April 1, 2011

Ms. Sherrie Raulerson, Superintendent
Baker County School District
270 South Blvd. E.
Macclenny, Florida 32063

Dear Superintendent Raulerson:

The Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services is in receipt of your district’s response to the preliminary findings of its 2010-11 Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Compliance Self-Assessment. This letter and the attached document comprise the final report for Baker County School District’s 2010-11 Level 1 and Fall Cycle Level 2 self-assessment monitoring process.

The self-assessment system is designed to address the major areas of compliance related to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). SPP Indicator 15, Timely Correction of Noncompliance, requires that the state identify and correct noncompliance as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from identification. While any incident of noncompliance is of concern, in accordance with the language in SPP Indicator 15, the Bureau’s current monitoring system considers the timeliness of correction of noncompliance to be of greatest significance.

The results of district self-assessments are included in the State’s APR and are used to inform oversight activities, including the selection of districts for on-site monitoring, and the local educational agency (LEA) determinations required under Section 300.603, Title 34, Code of Federal Regulations, which result in districts being identified as “meets requirements,” “needs assistance,” “needs intervention,” or “needs substantial intervention.”

On January 5, 2011, the preliminary report of findings from the 2010-11 Level 1 and Fall Cycle Level 2 self-assessment process was released to your district’s ESE Director. The preliminary report detailed student-specific incidents of noncompliance that required immediate correction. Districts were required to correct all student-specific noncompliance and to provide evidence to the Bureau no later than March 7, 2011. In addition, districts are required to demonstrate that they are now correctly implementing each of the standards identified as noncompliant (i.e., 100 percent compliance).
In its 2010-11 Level 1 and Fall Cycle Level 2 self-assessment, Baker County School District assessed 53 standards. There were no incidents of noncompliance identified on those standards. The following is a summary of the district’s timely correction of student-specific incidents of noncompliance.

**Correction of Noncompliance by Student**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Records Reviewed/Protocols Completed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Items Assessed</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncompliant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely Corrected</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The attached *Baker County District Summary Report: Findings of Noncompliance by Standard* contains a summary of the findings reported by the individual standard or regulation assessed. In addition, a Matrix of Services review was required. Baker County School District reviewed five matrices for students reported at the 254 or 255 cost factors for weighted funding through the Florida Education Finance Program. No cost factor discrepancies were identified.

We understand that the implementation of this self-assessment required a significant commitment of resources and appreciate the time and attention your staff has devoted to the process thus far.

If you have questions regarding this process, please contact your assigned district liaison for monitoring or Patricia Howell, Program Director, at (850) 245-0476 or via electronic mail at patricia.howell@fldoe.org.

Sincerely,

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

Attachment

cc:  Debra Melvin    Patricia Howell
     Gayle Albritton  Vicki L. Eddy
     Frances Haithcock  Sheila Gritz
     Mary Jane Tappen
     Kim C. Komisar
This report provides a summary of the district's results and must be used when developing corrective actions. See the Student Report: Incidents of Noncompliance for student-specific findings. Results are reported by standard, and are based on the following:

Number of IEP protocols completed: 5
Number of standards per IEP: 37
Number of T16 protocols completed: 5
Number of standards per T16: 16

Total number of protocols: 10
Total number of standards: 265
Total number of incidents of noncompliance (NC): 0
Overall % incidents of noncompliance: 0%

Total number of different standards assessed: 53
Total number of different standards for which noncompliance was identified: 0
% of different standards for which noncompliance was identified: 0%

Percent of noncompliance is calculated as the # of incidents of noncompliance for a given standard divided by the # of protocols reviewed for that standard, multiplied by 100.

* Correctable for the student(s): A finding which requires immediate action(s) to correct the noncompliance
** Ensure future compliance: For findings which cannot be corrected for individual students, corrective actions are required to address how the district will ensure future compliance

No findings of noncompliance!