Mr. L. Daniel Hutto, President  
Florida School for the Deaf and the Blind (FSDB)  
207 North San Marco Avenue  
St. Augustine, Florida 32084-2762  

Dear Mr. Hutto:

The Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services is in receipt of your district’s response to the preliminary findings of its 2008-09 Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Compliance Self-Assessment. This letter and the attached document comprise the final report for FSDB’s 2008-09 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 March 30, 2009, the preliminary report of findings from the 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 no later than May 26, 2009, and to provide evidence to the Bureau no later than June 2, 2009. In addition, the preliminary report identified any standards for which the noncompliance was considered systemic (i.e., evident in ≥ 25% of the records reviewed).

BAMBI J. LOCKMAN  
Chief  
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services
In the event that there were systemic findings, a corrective action plan (CAP) was required. FSDB’s CAP was submitted to the Bureau for review and approval. We look forward to receiving the district’s report on their results no later than January 27, 2010. Your district’s adherence to this schedule is required in order to ensure correction of systemic noncompliance within a year as required by OSEP and Florida’s SPP.

In its 2008-09 self-assessment, FSDB assessed 44 standards. One or more incidents of noncompliance were identified on seven of those standards (15.9%). The following is a summary of the district’s timely correction of student-specific incidents of noncompliance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correction of Noncompliance by Student</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>220</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncompliant</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely Corrected</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The attached Florida School for the Deaf and the Blind Summary Report: Findings of Noncompliance by Standard contains a summary of the findings reported by the individual standard or regulation assessed. In the event there were systemic findings of noncompliance on specific standards that required the development of a CAP, those items are designated by shaded cells.

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:   debbie Schuler
      Frances Haithcock
      Mary Jane Tappen
      Kim C. Komisar
      Patricia Howell
      Annette Oliver
      Sheila Gritz
      Donnajo Smith
Florida Department of Education  
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services  

Self-Assessment 2008 - 2009  

This report provides a summary of the district's results and must be used when developing a corrective action plan. Results are reported by standard, with systemic noncompliance (occurrence in ≥ 25% of possible incidents) indicated as appropriate. See the Student Report: Incidents of Noncompliance for student-specific findings. Results are based on the following:

- Number of EP protocols completed: 5
- Number of standards per EP: 16
- Number of T16 protocols completed: 5
- Number of standards per T16: 28
- Total number of protocols: 10
- Total number of standards: 220
- Total number of incidents of noncompliance (NC): 9
- Overall % incidents of noncompliance: 4%

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 for which immediate action can be taken to correct the noncompliance.

** Individual CAP: For a finding which cannot be corrected for an individual student, a corrective action plan (CAP) is required to address how the district will ensure future compliance; this plan will be limited in scope, based on the nature of the finding.

*** Systemic CAP: For a finding of noncompliance on a given standard that occurs in ≥ 25% of possible incidents, a corrective action plan (CAP) is required to ensure future compliance; this plan must address the systemic nature of the finding and will be broader in scope than an individual CAP.

Note: In the event that there is a systemic finding of noncompliance on a standard that requires an individual CAP, only a systemic CAP is required.
# Self-Assessment 2008 – 2009


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noncompliance (NC)</th>
<th><em>Correctable for the Student(s)</em></th>
<th>**Individual CAP</th>
<th># NC</th>
<th>% NC</th>
<th>***Systemic CAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T16-6 If an agency likely to provide or pay for services during the current year is involved, a team member or designee was designated as responsible for follow-up with the agency and the IEP team was reconvened to identify alternative strategies if the agency failed to provide services as indicated on the IEP. (34 CFR 300.324(c)(1); Rule 6A-6.03028(8)(d), FAC.)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T16-12 There are transition services on the IEP that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the student to facilitate the student's articulation to post-school. (34 CFR 300.320(b)(2))</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T16-13 The transition services include course(s) of study that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the student to facilitate the student's articulation from school to post-school. (34 CFR 300.320(b)(2))</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T16-14 If transition services are likely to be provided or paid for by another agency, a representative of the agency <strong>was invited</strong> to participate in the IEP. (34 CFR 300.321(b)(3))</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T16-16 The IEP includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition service that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals. (34 CFR 300.320(b))</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP-13 The EP contains a statement of how the student's progress will be measured and reported to the parents. (Rule 6A-6.030191(4)(d), FAC.)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP-14 In developing the EP, the team considered the strengths of the student and needs resulting from the student's giftedness, the results of recent evaluations, including class work and state or district assessments, and, in the case of a student with limited English proficiency, the language needs of the student as they relate to the EP. (Rule 6A-6.030191(5)(a)-(c), FAC.)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>