

**2017-18 Exceptional Student Education
On-Site Monitoring Report**

**Washington County School District
November 1-3, 2017**



This publication is produced through the Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services (BEES), Division of K-12 Public Schools, Florida Department of Education (FDOE), and is available online at <http://www.fldoe.org/ese/mon-home.asp>. For information on available resources, contact the BEES Resource and Information Center (BRIC).

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

BEES website: <http://www.fldoe.org/ese/>

Email: BRIC@fldoe.org

Telephone: 850-245-0475

Fax: 850-245-0987



**2017-18 Exceptional Student Education
On-Site Monitoring Report**

Washington County School District

November 1-3, 2017

Table of Contents

Authority.....	1
Exceptional Student Education (ESE) On-Site Monitoring Process.....	1
Background Information.....	1
School Selection.....	2
On-Site Activities.....	3
On-Site Visit Team	3
Data Collection	3
2017-18 ESE On-Site Monitoring Results	4
Graduation Rate	4
Dropout Rate	4
Discipline 4A.....	5
Educational Environment (Least Restrictive Environment).....	5
Math Scores for Middle-Grades Students with Disabilities	5
English Language Arts Scores for Third Grade Students with Disabilities.....	6
Interviews Conducted.....	6
Administrator Focus Groups	7
Teacher Focus Groups.....	7
Parent Focus Group	8
Student Focus Groups.....	8
School Walk-Through Debriefings	9
Commendations.....	9
2017-18 Next Steps	9
Technical Assistance	14
State Support Team for Washington County School District.....	16

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 (sections 1001.03(3), 1003.571 and 1008.32, Florida Statutes [F.S.]) and rules. 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]). BEESS 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, BEESS 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, BEESS 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 who are not currently identified as needing special education or related services, but who need additional academic or behavioral supports in order to succeed in a general education environment. These children should include particularly, but not exclusively, children in those groups that were significantly over-identified.

Section 1003.573, F.S., Use of restraint and seclusion on students with disabilities, establishes documentation, reporting and monitoring requirements for districts regarding the use of restraint and seclusion on students with disabilities. It also requires districts to have policies and procedures in place that govern parent notification, incident reporting, data collection and monitoring the use of restraint or seclusion for students with disabilities. As required, the FDOE has established district- and school-based standards for documenting, reporting and monitoring the use of restraint and seclusion. These standards are included in each district's Exceptional Student Education Policies and Procedures (SP&P) document.

ESE On-Site Monitoring Process

Background Information

The 2017-18 ESE On-Site Monitoring process focuses on those State Performance Plan 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 more 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 rates of suspensions and expulsions of more 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 aged 6 through 21:
 - A. In the regular class 80 percent or more of the day;
 - B. In the regular class less than 40 percent of the day; and
 - C. In separate schools, residential facilities, 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 3) 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 on the FDOE website.
- Seclusion – Rate of incidents of seclusion, as reported on the FDOE website.

The ESE On-Site Monitoring process includes four phases:

- Phase 1 is composed of planning activities that occur in advance of the initial on-site visit to the school district.
- Phase 2 is the initial on-site visit to the selected school district by the state support team (SST).
- Phase 3 is follow-up activities, which 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 is evaluation of the effectiveness of how the district is addressing each of the focus areas, and should include participation of the action-planning and problem-solving process team.

In a letter dated August 3, 2017, the superintendent of the Washington County School District was informed that BEESS would be conducting an on-site monitoring visit for the following focus areas: graduation rate, dropout rate, suspensions and expulsions with a significant discrepancy (4A), least restrictive environment (LRE) and concerns regarding low math scores for middle-grades students with disabilities and low scores in English Language Arts (ELA) for third grade students with disabilities.

School Selection

Upon review of the school district's data, it was determined that the on-site monitoring process would involve all of the following schools for school administrator, teacher focus groups and school walk-through debriefings and some of these schools for parent and student focus groups:

- Kate M. Smith Elementary School
- Vernon Elementary School
- Vernon Middle School
- Chipley High School
- Washington Institute for Specialized Education

On-Site Activities

On-Site Visit Team

The following SST members planned or conducted the on-site monitoring visit:

FDOE, BEESS

- Monica Verra-Tirado, State Director for Special Education, Bureau Chief
- Derek Hemenway, Program Specialist, Dispute Resolution and Monitoring (DRM)
- Shane Brown, Program Specialist, DRM
- Karrie Musgrove, Program Specialist, Instructional Student Support
- Dianne Mennitt, School Nurse Consultant, Student Services

Peer Monitor

- Staci Williams, ESE Director, Calhoun County School District

FDOE, BEESS Discretionary Projects

- Tury Lewis, Regional Representative, Project 10: Transition Education Network
- Ann Selland, Regional Coordinator, Problem Solving/Response to Intervention (PS:RtI)
- David Davis, Regional Technology Unit Coordinator, PS:RtI Technology Learning Connection
- Rusty Holmes, Project Manager, Multiagency Network for Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities (SEDNET)
- Faye Yongue, Program Coordinator, Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System (FDLRS)
- Caren Prichard, Facilitator, Florida Inclusion Network (FIN)
- Kathy Christiansen, Technical Assistant Specialist, Florida Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports Project: Multi-Tiered System of Support (FLPBIS:MTSS)
- Pam Sudduth, Learning and Development Facilitator for Literacy, PS:RtI

Data Collection

On-site monitoring activities included the following:

- Review of recent data
- Welcome session with district and school administrators and staff – 21 participants
- Administrator focus groups – 19 participants
- Teacher focus groups – 36 participants
- Parent focus group – four participants
- Student focus groups – 25 participants
- School walk-through debriefings – 21 classrooms
- Action-planning and problem-solving process – 24 participants

The district's initial Best Practices for Inclusive Education plan dated November 28, 2016, was revised on September 6, 2017, and included the following goals:

- Goal 1: The district will work with Panhandle Area Educational Consortium (PAEC – FDLRS, FIN and SEDNET) to ensure that all students with disabilities receive multi-tiered behavior supports, as determined by MTSS, positive behavior intervention plans and IEPs, in general education classrooms and natural contexts with training beginning January 2017 and continuing through the 2017-18 school year.
- Goal 2: The district will work with PAEC – FDLRS, FIN and SEDNET to provide professional development opportunities throughout the district for the 2017-18 school year.
- Goal 3: The district will work with PAEC – FDLRS, FIN and SEDNET to provide parent newsletters to all students in the district for the 2017-18 school year.

2017-18 ESE On-Site Monitoring Results

The following data are related to the focus areas and activities for the 2017-18 ESE On-Site Monitoring for the Washington County School District.

Graduation Rate

The federal uniform high school graduation rate for students with disabilities is calculated by taking the number of first-time ninth graders from four years ago, plus the number of incoming transfer students on the same schedule to graduate, minus the number of students from this population who transferred out or left to enroll in a private school or home education, divided by the number of standard diplomas from the same group. The district's federal graduation rate for students with disabilities increased from 42.4 percent during the 2014-15 school year to 50.0 percent during the 2015-16 school year. The 2016-17 graduation rate increased to 65.9 percent, which is above the state target of 60.3 percent.

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Washington	42.4%	50.0%	65.9%
State Target	56.3%	58.3%	60.3%

Dropout Rate

The federal dropout rate for students with disabilities is calculated by taking the number of students who exited special education as a result of dropping out, divided by the number of students who graduated with a regular high school diploma, special diploma, certificate of completion, special certificate of completion, dropped out or died. The district's federal dropout rate for students with disabilities decreased from 34.4 percent during the 2014-15 school year to 32.1 percent during the 2015-16 school year. The 2016-17 dropout rate decreased to 15.7 percent, which is above the state target of 11.7 percent.

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Washington	34.4%	32.1%	15.7%
State Target	15.1%	13.4%	11.7%

Discipline 4A

Discipline indicator 4A identifies the risk of students with disabilities being suspended or expelled for more than 10 days in a school year as compared to their peers without disabilities. A risk ratio of 2.0 would mean that students with disabilities are twice as likely to be suspended or expelled for more than 10 days in a school year compared to their peers without disabilities. The district's risk ratio for discipline 4A increased from 4.31 percent during the 2014-15 school year to 7.16 percent during the 2015-16 school year, which means that when compared to students without disabilities, students with disabilities in the district are 7.16 times more likely to be suspended or expelled for more than 10 days in a school year. The 2016-17 risk ratio decreased to 2.19 percent. Florida has set the risk ratio threshold at 3.0; therefore, rates above 3.0 are considered significantly disproportionate.

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Washington	4.3	7.2	2.2
State Risk Ratio	3.0	3.0	3.0

Educational Environment (Least Restrictive Environment)

To the maximum extent appropriate, students with disabilities are to be educated with students without disabilities. These LRE data are calculated by dividing the number of students with disabilities aged 6 through 21 served in the regular class for 80 percent or more of the day, by the total number of students with disabilities aged 6 through 21 reported in October (survey 2). These data do not include parentally placed private school students or students served in Florida county jails, Florida Department of Juvenile Justice facilities or Florida Department of Corrections. The district's percentage of students with disabilities being served in the regular class increased from 72.0 percent during the 2014-15 school year to 74.3 percent during the 2015-16 school year. However, the 2016-17 LRE rate decreased to 70.6 percent, which is below the state target of 82.0 percent.

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Washington	72.0%	74.3%	70.6%
State Target	77.0%	79.0%	82.0%

Math Scores for Middle-Grades Students with Disabilities

After reviewing state assessment data trends for the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), BEESS identified students with disabilities in middle-grades math (Grades 6-8) as an area in critical need of support. BEESS established a tiered criteria in order to provide needed supports for middle-grades math in each district to increase the number of students with disabilities scoring level three and above and close the gap between students without disabilities and students with disabilities. The percentage of students with disabilities that scored level three and above in middle-grades math increased from 11.1 percent during the 2014-15 school year to 19.5 percent during the 2015-16 school year. The 2016-17 percentage decreased to 12.5 percent, which is below the state average of 22.2 percent.

FSA Scores of Level Three and Above in Middle-Grades Math	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Washington			
Percentage of Students with Disabilities	11.1%	19.5%	12.5%
Percentage of Students without Disabilities	63.1%	58.9%	56.3%
Achievement Gap between Students with and without Disabilities	52.0%	39.4%	43.8%
State			
State Target for Students with Disabilities	51.0%	56.0%	61.0%
Average for Students with Disabilities	22.7%	21.0%	22.2%
Average for Students without Disabilities	59.4%	60.3%	61.2%
Achievement Gap between Students with and without Disabilities	36.7%	39.3%	39.0%

English Language Arts Scores for Third Grade Students with Disabilities

After reviewing state assessment data trends for the FSA, BEESS has identified students with disabilities in third grade ELA as an area in critical need of support. BEESS established a tiered criteria in order to provide needed supports for Grades K-3 ELA in each district in order to increase the number of students with disabilities scoring level three and above and close the gap between all students and students with disabilities. The percentage of students with disabilities that scored level three and above in third grade ELA increased from 19.4 percent during the 2014-15 school year to 34.1 percent during the 2015-16 school year. The 2016-17 percentage decreased to 32.7 percent, which is above the state average for students with disabilities of 31.2 percent.

FSA Scores of Level Three and Above in Third Grade ELA	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Washington			
Percentage of Students with Disabilities	19.4%	34.1%	32.7%
Percentage of All Students	57.0%	61.8%	64.3%
Achievement Gap between Students with Disabilities and with All Students	37.6%	27.7%	31.6%
State			
State Target for Students with Disabilities	51.0%	56.0%	61.0%
Average for All Students	52.9%	54.4%	57.8%
Average for Students with Disabilities	25.2%	26.2%	31.2%
Achievement Gap between Students with and without Disabilities	27.7%	28.2%	26.6%

Note: All includes students with disabilities and students without disabilities.

Interviews Conducted

Administrator Focus Groups

Members of the SST conducted focus groups with administrators from Kate M. Smith Elementary School, Vernon Elementary School, Vernon Middle School, Chipley High School and Washington Institute for Specialized Education regarding graduation, dropout, discipline 4A, LRE, low math scores for middle-grades students with disabilities and low ELA scores for third grade students with disabilities.

Themes that emerged from the administrator focus groups included the following:

- Administrators have a focused growth mindset regarding the use of available data for informed decision making.
- School staff have strong relationships with students.
- Staff make strong efforts to connect learning with real-world applications.
- Students often enter school already below grade level and with attendance issues.
- Students who have participated in voluntary prekindergarten (VPK) are more prepared for school; however, not all students participate in VPK.
- A formal process is lacking for students transferring between schools.
- Schools should continue to work with FIN on flexible scheduling for students with disabilities.
- Students have more support at elementary levels via separate classrooms, but when they reach the secondary level they may be put into inclusion settings with insufficient transitional support.
- Students need more opportunities for remediation.
- Data entered into the district's Focus Student Information System is not always reliable and accurate.
- Students are not always evaluated as a student with a disability in a timely manner.
- Some parts of the district have transient populations.
- Schools often face a shortage of teachers and staff.

Teacher Focus Groups

Members of the SST conducted focus groups with teachers from Kate M. Smith Elementary School, Vernon Elementary School, Vernon Middle School, Chipley High School and Washington Institute for Specialized Education regarding graduation, dropout, discipline 4A, LRE, low math scores for middle-grades students with disabilities and low ELA scores for third grade students with disabilities.

Themes that emerged from the teacher focus groups included the following:

- Teachers feel supported by administrators.
- Instruction is data driven and academic analysts at the schools are central to this effort.
- There is a need for more vertical alignment and communication across grade levels within schools and between schools.
- Not all teachers were able to have a period in which to collaboratively plan with other teachers.
- Some students are taking multiple math classes simultaneously and are not academically successful because of scheduling and requirements.
- Some schools have a high ratio of students with disabilities in the same classes.

- Prekindergarten programs are not always available and after-school programs may be too costly for families.
- Participation in VPK increases student readiness for kindergarten.
- The MTSS process requires a great deal of paperwork and takes a long time.
- More alternatives to suspension are needed.
- ESE students in core ELA classrooms are not getting additional supports as soon as they need them.
- More parental involvement is needed and some households do not have resources (e.g., internet access) or support for completing homework.
- Students in rural areas may have very long bus rides to and from school.
- Teachers want more training on how to implement inclusion and scheduling.

Parent Focus Group

Members of the SST conducted a focus group with parents of students with disabilities aged 14 years or older regarding postsecondary transition.

Themes that emerged from the parent focus group included the following:

- Some parents feel satisfied overall with their experiences with school and district staff.
- Some parents have issues with communication with school or district staff, including a lack of flexibility in scheduling IEP meetings and difficulty reaching staff.
- There are concerns regarding the reliability and accuracy of the district's Focus Student Information System.
- Parents do not feel that teachers always understand how a student's disability may affect the learning process and the importance of implementing the IEP.
- Parents feel that evaluations and reevaluations take too long.

Student Focus Groups

Members of the SST conducted focus groups with students from Vernon Middle School, Chipley High School, and Washington Institute for Specialized Education. Students were asked to share their perspectives on topics such as graduation, dropout, academic support, and post-school activities.

Comments from these student focus groups included the following:

- Students have positive perceptions of school environments and staff and feel that they know someone inside or outside of school that they could talk with if experiencing difficulties or problems in school.
- Students are focused on graduation and shared post-secondary goals.
- Most students have participated in their IEP team meeting, but some students are unaware of having an IEP or specifics regarding their IEP.
- Some students are taking multiple math classes simultaneously.
- Many students with disabilities take classes together as a group throughout the day.
- Some students are concerned with the reliability and accuracy of the district's Focus Student Information System.
- Some students feel uncomfortable asking for help and want more opportunities for tutoring and additional extracurricular activities.
- Some students feel that school security restrictions and community factors increase the chances of students dropping out.

- Students feel that disciplinary practices are fair but not always implemented consistently by different teachers.
- Many students feel that specific disciplinary practices, such as in-school suspension and out-of-school suspension, are not effective in reducing disciplinary problems and could place students further behind in coursework.

School Walk-Through Debriefings

School walk-through debriefings were conducted at Kate M. Smith Elementary School, Vernon Elementary School, Vernon Middle School, Chipley High School and Washington Institute for Specialized Education regarding student engagement, school climate and evidence of academic and behavioral expectations.

Observations from the school walk-through debriefings included the following:

- The environments were quiet, spacious and individualized.
- There were low teacher-to-student ratios.
- Student work was displayed in the hallways.
- The classrooms were structured for small-group work and centers.
- There was evidence of technology accessible to all students.

Commendations

1. The district provides academic data analysts who offer direct support to teachers at all grade levels and are responsible for informing families of the MTSS process and procedures.
2. District staff, administrators and teachers exhibited a growth mindset and were observed to be student focused and continuously looking at ways to improve instruction, engagement and motivation.
3. Excellent use of technological resources was observed in the classrooms at the schools visited.

2017-18 Next Steps

Next Steps	
Graduation Rate	
Summary	The district's graduation rate for students with disabilities for the 2015-16 school year was 50.0 percent, which is below the state target of 58.3 percent. For the 2016-17 school year, the graduation rate increased to 65.9 percent, which is above the state target of 60.3 percent.
Recommendations	According to district and school staff, the district's early warning system (EWS) was not always reliable or accurate, and there were concerns that not all students who were behind in credits or grade levels were identified in a timely manner. The district should consider the following actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to collaborate with Project 10 to ensure implementation of the early warning color-coding system and to determine which students need interventions in order to graduate. • Provide professional development for staff on how to enter data into and use data from the Focus Student Information System to support student achievement.

Required Actions	None.
Dropout Rate	
Summary	The district's dropout rate for students with disabilities for the 2015-16 school year was 32.1 percent, which is above the state target of 13.4 percent. For the 2016-17 school year, the dropout rate decreased to 15.7 percent, which is above the state target of 11.7 percent.
Recommendations	According to district and school staff, the district's EWS was not always reliable or accurate, and there were concerns that not all students who were behind in credits or grade levels were identified in a timely manner. The district should consider the following actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to collaborate with Project 10 to ensure implementation of the early warning color-coding system and to determine which students need interventions in order to graduate. • Provide professional development for staff on how to use data from the data system to support student achievement.
Required Actions	None.
Discipline 4A	
Summary	The district's risk ratio for discipline 4A for the 2015-16 school year was 7.2, which indicates that when compared to students without disabilities, students with disabilities were 7.2 times more likely to be suspended or expelled for more than 10 days in a school year. For the 2016-17 school year, the risk ratio for discipline 4A decreased to 2.2, which is below the state threshold of 3.0.
Recommendations	The district should consider reviewing the Office of Special Education Programs' guidance on supporting behavior of students with disabilities with school principals and ESE staff, and monitoring discipline of students with disabilities. This guidance can be accessed at https://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/school-discipline/files/dcl-on-pbisin-ieps--0801-2016.pdf . The district should continue to compile and review discipline 4A data quarterly through problem-solving activities and collaborate with FLPBIS:MTSS and participate in the PBIS Disproportionality Work Group.
Required Actions	None.
Educational Environment (Least Restrictive Environment)	
Summary	The district's percentage of students with disabilities being served in the regular class for the 2015-16 school year was 74.3 percent, which is below the state target of 79.0 percent. For the 2016-17 school year, the LRE rate decreased to 70.6 percent, which is below the state target of 82.0 percent.
Recommendations	The district should consider the following actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to collaborate with FIN on flexible scheduling methods for students with disabilities.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that general education and ESE teachers have time together for collaboratively developing or reviewing long-term instructional plans and delivery methods. • Establish a formal process for students transferring to schools within the district. • Include more opportunities for instructional staff to use data for classroom-level problem solving. <p>It is also recommended that the district review FDOE's technical assistance paper, DPS: 2016-13, entitled, "Least Restrictive Environment Considerations Related to Individual Educational Plans," which can be accessed at https://info.fldoe.org/docushare/dsweb/Get/Document-7540/dps-201613.pdf.</p>
Required Actions	<p>The district must review its LRE data and explore options for educating students with disabilities in the general education classroom with sufficient supports in place by March 2, 2018.</p> <p>In addition, the district must provide professional development by June 29, 2018, for teachers and administrators that includes flexible and inclusive scheduling at the elementary, middle and high school levels through FIN and Quality Individual Educational Plan training through FDLRS. The training should focus on how students' learning needs can be met in the general education classroom.</p> <p>The following documentation must be provided to the district's BEESS liaison via BEESSMonitoring@fldoe.org:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A detailed narrative of the LRE data review and the options discussed and determined as needed for educating students with disabilities in the general education classroom must be provided by April 2, 2018. • Evidence of the professional development provided, including a list of attendees, dates of training and training materials for each training provided must be provided by July 6, 2018.
Math Scores for Middle-Grades Students with Disabilities	
Summary	<p>The district's percentage of students with disabilities scoring a level three or above for the 2015-16 school year was 19.5 percent, which is below the state target of 56.0 percent. For the 2016-17 school year, the percentage was 12.5 percent, which is below the state target of 61.0 percent.</p>
Recommendations	<p>The district should consider the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilize a team problem-solving approach and identify barriers to student success in middle-grades math courses including, steps to ensure quality instruction, supports and interventions for students with disabilities in middle-grades math courses. • Collaborate with discretionary project staff (e.g., FDLRS, FIN and PS:Rtl) to provide training and technical assistance to math teachers on best practices for instruction of students with disabilities that are based on needs. • Ensure that students with disabilities are enrolled in the

	<p>appropriate math course based on the sequential order of the courses and are receiving accurate support and accommodations according to their IEPs.</p> <p>In addition, when the FSA and end-of-course math scores for the 2017-18 school year are available, the district should review and analyze the data results. The district should continue to monitor student progress for middle-grades math students during the 2018-19 school year and consider additional professional development if the scores have not improved.</p>
Required Actions	None.
ELA Scores for Third Grade Students with Disabilities	
Summary	The district's percentage of students with disabilities scoring a level three or above for the 2015-16 school year was 34.1 percent, which is below the state average of 26.2 percent. For the 2016-17 school year, the percentage was 32.7 percent, which is above the state average of 31.2 percent.
Recommendations	<p>The district should consider the following actions to facilitate the improvement in academic achievement of all students with special attention given to students with disabilities in ELA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to analyze and problem solve using FSA data to determine Tier 1 issues that may be able to be resolved quickly. • Continue and increase use of the discretionary projects to support the district in the areas of flexible scheduling, MTSS implementation, collaborative teaching, universal design for learning and others that may be relevant based on assessment data. • Continue to support the district analyst's meetings to discuss school data; both achievement and EWS data. In these problem-solving sessions ensure that analysts are sharing best practices, strategies and barriers to implementation among teachers and classrooms.
Required Actions	None.
Phase 4 of the ESE Monitoring Process	
Summary	<p>The Washington County School District was selected for an on-site visit for the following focus areas related to students with disabilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduation rate • Dropout rate • Discipline 4A • LRE • Concerns regarding low math scores for middle-grades students with disabilities • Concerns regarding low ELA scores for third grade students with disabilities.
Required Actions	By November 5, 2018 , designated BEESS staff and members of the district problem-solving team will reconvene via a conference call to

	<p>share how the district is addressing each of the above-mentioned focus areas and determine next steps. The district will coordinate with BEESS regarding the date and time of the conference call and provide documentation (e.g., recent data, professional development, problem-solving notes and action plans) via BEESSMonitoring@fldoe.org by October 29, 2018.</p>
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Technical Assistance

1. **Implementing a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) for Behavior: Recommended Practices for School and District Leaders** (FLPBIS:MTSS) may be accessed at https://www.pbis.org/common/cms/files/pbisresources/RTIB_Guide_101811_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 **SP&P** document provides district- and school-based standards for documenting, reporting and monitoring the use of manual, physical, or mechanical restraint and seclusion developed by FDOE. The school district's document for the 2015-16 through 2017-18 school years may be accessed at <http://beess.fcim.org/sppDistrictDocSearch.aspx>.
3. The technical assistance paper, DPS: 2011-165, 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 <https://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 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 following resource documents 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, which draws from emerging research and best practices;
 - **Directory of Federal School Climate and Discipline Resources**, which indexes federal technical assistance and other resources; and
 - **Compendium of School Discipline Laws and Regulations**, which catalogs state laws and regulations related to school discipline.
5. **The Project 10: Transition Education Network** (<http://project10.info>) assists Florida school districts and relevant stakeholders in building capacity to provide secondary transition services to students with disabilities in order to improve their academic success and post-school outcomes. Project 10 serves as the primary conduit between BEESS and school-district personnel in addressing law and policy, effective practices, and research-based interventions in the area of transition services for youth with disabilities. The project also supports transition initiatives developed through the BEESS Strategic Plan. Examples of assistance provided related to graduation rates include using school-level data for graduation success, technical assistance to improve data collection, analysis and data-driven decision making, in order to develop a color-coded student graduation tracking system that can be coordinated with existing initiatives or systems. Regarding dropout, the

project supports dropout prevention strategies for students with disabilities, school-based enterprise, service learning and EWS.

6. **FDLRS Associate Centers Support** may be accessed at <http://www.fdlrs.org>. The 19 FDLRS associate centers provide an array of instructional and technical support services to school districts statewide. The four central functions of each FDLRS center are Child Find, parent services, human resource development, and professional learning and technology. The centers collaborate with districts, agency and support personnel, communities, families, and educational personnel providing support services for educators, school administrators, parents, and students with disabilities. Examples of professional development related to graduation rates include Florida standards and access points, differentiated instruction, access to the general curriculum, Strategic Instruction Model, behavior/discipline, Standing up for Me, self-advocacy, responsive classroom, and district-specific supports. Professional development related to dropout include differentiated instruction, accommodations, Conversation, Help, Activity, Movement, Participation, and Success (known as CHAMPS), Tough Kids, discipline in the secondary classroom, support for parent involvement, Professional Development Alternatives for Positive Behavior Support module, universal design for learning, small-group planning and problem solving, disability awareness, and district-specific supports.
7. **PS:Rtl Technology** may be accessed at <http://www.floridarti.usf.edu/index.html>. One function of this project provides support to regional technology coordinators and technology specialists to effectively implement accessible instructional materials, assistive technologies, learning technologies, and universal design for learning principles within all tiers of instruction. This project also manages, coordinates and supports the regional assistive technology loan libraries.
8. **SEDNET** may be accessed at <http://www.sednetfl.info/>. The 19 regional SEDNET centers assist Florida school districts and relevant stakeholders in building capacity to provide the necessary mental health and academic supports to students with or at risk of emotional and behavioral disabilities to prepare students to achieve academic success; graduate high school; and become college, career and life ready.
9. The **PS/Rtl – Technology and Learning Connections (TLC)** may be accessed at <http://www.tlc-mtss.com>. TLC provides guidelines and resources to support the implementation of universal design for learning. A quarterly newsletter that focuses on technology integration to support the local development of highly effective classrooms for all students may also be accessed. TLC's Winter 2016-17 newsletter focused on math instruction, resources and tools to eliminate barriers and increase achievement for all students and can be viewed at <http://conta.cc/2kjsuGt>. To sign up to receive this quarterly newsletter, go to <http://bit.ly/1TLoHLQ>. Additional resources are available at <http://www.tlc-mtss.com/resources.html>.

State Support Team for Washington 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>

Monica Verra-Tirado
Bureau Chief
BEESS
Monica.Verra-Tirado@fldoe.org

Derek Hemenway
Program Specialist
DRM

Shane Brown
Program Specialist
DRM
Shane.Brown@fldoe.org

Karrie Musgrove
Program Specialist
Instructional Student Support
Karrie.Musgrove@fldoe.org

Dianne Mennitt
School Nurse Consultant
Student Services
Dianne.Mennitt@fldoe.org

Peer Monitor

Staci Williams
ESE Director
Calhoun County School District

BEESS Discretionary Projects

Tury Lewis
Regional Representative
Project 10: Transition Education Network
tllewis@usfsp.edu

Ann Selland
Regional Coordinator
PS:Rtl
aselland@usf.edu

David Davis
Regional Technology Unit Coordinator
PS:Rtl Technology Learning Connection
david@tlc-mtss.com

Rusty Holmes
Regional Director
SEDNET
holmesr@paec.org

Faye Yongue
Program Coordinator
FDLRS
Faye.Yongue@paec.org

Caren Prichard
Facilitator
FIN
cprichard@contactfin.com

Kathy Christiansen
Technical Assistant Specialist
FLPBIS:MTSS
kchristianse@usf.edu

Pam Sudduth
Learning and Development Facilitator for
Literacy
PS:Rtl
psudduth@usf.edu



Pam Stewart, Commissioner
313231L