

PASCO COUNTY
Focused Monitoring

Exceptional Student Education Programs

December 4 – 7, 2006

Florida Department of Education
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services
ESE Program Administration and Quality Assurance

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 that support educational programs, and parents in the provision of special programs for exceptional students. For additional information on this publication, or for a list of available publications, contact:

Clearinghouse Information Center
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services
Florida Department of Education
325 W. Gaines Street, Room 628
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0400.

Telephone: 850.245.0477

Fax: 850.245.0987

SunCom: 205-0477

E-mail: cicbiscs@fldoe.org

Web site: www.fldoe.org/ese

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

T. WILLARD FAIR, *Chairman*

Members

DONNA G. CALLAWAY

DR. AKSHAY DESAI

ROBERTO MARTÍNEZ

PHOEBE RAULERSON

KATHLEEN SHANAHAN

LINDA K. TAYLOR

Jeanine Blomberg
Commissioner of Education



July 31, 2007

Ms. Heather Fiorentino, Superintendent
Pasco County School District
7227 Land O'Lakes Boulevard
Land O'Lakes, Florida 34639-2899

Dear Superintendent Fiorentino:

We are pleased to provide you with the Final Report of Focused Monitoring of Exceptional Student Education Programs in Pasco County. This report was developed by integrating multiple sources of information, including: student record reviews; interviews with school and district staff; information from focus groups; and parent survey data from our visit on December 4-7, 2006. The final report will be placed on the Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services' website and may be viewed at www.fldoe.org/ese.

The report includes a system improvement plan outlining the findings of the monitoring team. Bureau staff have worked with Monica Verra, ESE Director, and her staff to develop a system improvement plan that includes strategies and activities to address the areas of concern and noncompliance identified in the report. We anticipate that some of the action steps that will be implemented will be long term in duration, and will require time to assess the measure of effectiveness. The system improvement plan has been approved and is included as a part of this final report.

The first scheduled update on the system improvement plan will be due on November 30, 2007. The Department of Education must ensure timely corrections on noncompliance within one year of reporting to the district. The successful completion of improvement plan activities and the submission of the annual report no later than June 7, 2008, will be required. A verification monitoring visit to your district may take place after review of the annual report.

BAMBI J. LOCKMAN
Chief

Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services

Superintendent Fiorentino
July 31, 2007
Page 2

If my staff can be of any assistance as you implement the system improvement plan, please contact Kim C. Komisar, Program Director, ESE Monitoring. Dr. Komisar may be reached at 850-245-0476, or via electronic mail at Kim.Komisar@fldoe.org.

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

Sincerely,



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

Enclosure

cc: Cathi Martin, School Board Chair
Members of the School Board
McClain & Alfonso, School Board Attorneys
School Principals
Monica Verra, ESE Director
Kim Komisar

PASCO COUNTY

Focused Monitoring

Exceptional Student Education Programs

December 4-7, 2006

Florida Department of Education
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services
ESE Program Administration and Quality Assurance

**Pasco County Final Monitoring Report
Focused Monitoring
December 4-7, 2006**

Table of Contents

Monitoring Process	1
Authority	1
State Performance Plan and Monitoring	1
Indicator Selection	2
Background Information and Demographics	2
Parent Survey Report: Students with Disabilities	3
Monitoring Activities	4
Reporting of Information	6
Reporting Table	9
Dropout	9
Performance on Statewide Assessment	9
Behavior/Discipline	9
Least Restrictive Environment (ages 6-21)	9
Least Restrictive Environment (PreK)	10
Child Find/Disproportionate Representation – Selected Disabilities – MH	10
Secondary Transition	10
Gifted	10
Matrix of Services	11
System Improvement Plan	13
Promising Practices, Recommendations and Technical Assistance	13
Promising Practices	13
Recommendations	14
Technical Assistance	14
System Improvement Strategies	15
Appendix A: ESE Monitoring Team Members	17

Pasco County Final Monitoring Report

Focused Monitoring

December 4-7, 2006

Monitoring Process

Authority

The Florida Department of Education (DOE), Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services, in carrying out its roles of leadership, resource allocation, technical assistance, monitoring, and evaluation, is required to oversee the performance of district school boards in the enforcement of all laws and rules (Sections 1001.03(8) and 1008.32, Florida Statutes (F.S.)). In fulfilling this requirement, the Bureau conducts monitoring activities of the exceptional student education (ESE) programs provided by district school boards, in accordance with Sections 1001.42 and 1003.57, F.S. Through these monitoring activities, the Bureau examines and evaluates procedures, records, and ESE programs; provides information and assistance to school districts; and otherwise assists school districts in operating effectively and efficiently. One purpose of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA 2004) is to assess and ensure the effectiveness of efforts to educate children with disabilities (Section 300.1(d) of Title 34, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), and school districts are required to make a good faith effort to assist children with disabilities to achieve their stated goals and objectives in the least restrictive environment (34 CFR §300.350(a)(2) and §300.556). In accordance with the IDEA 2004, the Department is responsible for ensuring that the requirements of the IDEA are executed and that each educational program for children with disabilities administered in the state meets the educational requirements of the state (34 CFR §300.600(a)(1) and (2)). Federal Regulations for IDEA 2004 were made public on August 14, 2006, and implementation required on October 13, 2006.

The monitoring system reflects the Department's commitment to provide assistance, service, and accountability to school districts, and is designed to emphasize improved educational outcomes for students while continuing to conduct those activities necessary to ensure compliance with applicable federal laws and regulations and state statutes and rules. In addition, these activities serve to ensure implementation of corrective actions, such as those required subsequent to monitoring by the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE), Office of Special Education Programs, and (OSEP) and by the Office for Civil Rights (OCR), as well as other quality assurance activities of the Department.

State Performance Plan and Monitoring

In accordance with 34 CFR 300.600(a)(1), not later than one (1) year after the date of enactment of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004, each state must have in place a performance plan that evaluates the state's efforts to implement the requirements and purposes of Part B and describe how the state will improve such implementation. The purpose of the monitoring process is to implement a methodology that targets the Bureau's monitoring

intervention on key data indicators identified as significant for educational outcomes for students. Through this process, the Bureau uses data to inform the monitoring process, thereby implementing a strategic approach to intervention and commitment of resources that will improve student outcomes. A detailed description of the Bureau's monitoring processes is provided in *Focused Monitoring and Verification Monitoring: Work Papers and Source Book for Exceptional Student Education Programs (2006-07)*. The protocols used by Bureau staff when conducting procedural compliance reviews are available in *Compliance Manual: Work Papers and Source Book for Exceptional Student Education Programs (2006-07)*. These documents are available on the Bureau's website at www.firn.edu/doe/commhome/mon-home.htm.

Indicator Selection

In its continuing effort to focus the monitoring process on student educational outcomes, there are three (3) specific monitoring priority areas which are identified in the IDEA 2004, section 616(a)(3). The first priority is the provision of a free appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE) which includes standard diploma rate, dropout rate, participation and performance on statewide assessments, suspension and expulsion, LRE for both ages 6-21 and for ages 3-5, PK outcomes, and parent satisfaction. The second priority is general supervision by the state which includes child find, transition (Part C to Part B), secondary transition, and postsecondary outcomes. The third priority is disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services including all disabilities in general and specific disability categories. The IDEA 2004 can be viewed on website: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/idea2004.html>.

Data on all State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators used to determine the focus for an on-site visit to the Pasco County School District were based on a review of data from the 2006 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile that was submitted electronically to the Department of Education Information Database for Surveys 2, 3, 5, 9, and from the assessment files for each school year. This data is compiled into an annual data profile for each school district. The 2006 LEA Profiles for all Florida school districts are available on the Bureau's website at <http://www.firn.edu/doe/commhome/datapage.htm>. Data from parent calls, complaints, due process hearings, and mediations were also reviewed in the pre-staffing for this school district.

Background Information and Demographics

During the week of December 4, 2006, the Florida Department of Education, Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services, conducted an on-site review of the exceptional student education (ESE) programs in the Pasco County Public Schools. Ms. Monica Verra, ESE Director, served as the coordinator and point of contact for the school district during the monitoring visit. Pasco County was monitored on the following indicators: least restrictive environment (LRE) for ages 3-5, LRE for ages 6-21, performance on statewide assessment, disproportionate representation (selected disabilities and gifted), secondary transition, behavior/discipline and dropout.

According to the 2006 LEA Profile, the Pasco County School District has a total school population (Pre-Kindergarten (Pre-K) -12th grade) of 62,768. Eighteen percent (18%) of students

were identified as students with disabilities. Pasco County is considered a “large size” school district, and is in the enrollment group with these school districts: Brevard, Collier, Escambia, Lee, Manatee, Marion, Osceola, Polk, Sarasota, Seminole and Volusia. Pasco County School District has thirty eight (38) elementary schools, eleven (11) middle/junior high schools, thirty (30) senior high schools, three (3) combination schools, six (6) charter schools, and six (6) Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) centers.

Forty one percent (41%) of all students are on free/reduced lunches, and four percent (4%) are identified as limited English proficient (LEP). Of the students with disabilities who exited from the school district during the 2004-05 school year, thirty eight percent (38%) met all graduation requirements for a standard diploma, eighteen percent (18%) met the requirements through a waiver of a passing score on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), and less than one percent (<1%) graduated through the General Educational Development diploma (GED) exit option (i.e., under-credited students who have passed the FCAT and who pass the GED examination). The school district’s dropout rate during 2004-05 was four percent (4%) for all students, six percent (6%) for students with disabilities, and less than one percent (<1%) for gifted students. Less than one percent (<1%) of the population of students with disabilities received out-of-school suspensions or expulsions totaling more than ten days, compared to less than one percent (<1%) for nondisabled students.

The Pasco County School District’s racial/ethnic student demographics for all students with disabilities are: White (81%); Black (6%); Hispanic (10%); Asian/Pacific Islander (less than 1%); American Indian/Alaskan Native (less than 1%); and Multiracial (3%). For students who are gifted, the racial/ethnic demographics are: White (86%); Black (2%); Hispanic (5%); Asian/Pacific Islander (4%); American Indian/Alaskan Native (less than 1%); and Multiracial (3%).

Parent Survey Report: Students with Disabilities

FDOE has elected to use the 25-item scale from the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) survey that addresses family involvement. Each family selected to be included in the annual sample received a mailed survey printed on an optical scan form accompanied by a cover letter explaining the importance of the survey and guaranteeing the confidentiality of the parent’s responses. The packet also included a pre-addressed, postage-prepaid envelope for return of the survey. The survey was provided in three languages: English, Spanish, and Haitian-Creole.

Data from the surveys was scanned into an electronic database and sent to Dr. William Fisher, NCSEAM’s measurement consultant, who analyzed the data and produced reports at both the state and LEA levels.

During the 2005-06 school year, the parent survey was sent to parents of 4,708 students (PK-12) with disabilities in Pasco County School District for whom complete addresses were provided by the school district. A total of 540 parents, representing 11.5% of the sample, returned the survey. When applying the standard of measure indicating their perception of schools’ facilitation of

parental involvement, 32% of parents of children ages 3-21 reported their perceived level of satisfaction at or above the standard.

Monitoring Activities

The 2006 monitoring process for the Pasco County School district included data review, interviews with administrators, teachers, and other service delivery providers, focus group interviews with students, case studies, classroom observations, record reviews, and a review of the parent surveys. Peer monitors, who are exceptional student education personnel from other Florida school districts, are trained to assist with the DOE’s monitoring activities.

An on-site focused monitoring visit to the school district was conducted from December 4-7, 2006, by five (5) Bureau staff members and fifteen (15) peer monitors. A listing of these staff and peer monitors is included as appendix A. On-site visits were made to the following:

- Centennial Elementary School
- Fox Hollow Elementary School
- Gulfside Elementary School
- Lake Myrtle Elementary School
- Pasco Elementary School
- Richey Elementary School
- Seven Oaks Elementary School
- Seven Springs Elementary School
- Wesley Chapel Elementary School
- River Ridge Middle School
- Hudson High School
- J.W. Mitchell High School
- Wesley Chapel High School
- Dayspring Academy (Charter School)
- Mandala Adolescent Treatment Center (DJJ)

A summary of the monitoring activities conducted in Pasco County is included in the table below.

Activity	Source	Number
Interviews	District staff	6
	School staff	
	▪ School administrators/non-instructional support	56
	▪ ESE teachers—disabilities and gifted	42
	▪ General education teachers	<u>19</u>
	Total	123
Focus Groups	J.W. Mitchell High School - grades 9-12	
	▪ Students pursuing special diploma	14
	▪ Students pursuing standard diploma	<u>8</u>
	Total	22

Activity	Source	Number
Case studies	Individual student case studies	51
Classroom Visits	ESE and general education classrooms	75
Record Reviews	IEPs	
	▪ Full desk and targeted on-site reviews	112
	▪ Matrix of services documents	28
	EPs	
	▪ Full desk and targeted on-site reviews	35
	Transition IEPs	73
FCAT Waivers	17	
		Total 265

Through a review of the school district’s Continuous Improvement/Self Improvement Plan (June 2006), and interviews with the school personnel, the following actions and improvements were noted in regards to gifted disproportionality and ESE discipline rates:

- **Disproportionate Representation of student membership in programs for the gifted**
(Purpose: The distribution of students from underrepresented populations identified as gifted will increase to more closely reflect the overall distribution of the school district’s population. The criteria for eligibility for membership in the gifted program under Plan B is found in 6A-6.03019(2)(b), FAC.)
 - The school district reviewed 2004-05 SAT and FCAT scores for all who qualified as ESOL/LEP students and were eligible for Free/Reduced Lunch to assist in identifying potential Plan B candidates. From August 2005 to June 1, 2006, 57% of the students considered under Plan B were found eligible for gifted services.
 - School district student membership of free/reduced lunch increased for gifted students from 22% in the 2004-05 school year to 23% in the 2005-06 school year. LEP increased from less than one percent (<1%) in 2004-05, to three percent (3%) in the 2005-06 school year.
 - School guidance counselors and administrators have begun contacting the school district office requesting copies of the lists of underrepresented students specific to their schools.
 - School personnel are using the lists for screening appropriate candidates for gifted eligibility under Plan B.
 - School personnel are contacting district office for technical guidance with interpreting and implementing the Plan B criteria for determining eligibility.
 - Parents of Plan B candidates are beginning to demonstrate knowledge of gifted eligibility by contacting the school district office for clarification regarding the criteria for Plan B eligibility.
 - Student Services’ data reports that the Reynolds Intellectual Assessment Scale (RIAS) has been a more effective measure for identifying under represented gifted students when compared to other assessments, such as the WISC IV and Woodcock Johnson.

- **ESE Discipline Rates**

(Purpose: Schools will report a decrease in the use of In-School Suspension with ESE students through the implementation of alternative strategies. Goal: Reduce the percentage of ESE students being assigned ISS to the same level as like-size school districts.)

- The Code of Student Conduct was revised to reflect more appropriate levels of severity for certain violations. In addition, procedures were changed to limit processing of Level III offenses to administrators only.
- ESE and Student Services Departments collaborated to provide Associate Behavior Analysts Certification training to selected school district staff. Upon completion of certification process, the group will be used as intervention teams across the school district.
- Discipline data will be incorporated into Pasco's new on-line database by the end of the 06-07 school year.
- The ESE and Student Services Departments collaborated to provide an evening Team-Based Intervention training for school-based and itinerant staff.
- ESE, Student Services, and Information Services Departments continue to incorporate discipline data into an on-line database, making it more accessible to all school staff.
- The ESE and Student Services Departments collaborated to adopt "Getting Off to a Good Start" (GOTAGS), which is a classroom management program. Pasco trained 35 staff to be teacher trainers. Pasco will target all new teachers for the 06-07 school year.
- The ESE and Student Services Departments collaborated to provide an associate-level behavior analyst certification training for school-based and itinerant ESE and Student Services staff.

Reporting of Information

Findings based on data generated through: record reviews; focus group interviews; individual interviews; case studies; classroom visits; parent surveys; and, the review of school district forms are summarized in the reporting table that follows. This report provides conclusions with regard to the key data indicators and specifically addresses related areas that may contribute to or impact the indicators.

As part of the monitoring activities, school district forms and documents representing nine areas of the ESE process were reviewed to determine compliance with federal and state requirements. The items that needed to be corrected were listed in a letter to the ESE Director on April 20, 2007.

To the extent possible, this report focuses on systemic issues, rather than on isolated instances of noncompliance or need for improvement. In accordance with established Bureau monitoring procedures, a finding of a systemic violation will be made if evidence of such a violation is found in 25% or more of the pertinent data sources. There were no systemic findings in the Pasco County School District. There were no instances of noncompliance with federal

requirements for programs for students with disabilities that will result in the adjustment of federal funds. Individual or non-systemic findings are noted in the table in this report.

In response to specific student related findings listed in the letter to the ESE Director on May 11, 2007, the school district is required to correct the items as noted. This letter identifies the specific area(s) of the student's IEP/EP/TIEP for which a team meeting must be held to correct the finding and/or specifies an action the school district must perform to correct data.

During the course of conducting the focused monitoring activities, it is often the case that suggestions and/or recommendations related to interventions or strategies are proposed, and promising practices are noted. Listings of these recommendations and promising practices, as well as DOE contacts available to provide technical assistance in the development and implementation of a system improvement plan, are included following the reporting table.

In response to the findings included in the reporting table, the school district is required to develop a system improvement plan. This plan is developed in consultation with the Bureau, and must include activities and strategies intended to address specific findings, as well as measurable evidence of change. A draft system improvement plan is also included.

**Pasco County School District
Focused Monitoring**

Reporting Table

Standard/Citation	Findings	Supporting Evidence	Concerns
Indicator #2: Dropout			
Related Factors: General; Child Study Team/Attendance			
	There are no findings of noncompliance in this area.		
Indicator #3: Performance on Statewide Assessment			
Related Factors: FCAT Waiver/Other Options			
	There are no findings of noncompliance in this area.		
Indicator #4: Behavior/Discipline			
Related Factors: IEP Requirements/Implementation; Functional Behavioral Assessment (FBA)/Positive Behavior Intervention Plan (PBIP)			
	There are no findings of noncompliance in this area.		
Indicator #5: Least Restrictive Environment (ages 6-21)			
Related Factor: IEP Requirements/Implementation			
34 CFR §300.346(a)(2)(i) Rule 6A-6.03028(6)(d), FAC Rule 6A-6.03016, FAC	Counseling is required for the students identified as severely emotionally disturbed (SED). This was not being provided for all students.	For four (4) students identified with the primary exceptionality of SED, there was no evidence that counseling was being provided.	IEPs at all schools visited showed changes, revisions and updates to the IEPs in highlighted color coding (some with 1-3 different colors). Many of these were not readable and were difficult to interpret to determine if the IEP dates were out of compliance. Some changes were initialed, and others were not. There are concerns that the color coding may present a challenge to the parents when receiving copies

Standard/Citation	Findings	Supporting Evidence	Concerns
			of the IEP, because the color coding is not visible on copies. At one elementary school, not all minutes with nondisabled peers are documented, such as recess and physical education.
Indicator #6: Least Restrictive Environment (PreK)			
Related Factors: Continuum of Placements/General; IEP/IFSP Requirements/Implementation; Removal Standard – Placement;			
	There are no findings of noncompliance in this area.		Not all pre-kindergarten students in elementary schools have time with typically developing peers.
Indicator #10: Child Find/Disproportionate Representation – Selected Disabilities – MH			
Related Factors: Activities Required Prior to Referrals (K-12 only); Referral; Evaluation; Assessments; Eligibility; Reevaluation			
	There are no findings of noncompliance in this area.		
Indicator #13: Secondary Transition			
Related Factor: IEP Notice IEP Meeting; IEP Contents; Transfer of Rights; Summary of Performance			
Rule 6A-6.03027, FAC SPP Indicator 13	Transition IEPs do not include coordinated, measurable, annual goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goal(s).	Two (2) students' transition IEPs do not include coordinated, measurable, annual goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goal(s).	Agency representatives are invited to the transition IEP meetings, but there is minimal documentation of them attending, and there is inconsistent evidence that they are providing input into the team meetings.
Gifted			
Related Factors: Eligibility; Service Delivery; EP Requirements/Implementation			
	There are no findings of noncompliance in these areas.		There is inconsistency in the writing of measurable goals on students' educational plans.

Standard/Citation	Findings	Supporting Evidence	Concerns
Matrix of Services			
S. 1011.62(1)(e), F.S., Funding model for exceptional student education programs	One (1) matrix of services documents reviewed was inaccurately reported.	<p>One (1) of twenty eight (28) matrix of services documents for students reported at the 254 or 255 level was not accurately reported.</p> <p>The school district has made the amendment to the Automated Student Information System database.</p>	

System Improvement Plan

In response to these findings, the school district is required to develop a system improvement plan for submission to the Bureau. This plan must include activities and strategies intended to address specific findings, as well as measurable evidence of change. In developing the system improvement plan, every effort should be made to link the system improvement activities resulting from this focused monitoring report to the school district's targeted technical assistance needs identified through the State Performance Plan Indicator teams. The promising practices, recommendations, and technical assistance resources included below should be considered when developing strategies and/or interventions targeting the critical issues identified by the Bureau as most significantly in need of improvement.

Promising Practices, Recommendations and Technical Assistance

Promising Practices

During the on-site visit, and through the pre-visit interviews with the school district personnel, numerous promising practices were noted by school district and school staff and by Bureau and peer monitors. Some of the reported promising practices were school specific, some were grade specific, and others were the results of district-wide initiatives. The school district is encouraged to continue to promote an atmosphere where teachers and staff can share these practices. Some of the reported promising practices are listed below.

- There is extensive training throughout the year for ESE and general education teachers, for different areas of exceptional student education.
- There is high parent involvement in the school district with the ESE programs. Parents of Plan B candidates are becoming more active and are demonstrating their knowledge of gifted eligibility through their increased contacts with the school district's ESE office.
- Students are closely monitored with a detailed tracking system throughout high school, to prevent at-risk students from dropping out. ESE, Student Services, and Information Services Departments continue to incorporate discipline data into an on-line database, making it more accessible to all school staff.
- A middle school has a dropout prevention program, "DOP – Why Try?" that focuses on the lowest quartile of students with high absences and low academic scores. Also at this school, the students participate in two businesses – the Dog Biscuit Company and the paper shredding business.
- High schools are organized into a structure of smaller, more personalized "schools within a school" called learning communities. Four career cluster areas offered by the high schools are: Arts and Communication; Business, Administration and Information Technology; Health, Human and Public Services; and Science, Technology and Technical Studies.
- The ESE department uses a detailed training manual, "A Practical guide for Bridging the Gap between School and Community Living," that offers students, parents and teachers a reference for transition services available through the District School Board. Other published materials include a transition DVD and the Career and Academic Planner (CAP) Program which provides career exploration and decision-making for students in grades 8-12.

- The school district has an interagency council (POST) that has focus groups to address transition barriers and needs.

Recommendations

Recommendations have been proposed for the school district to consider when developing the system improvement plan and determining strategies that are most likely to effect change. The list is not all-inclusive, and is intended only as a starting point for discussion among the parties responsible for the development of the system improvement plan (SIP).

- Continue to work with the State Performance Plan Indicator Group to improve the extent to which children with disabilities (ages 3-5) are provided services in environments with typically developing peers.
- Continue training/monitoring in the completion of Matrix of Services to ensure accurate ratings
- Conduct periodic self-assessments of ESE programs across schools to ensure that IEPs and EPs are being written with measurable goals and that these documents are completed accurately.
- Continue to develop and implement strategies to ensure that all gifted students are provided with appropriate services based on their needs beyond the general curriculum.

Technical Assistance

Bureau staff are available for assistance on a variety of topics. Staff may be contacted for assistance in the development and/or implementation of the system improvement plan. Following is a partial list of contacts:

ESE Monitoring
(850) 245-0476

Kim Komisar, Program Director
Kim.Komisar@fldoe.org

Annette Oliver, Program Specialist
Annette.Oliver@fldoe.org

ESE Program Development and Services
(850) 245-0478

Cathy Bishop, Administrator
Cathy.Bishop@fldoe.org

Clearinghouse Information Center
cicbiscs@FLDOE.org
(850) 245-0477

Kathy Dejoie, Program Director
Kathy.Dejoie@fldoe.org

Special Programs Information, Clearinghouse and Evaluation
(850) 245-0475

Karen Denbroeder, Administrator
Karen.Denbroeder@fldoe.org

**Pasco County School District
Focused Monitoring
System Improvement Strategies**

The school district is required to provide system improvement strategies to address identified findings of noncompliance, which may include an explanation of specific activities the school 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. In addition to findings of noncompliance, the report includes areas of concern that the school district is encouraged to address, either through this system improvement plan or through other avenues. Resources, suggestions and/or recommended actions are provided following this plan format.

15

Findings of Noncompliance	Improvement Strategies/Interventions	Outcome Measures and Timeline
Indicator #5: Least Restrictive Environment (ages 6-21)		
Related Factor: IEP Requirements/Implementation		
Counseling was required for the students identified as severely emotionally disturbed (SED). Beginning July 1, 2007, counseling will no longer be a required component of a student's IEP.	The IEPs for identified SED students will be reviewed for need for counseling.	August 31, 2007
	Using protocols developed by the Bureau, school and/or district staff will conduct semi-annual compliance reviews of a random sample of at least ten (10) IEPs.	February 1, 2008
		May 1, 2008
Indicator #6 Least Restrictive Environment (PreK)		
There were no findings of noncompliance in this area.	<i>The school district is encouraged to include strategies in their district ESE staff development to address concerns noted in the body of this report.</i>	
Indicator #10 Child find/Disproportionate Representation – Selected Disabilities - MH		
There were no findings of noncompliance in this area.	<i>The school district is encouraged to include strategies in their district ESE staff development to address concerns noted in the body of this report.</i>	

Findings of Noncompliance	Improvement Strategies/Interventions	Outcome Measures and Timeline
Indicator #13: Secondary Transition		
Transition IEPs do not include coordinated, measurable, annual goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.	<p>The Transition IEP teams for the identified students will reconvene to address identified findings.</p> <p><i>The school district is encouraged to include strategies in their district ESE staff development to address concerns noted in the body of this report.</i></p>	August 31, 2007
Gifted		
There were no findings of noncompliance in this area.	<p><i>The school district is encouraged to include strategies in their district ESE staff development to address concerns noted in the body of this report.</i></p>	

Appendix A:

ESE Monitoring Team Members

**Florida Department of Education
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services
2006-07 Focused Monitoring
Pasco County School District**

Department of Education Staff

Bambi J. Lockman, Chief, Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services
Eileen L. Amy, Administrator, ESE Program Administration and Quality Assurance
Ginny Chance, Program Director, ESE Program Administration and Quality Assurance

ESE Monitoring Team Members

Annette Oliver, Program Specialist, Team Lead
Ginny Chance, Program Director
Laura Harrison, Program Specialist
Marilyn Hibbard, Program Specialist
Angela Nathaniel, Program Specialist

Peer Reviewers and Contracted Staff

Jan Benet, Alachua County School District
Dwanette Dilworth, Marion County School District
Kim Dotts-Hoehnle, UF/P.K. Yonge Development Research School
Audrey Dukes, Alachua County School District
Debi Dukes, Union County School District
Jim Fowler, Broward County School District
Dianne Frye, St. Lucie County School District
Cathy Hedbawny, Jackson County School District
Willis Henderson, Escambia County School District
Kim Keene, Jackson County School District
Susan Poston, Alachua County School District
Lisa Rowland, Gilchrist County School District
Martha Scott, Gadsden County School District
Angela Spornraft, Hardee County School District
Crystal Woodall, Union County School District