPs and 5 EPs developed by staff who participated in the training session</p> <p>The DOE will adjust the federal funds for three students whose records did not include current IEPs on the day of the review.</p> <p>The district will submit revisions</p>	<p>Documentation of the reconvened IEPs was submitted to the Bureau and accepted October 5, 2005.</p> <p>Documentation of corrections to the matrix of services documents was submitted to the Bureau on October 5, 2005.</p> <p>District report of self-assessment reveals compliance with all targeted elements for 100% of IEPs and EPs reviewed.</p> <p>Results of the matrix review will be reported annually.</p> <p>May 2006</p> <p>May 2007</p>

Category	Findings	ESE	All	System Improvement Strategies	Evidence of Change and Reporting Date
Review of Student Records (continued)	<p>meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no evaluation schedule for each outcome identified • no statement of how the student's progress toward annual goals would be measured • no statement of how the parents would be informed of the progress toward the annuals goals • no documentation that the results of recent evaluations, class work, and district and statewide assessments were considered • lack of a general education teacher present at the EP meeting • lack of documentation that parents had received or been provided a copy of the EP • EPs not reviewed within the required time period <p>Individual or non-systemic findings of noncompliance were noted on 2 additional EP components.</p>			<p>to its data through the Automated Student Database for the five students whose matrix of services documents were found to be inaccurately reported.</p> <p>Using protocols developed by the Bureau, district staff will conduct reviews of two IEPs per school for students reported through the FEFP at the 254 or 255 level of funding (first and last record from alphabetical list of 254/255 records). For students whose IEPs do not support the services on the matrix or for whom the services are not in evidence, the district will submit an amendment to the Automated Student Information System database for the open window of correction.</p>	
Review of District Forms Review of	<p>The following forms require revision to demonstrate compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Notice and Consent for Initial Placement</i> • <i>Informed Notice and Consent for</i> 	X			Revised forms were submitted to the Bureau and approved September 13, 2005.

Category	Findings	ESE	All	System Improvement Strategies	Evidence of Change and Reporting Date
District Forms (continued)	<p><i>Evaluation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Informed Notice and Consent for Reevaluation</i> • <i>Notification of Change of Placemen/FAPE</i> • <i>Informed Notice of Refusal</i> • <i>Informed Notice of Dismissal</i> • <i>Notice: Not Eligible for Exceptional Student Placement</i> • <i>Annual Notice of Confidentiality</i> <p>Recommendations were indicated for 10 forms.</p>				

Appendix A:

District Data

**Florida Department of Education
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services
2005 Focused Monitoring
Monroe County School District**

Districts Rank-Ordered on Dropout Rate for Students with Disabilities

Based on data reported to the FDOE for Survey 5 (2003-04), dropout rates for students with disabilities were used to rank-order the districts.

District	Dropout Rate	Rank
Franklin	11.3%	1
Bradford	10.7%	2
Gadsden	9.1%	3
Suwannee	8.4%	4
Baker	8.0%	5
Hardee	7.5%	6
Flagler	7.4%	7
Duval	7.2%	8
Miami Dade	6.9%	9
Hamilton	6.8%	10
Monroe	6.7%	11
Levy	6.7%	12
Lake	6.6%	13
Osceola	6.4%	14
Hernando	6.3%	15
Citrus	6.2%	16
Dixie	6.1%	17
Pasco	6.0%	18
Okeechobee	6.0%	19
Taylor	5.9%	20
Lee	5.6%	21
Jefferson	5.6%	22
Collier	5.5%	23
Putnam	5.4%	24
Polk	5.4%	25
Lafayette	5.4%	26
Manatee	5.4%	27
Marion	5.4%	28
Sumter	5.3%	29
Pinellas	5.3%	30
Highlands	5.3%	31
DeSoto	5.2%	32
Escambia	5.1%	33
Wakulla	5.1%	34

District	Dropout Rate	Rank
Sarasota	4.9%	35
St. Johns	4.9%	36
Calhoun	4.7%	37
Palm Beach	4.6%	38
Leon	4.6%	39
Orange	4.6%	40
Jackson	4.5%	41
Hendry	4.4%	42
Charlotte	4.4%	43
Gilchrist	4.3%	44
Madison	4.3%	45
Holmes	4.0%	46
Clay	3.9%	47
Bay	3.9%	48
Gulf	3.8%	49
Walton	3.7%	50
St. Lucie	3.7%	51
Hillsborough	3.5%	52
Okaloosa	3.2%	53
Santa Rosa	3.1%	54
Washington	3.0%	55
Columbia	3.0%	56
Volusia	2.7%	57
Alachua	2.5%	58
Seminole	2.4%	59
Indian River	2.4%	60
Broward	1.8%	61
Glades	1.8%	62
Brevard	1.3%	63
Nassau	1.3%	64
Union	0.9%	65
Martin	0.8%	66
Liberty	0.5%	67
District Total	4.7%	

Note: Shaded districts have been monitored during the past four years or are currently being monitored.

Appendix B:
ESE Monitoring Team Participants

Appendix C:
Survey Results

