

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

KATHLEEN SHANAHAN, Chair
ROBERTO MARTÍNEZ, Vice Chair

Members

SALLY BRADSHAW
GARY CHARTRAND
DR. AKSHAY DESAI
BARBARA S. FEINGOLD
JOHN R. PADGET

Gerard Robinson
Commissioner of Education



April 6, 2012

Mr. Alberto M. Carvalho, Superintendent
Miami-Dade County School District
1450 NE Second Avenue
Miami, FL 33132-1308

Dear Superintendent Carvalho:

The Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services is in receipt of your district's response to the preliminary findings of its 2011-12 Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Compliance Self-Assessment. This letter and the attached document comprise the final report for Miami-Dade County School District's 2011-12 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 timely 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, 2012, the preliminary report of findings from the 2011-12 Level 1 and Fall Cycle Level 2 self-assessment process was released to your district's ESE Director. The preliminary report detailed student-specific findings 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 5, 2012. 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).

MONICA VERRA-TIRADO, Ed.D., CHIEF
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services

In its 2011-12 Level 1 and Fall Cycle Level 2 self-assessment, Miami-Dade County School District assessed 47 standards. One or more findings of noncompliance were identified on 21 of those standards (44.7 %). The following is a summary of the district's timely correction of student-specific findings of noncompliance:

Correction of Noncompliance by Student

	Number	Percentage
Records Reviewed/Protocols Completed	26	-
Total Items Assessed	581	-
Noncompliant	87	15%
Timely Corrected	87	100%

The attached *Miami-Dade 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. Miami-Dade County School District reviewed 15 matrixes 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.

In addition to the individual correction(s) reported above, the district was required to demonstrate 100 percent compliance through review of a random sample of student records for each standard that was identified as noncompliant. Your district has provided the required records to demonstrate 100 percent compliance on all of the targeted standards, and no further corrective actions are required.

We understand that the implementation of this self-assessment requires 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 email at patricia.howell@fldoe.org.

Sincerely,



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

Attachments

cc: Will Gordillo Mary Jane Tappen Suzan Bastos
Edna Waxman Karen Denbroeder Sheila Gritz
Pam Stewart Patricia Howell

Florida Department of Education
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services

Self-Assessment 2011 – 2012
Level 1 and Fall Cycle Level 2

Miami-Dade County District Summary Report: Findings of Noncompliance by Standard

This report provides a summary of the district's results and must be used when developing corrective actions. See the *Student Report: Findings of Noncompliance* for student-specific findings. Results are reported by standard, and are based on the following:

Number of Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) protocols completed: 11
Number of standards per Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) protocol: 31
Number of SPP 13 - Secondary Transition Age 16 (T16) protocols completed: 15
Number of standards per SPP 13 - Secondary Transition Age 16 (T16) protocol: 16

Total number of protocols: 26
Total number of standards: 581
Total number of findings of noncompliance (NC): 87
Overall % findings of noncompliance: 15%

Total number of different standards assessed: 47
Total number of different standards for which noncompliance was identified: 21
% of different standards for which noncompliance was identified: 44.7%

Percent of noncompliance is calculated as the # of findings 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

Florida Department of Education
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services

**Self-Assessment 2011 – 2012
Level 1 and Fall Cycle Level 2**

Miami-Dade County District Summary Report: Findings of Noncompliance by Standard

Noncompliance (NC)		*Correctable for the Student(s)	**Ensure Future Compliance	# NC	% NC
T16-1	The notice of the IEP team meeting included a statement that a purpose of the meeting was the consideration of postsecondary goals and transition services, that the student would be invited, and identified any agency that would be invited to send a representative. (34 CFR §300.322(b)(2))		X	1	6.7%
T16-3	The student's strengths, preferences, and interests were taken into account. If the student was unable to attend the meeting, other steps were taken to ensure the student's preferences and interests were considered. (34 CFR §§300.43(a)(2) and 300.321(b)(2); Rules 6A-6.03028(3)(c)7. and (g)1. and 6A-6.03411(1)(nn)2.- 4., F.A.C.)	X		3	20.0%
T16-4	Beginning in eighth grade, or during the school year in which the student turns 14, whichever is sooner, the IEP must include a statement of whether the student is pursuing a course of study leading to a standard diploma or a special diploma. (Rules 6A-6.03028(3)(h)8 and 6A-1.09961(2)(a), F.A.C.)	X		2	13.3%
T16-5	In order to ensure quality transition planning and services, IEP teams shall begin the process of identifying transition services needs of students with disabilities, to include consideration of the student's need for instruction or the provision of information in the area of self-determination to assist the student to be able to actively and effectively participate in IEP team meetings and self-advocate, beginning no later than age fourteen (14), so that needed postsecondary goals may be identified and in place by age sixteen (16). (Rule 6A-6.03028(3)(h)9, F.A.C.)	X		2	13.3%

Noncompliance (NC)		*Correctable for the Student(s)	**Ensure Future Compliance	# NC	% NC
T16-7	The IEP for a 17-year-old includes a statement that the student has been informed of the rights that will transfer at age 18. (34 CFR §§300.320(c), and 300.520(a)(1); Rule 6A-6.03028(3)(h)11, F.A.C.)		X	2	13.3%
T16-8	A separate and distinct notice of the transfer of rights was provided closer to the time of the student's 18th birthday. (34 CFR §§300.320(c), 300.520(a)(1) and 300.625); Rule 6A-6.03311(8)(c), F.A.C.)		X	1	6.7%
T16-9	There is a measurable postsecondary goal or goals in the designated areas (i.e., education/training, employment, and, where appropriate, independent living skills). (34 CFR §300.320(b)(1); Rule 6A-6.03028(3)(h)10a, F.A.C.)	X		9	60.0%
T16-10	The measurable postsecondary goal was based on age-appropriate transition assessment. (34 CFR §300.320(b)(1); Rule 6A-6.03028(3)(h)10a, F.A.C.)	X		3	20.0%
T16-11	The IEP includes measurable annual goals (and short-term objectives/benchmarks, if applicable) that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the student related to the student's transition services needs. (34 CFR §300.320(a)(2); Rule 6A-6.03028(3)(h)2-3, F.A.C.)	X		12	80.0%
T16-12	There are transition services on the IEP to assist the student in reaching the measurable postsecondary goals. (34 CFR §300.320(b)(2); Rule 6A-6.03411(1)(nn), F.A.C.)	X		4	26.7%
T16-13	The transition services include course(s) of study needed to assist the student to reach the postsecondary goal(s). (34 CFR §300.320(b)(2))	X		9	60.0%
T16-16	The IEP includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon: an age-appropriate transition assessment; transition services, including	X		14	93.3%

Noncompliance (NC)		*Correctable for the Student(s)	**Ensure Future Compliance	# NC	% NC
	courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals; and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority. (34 CFR §§300.320(b)-(c) and 300.321(b); Rule 6A-6.03028(3)(b)-(c) and (h), F.A.C.)				
DJJ-2	The parents were provided notice of the IEP team meeting a reasonable amount of time prior to the meeting, at least one attempt to invite the parent was through a written notice, and a second attempt was made if no response was received from the first notice. (34 CFR §300.322(a)(1))		X	2	18.2%
DJJ-5	The parents were members of any group making decisions about the educational placement of the student. If neither parent was able to attend the IEP team meeting, there is documentation of attempts to ensure parent participation. (34 CFR §§300.322(c)-(d), 300.328, and 300.501(c))		X	1	9.1%
DJJ-7	The IEP for a school-age student includes a statement of present levels of academic achievement and functional performance, including how the student's disability affects involvement and progress in the general education curriculum. (34 CFR §300.320(a)(1))	X		2	18.2%
DJJ-8	The IEP includes measurable annual goals, including academic and functional goals, designed to meet the student's needs that result from the disability to enable the child to be involved in and make progress in the general education curriculum and meet the student's other needs that result from the disability. Benchmarks or short-term objectives should be included for students with disabilities who take alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards or any other student with a disability as determined by the IEP team. (34 CFR §300.320(a)(2))	X		9	81.8%

Noncompliance (NC)		*Correctable for the Student(s)	**Ensure Future Compliance	# NC	% NC
DJJ-15	There is evidence of the provision of supplementary aids and services as specified on the IEP: lesson plans, log(s), interview(s), other. (Rule 6A-6.05281(1)(c), F.A.C.)	X		2	18.2%
DJJ-23	The IEP team considered the strengths of the student; the academic, developmental, and functional needs of the student; the results of the initial evaluation or most recent evaluation; and the results of the student's performance on any statewide or districtwide assessment. (34 CFR §300.324(a)(1); Rule 6A-6.03028(3)(g), F.A.C.)	X		1	9.1%
DJJ-24	The IEP team considered, in the case of a student whose behavior impedes his or her learning, or that of others, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and other strategies, to address that behavior. (34 CFR §300.324(a)(2)(i))	X		5	45.5%
DJJ-27	The IEP team considered the communication needs of the child, including, for a student who is deaf or hard-of-hearing, consideration of the student's opportunities for direct communication with peers and professional personnel in the student's mode of communication, academic level, and full range of needs, including opportunities for direct instruction in the student's language and communication mode. (34 CFR §300.324(a)(2)(iv))	X		1	9.1%
DJJ-30	The IEP had been reviewed at least annually, and revised as appropriate, to address: any lack of progress toward the annual goals; any lack of progress in the general education curriculum, if appropriate; the results of reevaluation; information about the student provided to, or by, the parent; and/or the student's anticipated needs or other matters. (34 CFR §300.324(b)(1))	X		2	18.2%

Florida Department of Education
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services

Self-Assessment 2011 – 2012
Level 1 and Fall Cycle Level 2
Miami-Dade County District Report: Matrix of Services

This report provides a summary of the results of the Matrix of Services review component of the ESE Compliance Self-Assessment for this school district.

Total # of Matrixes reported by District: 15
Cost Factor 254 reported: 11
Cost Factor 255 reported: 4

Total # of Matrixes reviewed by District: 15
Cost Factor 254 reviewed: 11
Cost Factor 255 reviewed: 4
Cost Factors 251-253 reviewed: 0

Total # of Matrixes reviewed by DOE: 2
Cost Factor 254 reviewed: 2
Cost Factor 255 reviewed: 0
Cost Factors 251-253 reviewed: 0
Discrepancies between Matrixes reported and
Matrixes reviewed by District or DOE: 8

Domain A – Curriculum and Learning Environment: 2
Domain B – Social/Emotional Behavior: 1
Domain C – Independent Functioning: 0
Domain D – Health Care: 0
Domain E – Communication: 2
Extra Points: 0
Total Ratings: 3
Cost Factors: 0

% Cost Factors Discrepancies: 0%

No cost factor discrepancies.