

**2013-14 Exceptional Student Education
Monitoring and Assistance
On-Site Visit Report**

**St. Lucie County School District
January 22-23, 2014**



This publication is produced through the Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services (BEESS), Division of Public Schools, Florida Department of Education, and is available online at <http://www.fldoe.org/ease/mon-home.asp>. For information on available resources, contact the BEESS Resource and Information Center (BRIC).

BRIC website: <http://www.fldoe.org/ease/clerhome.asp>

Email: BRIC@fldoe.org

Telephone: 850-245-0475

Fax: 850-245-0987





State Board of Education

Gary Chartrand, *Chair*
John R. Padget, *Vice Chair*
Members
Ada G. Armas, M.D.
John A. Colon
Marva Johnson
Rebecca Fishman Lipsey
Andy Tuck

Pam Stewart
Commissioner of Education

November 10, 2014

Ms. Genelle Zoratti Yost, Superintendent
St. Lucie County School District
4204 Okeechobee Road
Ft. Pierce, Florida 34947-5414

Dear Superintendent Yost:

We are pleased to provide you with the **2013-14 Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Monitoring and Assistance On-Site Visit Report for St. Lucie County School District**. This report was developed by integrating multiple sources of information related to an on-site monitoring visit to your school district on January 22-23, 2014. Those information sources included interviews with district and school staff, student record reviews, **Local Educational Agency Profiles, Guiding Questions – District-Level Needs Assessment** and an action-planning and problem-solving process. This report will be posted on the Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services' (BEESS) website and may be accessed at <http://www.fldoe.org/ease/mon-home.asp>.

The 2013-14 ESE Monitoring and Assistance process focuses on those State Performance Plan indicators that contributed to the targeting of school districts for coordinated early intervening services and those indicators that affect equity and access in the educational environment for students with disabilities. Additionally, the process focuses on a shift from ESE compliance to outcomes to prepare all students for college and career readiness, which include: increasing standard diploma graduates; decreasing the number of students dropping out of school; increasing regular class placement; decreasing the need for seclusion and restraint; and eliminating disproportionality in eligibility identification and discipline.

The St. Lucie County School District was selected for an on-site visit due to equity and access issues related to rates of incidents of restraints and the rates of suspension and expulsion for students with disabilities. The on-site visit was conducted by a state support team (SST) that included BEESS and discretionary project staff.

Monica Verra-Tirado, Ed.D., Chief
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services

Superintendent Yost
November 10, 2014
Page Two

Mr. Bill Tomlinson, assistant superintendent, ESE, Student Services, and Alternative Education, and his staff were very helpful to the SST in preparing for the on-site visit and throughout the visit. In addition, the principals and other staff members at the schools visited welcomed the SST and demonstrated a commitment to the education of students in the school district.

As part of the SST's visit, representatives from the school district's ESE department, the schools visited and other school district staff participated in an action-planning and problem-solving process. This group reviewed the school district's data collected prior to and during the on-site visit, and came to consensus on a priority goal related to rates of incidents of restraints and the rates of suspension and expulsion for students with disabilities. An action plan, developed around that goal, will be implemented by the ESE department with the assistance of designated discretionary project staff from the SST.

Thank you for your commitment to improving services to exceptional education students in the St. Lucie County School District. If there are any questions regarding this report, please contact me at 850-245-0475 or via email at monica.verra-tirado@fldoe.org.

Sincerely,

Monica Verra-Tirado, Ed.D., Chief
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services

Enclosure

cc: Bill Tomlinson
Barbara Casteen
Cathy Bishop
Patricia Howell

**2013-14 Exceptional Student Education
Monitoring and Assistance
On-Site Visit Report**

St. Lucie County School District

January 22-23, 2014

**Florida Department of Education
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services**

**2013-14 Exceptional Student Education
Monitoring and Assistance
On-Site Visit Report**

St. Lucie County School District

January 22-23, 2014

Table of Contents

Authority	1
ESE Monitoring and Assistance Process	2
Background Information	2
School Selection	3
On-Site Activities	3
SST – On-Site Visit Team	3
Data Collection	3
Review of Records	4
Guiding Questions – District-Level Needs Assessment	4
Results	4
Discipline (Suspensions and Expulsions)	4
Restraint and Seclusion	6
Data Review	7
Commendations	9
ESE Monitoring and Compliance	9
Records Review	9
Action-Planning and Problem-Solving Process and Next Steps	9
State Support Team for St. Lucie County School District	12
Appendix A: Guiding Questions – District-Level Needs Assessment	14
Glossary of Acronyms and Abbreviations	15

**2013-14 Exceptional Student Education
Monitoring and Assistance
On-Site Visit Report**

St. Lucie County School District

January 22-23, 2014

Authority

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE), Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services (BEESS), 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 exceptional student education (ESE) laws and rules (sections 1001.03(3), 1003.571 and 1008.32, Florida Statutes [F.S.]). One purpose of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is to assess and ensure the effectiveness of efforts to educate children with disabilities (s. 300.1(d) of Title 34, Code of Federal Regulations [CFR]). The bureau is responsible for ensuring that the requirements of IDEA and the educational requirements of the state are implemented (34 CFR §300.149(a)(1) and (2)).

In fulfilling this requirement, the bureau monitors ESE programs provided by district school boards in accordance with ss. 1001.42, 1003.57 and 1003.573, F.S. Through these monitoring activities, the bureau examines records and ESE services, evaluates procedures, provides information and assistance to school districts and otherwise assists school districts in operating effectively and efficiently. The monitoring system is designed to facilitate improved educational outcomes for students while ensuring compliance with applicable federal laws and regulations and state statutes and rules.

Under 34 CFR §300.646(b)(2), if a state identifies significant disproportionality based on race or ethnicity in a local educational agency (LEA) with respect to the identification of children as children with disabilities, the identification of children in specific disability categories, the placement of children with disabilities in particular educational settings or the taking of disciplinary actions, the LEA must use the maximum amount (15 percent) of funds allowable for comprehensive coordinated early intervening services (CEIS) for children in the LEA, particularly, but not exclusively, for children in those groups that were significantly overidentified.

Section 1003.573, F.S., Use of restraint and seclusion on students with disabilities, was created in July 2010, and established documentation, reporting and monitoring requirements for districts regarding the use of restraint and seclusion for students with disabilities. School districts were required to have policies and procedures that govern parent notification, incident reporting, data collection and monitoring of the use of restraint or seclusion for students with disabilities in place no later than January 31, 2011. In July 2011, s. 1003.573, F.S., was amended to require that the FDOE establish standards for documenting, reporting and monitoring the use of manual or physical restraint and occurrences of seclusion. In September and October 2011, the standards established by the FDOE were provided to school districts and were included in the district's **Exceptional Student Education Policies and Procedures (SP&P)** document.

ESE Monitoring and Assistance Process

Background Information

The 2013-14 ESE Monitoring and Assistance process focuses on those State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators that contributed to the targeting of school districts for CEIS and the following indicators that affect equity and access in the educational environment for students with disabilities.

- Indicator 1 – Graduation: Percentage of youth with individual educational plans (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular diploma.
- Indicator 2 – Dropout: Percentage of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.
- Indicator 4 – Rates of suspension and expulsion:
 - A. Percentage of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.
 - B. Percentage of districts that have (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and support, and procedural safeguards.
- Indicator 5 – Educational environments:
Percentage of children with IEPs ages 6 through 21:
 - A. Inside the regular class 80 percent or more of the day;
 - B. Inside the regular class less than 40 percent of the day; and
 - C. In separate schools, residential facilities or homebound or hospital placements.
- Indicator 10 – Disproportionality, specific disability categories: Percentage of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.
- CEIS – Services provided to students in kindergarten through grade 12 (with a particular emphasis on students in kindergarten through grade three) who are not currently identified as needing special education or related services, but who need additional academic and behavioral supports to succeed in a general education environment.
- Restraint – Rate of incidents of restraint, as reported in the FDOE website.
- Seclusion – Rate of incidents of seclusion, as reported in the FDOE website.

The 2013-14 ESE Monitoring and Assistance process includes four phases:

- Phase 1 was composed of planning activities that occurred in advance of the first on-site visit to the school district.
- Phase 2 was the initial on-site visit to the selected school district by the state support team (SST).
- Phase 3 includes follow-up and post-initial visit activities that are conducted by a designated follow-up team, as determined by the SST, and identification of the ongoing data that will be collected.
- Phase 4 includes evaluation of the effectiveness of the school district's action plan, and should include participation of the comprehensive team that was involved in Phase 1.

For ESE compliance monitoring purposes, the bureau required all school districts to participate in the 2013-14 Level I Fall Cycle Self-Assessment process, which included the review of records for implementation of IEPs and a review of incidents of restraint and seclusion. School districts identified as part of the monitoring and assistance process with on-site visits during the 2013-14

school year were exempt from self-assessing school records for IEP implementation and restraint and seclusion. Instead, bureau members of the school district's SST reviewed a sample of records as part of the on-site visit.

In a letter dated August 27, 2013, the superintendent of the St. Lucie County School District was informed that BEESS would be conducting an on-site monitoring visit for the following focus areas: restraint and discipline for students with disabilities.

School Selection

Upon review of the school district's data reported via the FDOE's web-based reporting systems for incidents of restraint and SPP indicator 4B, and additional data provided by the school district, it was determined that the monitoring and assistance process would involve the following schools and programs for record reviews, school-level administrator interviews or on-site visits:

- Dale Cassens Educational Complex
- Fort Pierce Westwood High School
- Manatee K8
- Northport K8

On-Site Activities

SST – On-Site Visit Team

The following SST members conducted the monitoring and assistance on-site visit:

FDOE, BEESS

- Jill Snelson, program specialist IV (facilitator)
- Amelia Faith Bowman, program specialist IV (co-facilitator)
- Anne Bozik, program specialist IV, emotional and behavioral disabilities
- Karin Gerold, program specialist IV

FDOE/Bureau Discretionary Projects

- Sandy Akre, director, The Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System (FDLRS)
- Teresa DiBiasio, M.Ed., school improvement specialist, Region III, Differentiated Accountability, FDOE
- Jayna Jenkins, Ed.D., multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) liaison, Problem Solving/Response to Intervention Project (PS/Rtl), Student Support Services Project (action-planning and problem-solving co-facilitator)
- Eileen Orr, project manager, Multiagency Network for Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities
- Maryellen Quinn-Lunny, Ed.S., director, Center for Autism and Related Disabilities, Florida Atlantic University
- Nicole Rathnaw, facilitator, Florida Inclusion Network (FIN)/East Region
- Michelle A. White, Ed.D., BCBA-D, technical assistance specialist, Florida's Positive Behavior Support Project: A Multi-Tiered Support System (FLPBS:MTSS) (action-planning and problem-solving facilitator)

Data Collection

On-site monitoring and assistance activities included the following:

- School-level administrator and staff interviews – 32 participants

- Completion of Restraint protocols – 10 students
- Completion of IEP Implementation protocol – five students
- School walk-through observations – four schools
- Action-planning and problem-solving process – 25 participants
- Review of data from the school district's **LEA Profiles, Guiding Questions** – District-Level Needs Assessment and data compiled from district data systems

Review of Records

The school district was asked to provide the following documents, as applicable, for each of the 14 students selected for review of restraint or IEP implementation:

- IEPs for the 2012-13 and the 2013-14 school years
- Discipline and attendance records for 2013-14 school year
- Progress reports and report cards (current and previous year)
- Student's current schedule
- Parent notifications and other documentation related to incidents of restraint
- Verification of training for staff members involved in incidents of restraint
- Verification of the provision of related services and accommodations (lesson plans, teacher schedules and therapy logs)

Guiding Questions – District-Level Needs Assessment

Prior to the on-site visit, the school district was provided with questions to use as a guide in the collection of data. SST and district staff reviewed these data during the action-planning and problem-solving process. St. Lucie County School District's questions were related to SPP indicator 4B and restraints. A list of these questions is located in Appendix A of this report. The district chose to begin the process by focusing their efforts on the reduction of suspension and expulsion of students with disabilities.

Results

The following results reflect the data collected and reviewed through the activities of the 2013-14 ESE Monitoring and Assistance process for St. Lucie County School District. Also included are commendations, findings of noncompliance and next steps, as applicable.

Discipline (Suspensions and Expulsions)

Discipline risk ratios by racial or ethnic group are calculated for students with disabilities by dividing the discipline rate of a specific racial or ethnic group by the rate of all nondisabled students. (For example: A risk ratio of 1.0 indicates that, for instance, black students with disabilities are equally likely to be suspended or expelled as all nondisabled students.)

2013-14* Disaggregated Discipline Data		
	Students with disabilities	Students without disabilities
Number of students	5,087	36,775
Number of events of out-of-school suspensions (OSS)	1,041	5,193
Number of days of OSS	4,104	14,450
Number of students - OSS	644	2,666

*Reported as of May 13, 2014, by St. Lucie ESE District Office

Discipline Risk Ratios by Race or Ethnicity				
Race	2010-11 School Year*		2011-12 School Year**	
	State	St. Lucie	State	St. Lucie
White	0.86	0.86	0.80	1.16
Black	2.81	3.81	2.67	3.23
Hispanic	1.14	1.29	1.01	1.07
Asian	0.32			
American Indian and Alaskan Native	0.94		1.03	
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Island				
Two or more races	1.26		1.34	

Blank cells indicate that there are fewer than 10 students with disabilities for a specific race/ethnic group suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days.

Source: *2012 LEA Profile; **2013 LEA Profile - FDOE (<http://www.fldoe.org/ese/datapage.asp>)

The school district reported the following during a review of the guiding questions and the action-planning and problem-solving process regarding the number of black students with disabilities who were suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days:

- 2013-14 school year (August – December 2013) – 36 students
- The risk ratio for black male students with disabilities decreased from 3.84 at the beginning of the 2013-14 school year to 3.00 at the end of the 2013-14 school year.

In regard to how school-level evidence-based practices are being supported by the school district, specifically related to the suspension and expulsion of black students with disabilities, the school district’s responses to the guiding questions included the following:

- The school district’s positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) model includes a district coordinator, six zone leaders and district-based PBIS coaches for each school to oversee PBIS development, implementation and fidelity of implementation.
- PBIS district and school-based personnel meet monthly to review suspension data.
- The district’s code of conduct was revised to include Response to Intervention (RtI) practices as an alternative to suspension.
- Training is being provided to implement conversation, help, activity, movement, participation, success (CHAMPS) as the tier one school-wide classroom management system.

In regard to implementing the strategies in the SP&P document relating to discipline risk ratios of students with disabilities, by race or ethnicity, the school district reported the following:

- OSS data is being pulled for the district problem solving team review after every nine-week period. A district-level team also monitors the data to identify and support schools with high incidences of suspensions.

In addition to the data above, the school district reported the following information specifically related to SPP indicator 4B and restraint during interviews:

- Continuum of services:
 - One school was described as a “full service continuum middle and high school.” There were general education and self-contained classrooms that offered tier one through three services for both behavior and academics. There was an accelerated program at

- the middle school level as well as a program called Project Success which is a drug abuse prevention and intervention program. The school also housed a teenage parent program as well as a program for Department of Juvenile Justice and substance abuse.
- Participants from the two K-8 schools interviewed indicated that there was a continuum of services for special education at their schools. One school was a cluster site for behavior services.
 - Participants from the high school interviewed also indicated a continuum of services, which included resource rooms into which students were pulled for particular subjects. Participants also indicated the use of support teachers to provide services to students within the general education classroom.
 - Crisis management systems:
 - Participants from all schools mentioned the involvement of positive behavior support (PBS) to varying degrees at the schools. Also mentioned were Crisis Prevention Institute's Nonviolent Crisis Intervention (CPI), Professional Crisis Management (PCM) and CHAMPS. De-escalation and building rapport between the teachers and students were mentioned at more than one school. The participants from schools who mentioned CPI and PCM also mentioned the process of training and renewal for those staff involved with these programs.
 - Interviews regarding de-escalation strategies at the schools visited included strategies imbedded in the PBS and CPI programs used at school sites, meeting with teachers that have rapport with the students, removal from the class or activity and time outs.
 - Participants from several schools mentioned the importance of community services that are able to provide resources and support to the schools.
 - Alternatives to suspension:
 - Participants from all schools mentioned a behavior intervention classroom (BIC). This is a place on campus where students are placed as an alternative to OSS. Behaviors are addressed in BIC by staff trained to supervise the students. Participants from one school mentioned that BIC is counted as in school suspension (ISS). Teachers provide work for the students, and at one school, inclusion teachers would go to BIC to provide services for students.
 - A community-based program called project ROCK is used when a student is suspended from school. It is an option where parents may bring the student to the facility (one is in the north end of the county and one is south). Work is provided at the centers for students who attend. The students are still reported as OSS but reported as in attendance.
 - Interventions were in place at all schools for those students who have had prior involvement with law enforcement.

Restraint and Seclusion

According to the school district's SP&P document and the responses to the **Guiding Questions – District-Level Needs Assessment** document, the school district trains personnel with regard to the use of restraint using the following crisis management programs: PCM and CPI.

Data Review

Number of Restraint Incident Reports		
Year	Number of Incidents	Number of Students
2010-11	133	51
2011-12	286	143
2012-13	294	125
2013-14 (August – June)	213	89

Source: FDOE, Restraint-Seclusion Incident Reporting Website *Number is less than 10, including zero

Number of Seclusion Incident Reports		
Year	Number of Incidents	Number of Students
2010-11	28	11
2011-12	66	15
2012-13	28	13
2013-14# (August – June)	0	0

Source: FDOE, Restraint-Seclusion Incident Reporting Website *Number is less than 10, including zero
The district no longer allows the use of seclusion

Percentage of Incidents of Seclusion by Primary Exceptionality*					
Year	ASD	EBD	InD	SLD	Other
2010-11	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
2011-12	0%	80%	0%	0%	20%
2012-13	0%	77%	0%	0%	23%
2013-14# (August – June)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Source: FDOE, Restraint-Seclusion Incident Reporting Website *Number is less than 10, including zero
The district no longer allows the use of seclusion

Percentage of Incidents of Restraint by Primary Exceptionality*					
Year	ASD	EBD	InD	SLD	Other
2010-11	14%	33%	20%	4%	29%
2011-12	unavailable	34%	8%	1%	36%
2012-13	25%	34%	14%	2%	26%
2013-14 (August – June)	unavailable	35%	18%	8%	24%

Source: FDOE, Restraint-Seclusion Incident Reporting Website *Number is less than 10, including zero

**Exceptionalities:

ASD – Autism spectrum disorder
EBD – Emotional or behavioral disability

InD – Intellectual disabilities
SLD – Specific learning disability

In addition to the data above, the school district reported the following during interviews, review of the guiding questions and the action-planning and problem-solving process:

- Clean data continues to be an issue; monitoring of data entry more closely needs to be a priority.
- Between August and October 2012, there were 106 incidents of restraint. There were 65 incidents reported for the same period during the 2013 school year, which indicated a decrease.
- The school district's goal is to reduce incidents of restraint and seclusion by 10 percent, as referenced in their SP&P document.
- The school district's support for school-level evidence-based practices includes the following:
 - PCM and CPI training is ongoing to include paraprofessionals and behavior technicians.
- Activities that are occurring in the school district in regard to implementing the strategies in the SP&P document include the following:
 - IEP teams or 504 teams met with the district behavior analyst and specialist assigned to the school to review the IEP or Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Section 504) Accommodation Plan if a student with a disability was involved in multiple incidents of restraint, ensuring that the student had a behavioral intervention plan (BIP) that included strategies to address the problematic behaviors.
 - Strategies for increasing parental involvement included inviting a parent of an identified student with a disability to participate in the problem-solving process when the team was convening to consider the effectiveness of the student's program or placement, or when evaluation or reevaluation was considered.
 - MTSS was strengthened, and training was provided as needed in establishing and strengthening PBS at each school.
 - PBS coaches and behavior analysts assigned to each school site reviewed the data reports from both the FDOE reporting website and the school-based student data collection system to ensure fidelity to the plan and to measure the plan's effectiveness.
 - Additional training was provided to school sites for establishing crisis response teams and crisis management.
 - Behavior analysts and school psychologists assigned to each school provided professional development and consultation relative to crisis management and the development of school-based teams trained in non-violent CPI to respond to emergency or crisis behavioral situations.
 - Professional development was provided to school-based administrators to facilitate the development of effective school-based data teams to interpret data collected through both the DOE reporting website and the school-based student data management system and to develop multi-tiered systems of support and interventions.
 - Behavior analysts and school psychologists provided ongoing support and training to school-based personnel in conducting functional behavioral assessments (FBAs), developing BIPs to address individual student needs, collection of data and interpretation of data, including graphical representations of the collected data.
 - Professional development in classroom management systems such as CHAMPS was provided to schools and teachers.

Commendations

1. The district receives support from community organizations. Schools have also created outreach programs within the school as interventions for both academic and behavioral problems.
2. The school district has been involved in PBS and has alternatives to OSS.
3. The school district has many data collection tools and warning systems available to positively impact the MTSS and Rtl process for students.
4. The district’s percentage of students with disabilities in regular class placement (80 percent or more of the school week with nondisabled peers) exceeds the rate of other districts in the enrollment group and the state average.

ESE Monitoring and Compliance

Records Review

BEESS staff reviewed records of 14 students in the school district, from a sampling of four schools. Standards from the IEP Implementation and Restraint and Seclusion protocols were reviewed. Findings of noncompliance were found during the review. The district has corrected all student-specific findings of noncompliance; however, the district continues to sample records in order to demonstrate the correct implementation of the targeted standards 100 percent of the time.

Action-Planning and Problem-Solving Process and Next Steps

As part of the monitoring and assistance on-site visit, the SST members, ESE director and representatives from the St. Lucie County School District participated in an action-planning and problem-solving process. The group reviewed the data collected prior to and during the on-site visit and developed a list of priorities and obstacles. An action plan was developed to address the first priority selected, which was related to a reduction in the number of suspensions, expulsions and restraints of all students.

The district set desired outcome as follows:

- Through effective implementation of an MTSS, there will be a significant reduction in the number of suspensions, expulsions and restraints. Significant will be defined and numerated after data collection.

Next Steps	
Educational environment	
Summary:	District members of the problem-solving team acknowledged that data management and implementation of the MTSS process have been inconsistent, which has likely impacted the restraint and discipline data. Efforts had begun to address these concerns prior to the on-site monitoring and assistance visit.
Recommendation:	The school district should continue to monitor and train on the consistency of MTSS implementation and data management district-

Next Steps	
	wide. This will provide more accurate information to guide the district in providing academic and behavioral resources where needed most.
Required Actions:	None
Discipline	
Summary:	The risk ratio for black male students with disabilities decreased from 3.84 at the beginning 2013-14 school year to 3.00 at the end of the 2013-14 school year. A PBIS model currently in place in the district includes PBS for all schools in the district. As part of the model, district and school-based personnel are meeting monthly to review suspension data.
Recommendations:	None
Required Actions:	The school district shall continue to monitor and review suspension data with district and school personnel in order to provide appropriate interventions for the continued reduction of suspensions.
Restraint	
Summary:	The district's percentage of incidents of restraints for students with EBD has not decreased from the school year 2010-11.
Recommendations:	The district should continue to provide training at the school level for teachers, staff and behavior technicians on de-escalation strategies and PBS.
Required Actions:	By January 30, 2015, the school district must provide to the bureau a report comparing the number of incidents of restraint and seclusion by using crisis management approved techniques. The report will include analysis to determine if one or the other techniques appears to be used more frequently in restraint and seclusion incidents. The report must cover the period of the first semester of the 2014-15 school year.
Phases 3 and 4 of the ESE Monitoring and Assistance process	
Summary	<p>Additional action planning and problem solving for other priorities for the school district in regard to restraints, suspensions and expulsions were scheduled by the SST liaison for the school district and the ESE director.</p> <p>By January 23, 2015, the SST team, ESE director and designated district staff will evaluate the effectiveness of the school district's action plan(s) and determine additional next steps, as appropriate.</p>

Technical Assistance

1. **Implementing a Multi-Tiered System of Support for Behavior: Recommended Practices for School and District Leaders** (Florida's PBS Project) may be accessed at http://flpbs.fmhi.usf.edu/pdfs/RTIB%20Guide%20101811_final.pdf and provides an overview of the critical components of an MTSS for behavior. These critical components describe systems changes that are necessary for a results-driven ESE system.
2. The district's **ESE Policies and Procedures** document provides district- and school-based standards for documenting, reporting and monitoring the use of manual, physical or mechanical restraint and seclusion developed by the FDOE. The school district's document for the 2013-14 through 2015-16 school years may be accessed at <http://beess.fcim.org/sppDistrictDocSearch.aspx>.
3. The technical assistance paper entitled **Guidelines for the Use, Documentation, Reporting, and Monitoring of Restraint and Seclusion with Students with Disabilities**, dated October 14, 2011, may be accessed at <http://info.fldoe.org/docushare/dsweb/Get/Document-6212/dps-2011-165.pdf>. This document provides guidance regarding the use, documenting, reporting and monitoring of restraint and seclusion with students with disabilities in school districts, including (a) when restraint or seclusion might be used, (b) considerations when selecting a training program for restraint, (c) what should be documented, (d) parent notification and reporting, and (e) monitoring use. It also contains information about s. 1003.573, F.S., Use of restraint and seclusion on students with disabilities.
4. The United States Department of Education, in collaboration with the United States Department of Justice, released **School Discipline Guidance** in the January 2014, Volume 4, Issue 1 of the **Office of Special Education Programs Monthly Update**. This package will assist states, districts and schools in developing practices and strategies to enhance school climate, and ensure those policies and practices comply with federal law. The resource documents listed below are included in the package, and are available at <http://www.ed.gov/school-discipline>:
 - **Dear Colleague** guidance letter on civil rights and discipline;
 - **Guiding Principles** document that draws from emerging research and best practices;
 - **Directory of Federal School Climate and Discipline Resources** that indexes federal technical assistance and other resources; and
 - **Compendium of School Discipline Laws and Regulations** that catalogue State laws and regulations related to school discipline.
5. According to s. 1003.57, F.S., once every three years, each school district and school shall complete a Best Practices in Inclusive Education (BPIE) assessment with a FIN facilitator and include the results of the BPIE assessment and all planned short-term and long-term improvement efforts in the school district's SP&P. BPIE is an internal assessment process designed to facilitate the analysis, implementation and improvement of inclusive educational practices at the district and school team levels.

A FIN facilitator is available to assist the school district in scheduling and completing the BPIE, and based on the results, will identify how FIN can provide support to the school district (<http://www.floridainclusionnetwork.com/>).

**Florida Department of Education
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services**

2013-14 ESE Monitoring and Assistance

State Support Team for St. Lucie County School District

Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services

325 West Gaines Street
Suite 614, Turlington Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32399
850-245-0475
<http://www.fldoe.org/ese>

Ms. Karin Gerold
Program Specialist
Dispute Resolution and Monitoring
karin.gerold@fldoe.org

Ms. Anne Bozik
Program Specialist
Emotional and Behavioral Disabilities
anne.bozik@fldoe.org

Ms. Amelia Faith Bowman
Program Specialist
Dispute Resolution and Monitoring

Ms. Jill Snelson
Program Specialist
Dispute Resolution and Monitoring

FDOE Discretionary Projects

Jayna Jenkins, Ed.D
MTSS liaison
PS/RtI Student Support Services Project
jayna@usf.edu

Michelle A. White, Ed.D, BCBA-D
Technical Assistance Specialist
Florida's Positive Behavior Support Project
mwhite@usf.edu

Ms. Sandy Akre
Director
FDLRS/Galaxy
sandra.akre@stlucieschools.org

Ms. Teresa DiBisiao, M.Ed.
School Improvement Specialist, Region III
Differentiated Accountability
tdibisiao@usf.edu

Eileen Orr
Project Manager
The Multiagency Network for Students with
Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities (SEDNET)
eileenorr@stlucieschools.org

Ms. Maryellen Quinn-Lunny, Ed.S.
Director
Florida Atlantic University Center for Autism and
Related Disabilities
mqlunny@fau.edu

Ms. Nicole Rathnaw
Facilitator
Florida Inclusion Network
South Region
nrathnaw@contactfin.com

Appendix A

Guiding Questions – District-Level Needs Assessment

Appendix A: Guiding Questions – District-Level Needs Assessment

1. What are the most current data levels on each of the targeted BEESS indicators?
2. What is the gap between BEESS expected level(s) of targeted indicators and your district's current level(s) of targeted indicators?
3. Do data indicate equity issues related to the selected BEESS indicators? Are there subgroups for which the gap between expected and goal levels of performance and current levels of performance is more or less significant?
 - Gender
 - Race or ethnic group
 - Economically disadvantaged
 - Students with disabilities (by each sub-group)
 - English language learners
 - Comparison within and across above sub-groups
4. Disaggregate district-level indicator data to school levels. Which schools are contributing to total district frequency for each of the targeted BEESS indicators?
5. Disaggregate school-level indicator data by grade level. Which grades within each school are contributing to total school frequency for each of the targeted BEESS indicators?
6. Disaggregate between type of school (elementary, middle school and high school) by student outcomes.
7. What evidence-based practices are currently planned for use or implementation at the school level?
8. Are the expected evidence-based practices occurring sufficiently?
9. If expected evidence-based practices are not occurring or not occurring sufficiently, why not? (What are some potential barriers specific to targeted BEESS indicators at the school level?)
10. How are school-level evidence-based practices being supported by the district specific to BEESS indicators being targeted for improvement?
11. Are district supports for school-level practices being provided sufficiently?
12. If district supports are not occurring or not occurring sufficiently, why not? (What are some potential barriers specific to targeted BEESS indicators at the district level?)
13. What strategies, initiatives and resources have been identified in the District Improvement and Assistance Plan (DIAP) with regard to achieving annual measurable outcomes targets for students with disabilities?
14. As applicable, has the mid-year reflection based on mid-year assessment data been completed, and what, if any, adjustments have been made to the DIAP with regard to strategies to improve outcomes for students with disabilities?
15. What does the **ESE Policies and Procedures** document reflect with regard to the district's goal to improve targeted indicator performance? Did the district achieve the goal set during the prior year?
16. What is occurring to implement the strategies in the SP&P with regard to targeted indicator performance?
17. Based on all of the above answers, what priorities will be targeted to improve BEESS targeted indicators?

**Florida Department of Education
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services**

Glossary of Acronyms and Abbreviations

The following is a list of acronyms, abbreviations and terms used within this report.

ASD	Autism spectrum disorder
BEESS	Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services
BIC	Behavior intervention classroom
BIP	Behavioral intervention plan
BPIE	Best Practices for Inclusive Education
CEIS	Coordinated early intervening services
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CHAMPS	Conversation, help, activity, movement, participation, success
CPI	Crisis Prevention Institute's Nonviolent Crisis Intervention
EBD	Emotional or behavioral disability
ESE	Exceptional student education
FLPBS	Florida's Positive Behavior Support Project
FDLRS	Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System
FDOE	Florida Department of Education
F.S.	Florida Statutes
IDEA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
IEP	Individual educational plan
IND	Intellectual disability
ISS	In-school suspension
LEA	Local educational agency
MTSS	Multi-tiered system of supports
OSS	Out-of-school suspension
PBIS	Positive behavior interventions and supports
PBS	Positive behavior support
PBS/MTSS	Positive behavior support/multi-tiered system of supports
PCM	Professional Crisis Management
RtI	Response to intervention
SLD	Specific learning disabilities
SP&P	Exceptional Student Education Policies and Procedures
SPP	State Performance Plan
SST	State Support Team



Pam Stewart, Commissioner

313200T