

**NEW HAMPSHIRE  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
SPECIAL EDUCATION  
FOCUSED MONITORING  
PROGRAM APPROVAL AND IMPROVEMENT PROCESS**

**WEARE SCHOOL DISTRICT  
SUMMARY REPORT**

**Christine Tyrie, Superintendent of Schools  
Diane Lurvey, Director of Special Education  
Meeta Brown, Special Education Coordinator**

Mary Anne Byrne and Jennifer Dolloff,  
Education Consultants, SERESC

Report Date: May 23, 2008

## **Table of Contents**

### **Section I**

#### **A. Introduction**

- 1. Background and District Profile**
- 2. District Mission and Beliefs**
- 3. Team Members**
- 4. Focused Monitoring Priority**
- 5. Focused Monitoring Process**

#### **B. Data Inquiry and Analysis**

- 1. Abstract**
- 2. Collection Process/Activities**
- 3. Data Analysis**

#### **C. Compliance Component**

- 1. IEP Review Process**
- 2. Preschool Review**
- 3. Other**
- 4. Citations of Non-Compliance Identified**
- 5. District Wide Commendations**

### **Section II**

#### **The Improvement/Action Plan**

### **Section III**

#### **Grant Application**

# SECTION I

## A. Introduction

### 1. Background and District Profile

Center Woods Elementary School (CWES) and Weare Middle School (WMS) are located in the town of Weare, New Hampshire and are a part of School Administrative Unit 24. The Weare School District is comprised of these two schools where Center Woods Elementary School serves 593 students in kindergarten through fourth grade, and Weare Middle School serves 574 middle school students in grades five through eight. John Stark Regional High School serves 890 students in grades nine through twelve from Weare and Henniker. Weare students comprise two-thirds of the John Stark student population.

The town of Weare is located in Hillsborough County and occupies approximately 60.1 square miles. According to the 2000 U.S. Census data, the total population of Weare was 8,542. The per capita income was \$22,217.00. Weare spends about \$3000 per student below the state average while the Henniker School District and the John Stark School District spend slightly more than the state average. Weare voters did not pass the 2007-2008 Weare School District budget resulting in a default budget. In September 2007, the doors of a new middle school were opened, providing educational spaces for 850 students.

At Center Woods Elementary School there are five to seven teachers at each grade level depending on the enrollment. There is one special educator per grade level who assists classroom teachers in the implementation of students' individual educational plans. There are 2.5 FTE reading specialists and a half time Title I teacher. CWES has a preschool program serving three and four year olds. At the present time, there is no alternative program at CWES.

Weare Middle School has six classroom teachers and one special educator per grade. Grades five and six are configured into two-teacher pods for a total of three pods per grade level team. Grades seven and eight are configured into three four-teacher teams. WMS has two alternative programs, one behavior program, and one life skills program. Title I math services are provided to fifth and sixth graders. A literacy coach provides reading services funded by Title I, Title II and IDEA-B.

### 2. District Mission and Beliefs

#### The Weare School District Philosophy

The primary purpose of education in the Weare School District is to prepare all students to be responsible citizens in a democratic society, with a base of critical skills and attitudes necessary to understand and meet the challenges of a continually changing world. The school district promotes high expectations and standards for all students and staff; it encourages them to strive for their full potential, and instills in them a desire to expand their horizons through life-long learning. The school district pledges to recognize and accept unique needs, interests, and talents of all students and staff, and to teach them to have this same respect for themselves and others. Providing an orderly and caring atmosphere fosters the creative spirit, encourages a positive self-image, and promotes critical thinking.

Learning takes place not only in school, but in the home and community. A cooperative and supportive relationship among these groups creates a comprehensive and constantly improving educational experience.

#### Weare Schools District Goals

1. Prepare all students to be responsible citizens in a democratic society.
2. Provide all students with a foundation of basic skills.
3. Encourage a positive self-image in all students and staff.
4. Inspire all students and staff to be life-long learners.
5. Recognize, accept and provide for the individual needs and talents of all students and staff.
6. Develop the ability to communicate effectively.
7. Promote a structured, safe, and positive learning environment.

8. Foster a cooperative and supportive relationship among the home, school, and community through open communication.

### 3. Achievement Team Membership:

Christine Tyrie	Superintendent, SAU #24
Doug White	Assistant Superintendent, SINI and DINI team member
Diane Lurvey	Director of Student Services
Judy Lamont	School Board Member and Parent
David Pabst	Principal, Weare Middle School, SINI team member
Jude Chauvette	Principal, Center Woods Elementary School, DINI team
Meeta Brown	Weare Schools Special Education Coordinator, SINI team
Kristin Menard	Special Education Lead Teacher and Parent, CWES
Holly Kimball-Rhines	Reading Specialist, CWES
Denise Burke	Grade 2 teacher, CWES
David Chamberlain	Grade 5 teacher, WMS
Melissa Caswell	Grade 7/8 Special Educator and Parent, WMS
Elizabeth Paul	Reading Teacher, WMS
Donna Caggiano	Parent and Paraprofessional, WMS, SINI team
Mary Anne Byrne	SERESC Consultant
Jen Dolloff	SERESC Consultant

### 4. Focused Monitoring Priority

***Include a summary of the information the Achievement Team has gathered through examining district practice within the areas of Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment, District Processes, Leadership, Culture, and Climate, and how the priority areas are integrated into the SINI, DINI and/or FM processes.***

The Achievement Team has set three priorities for the Focused Monitoring process. The first priority is to develop and implement a consistent and universal system of reading interventions. NECAP, NWEA and DIBELS data along with the results of multiple questionnaires to staff demonstrated the need for this priority. Focus groups were conducted to test the hypothesis that the district does not currently have a well-articulated universal system of reading interventions. The results of these multiple data points reinforced the need to provide a well articulated system of reading instruction that is understood by all stake holders; with clear entry and exit points; including interventions that all necessary providers are trained to implement; and, consistent data collection, storage and use to insure that all students not yet achieving proficiency receive research-based interventions that are directed at individual area(s) of weakness. This priority integrates curriculum, instruction, assessment, and district processes. The final products will include a SAU 24 Pyramid of Interventions Framework, a Weare Intervention Manual designed for general education, special education as well as other service providers, and a data ‘binder’ that will allow all teachers easy access to necessary data collected over time.

The IEP is the focus of the second priority, which mirrors the Weare DINI plan. IEPs need to identify appropriate classroom accommodations that are aligned with acceptable NECAP accommodations. IEP goals need to be directly related to the district curriculum and address student needs as identified through student data. Direct instruction needs to be given in test taking strategies directly related to the NECAP question format and language used in questions and directions.

The third priority is to research best practice in parent involvement and develop a plan to more extensively involve parents in the schools, in the special education process and in supporting their children academically. A variety of questionnaires indicated that there is not currently a systematic approach to involving parents actively in the education of their children. This was believed to be a missing link in maximizing student potential.

## 5. Focused Monitoring Process

*Include a description of FM process such as aligning initiatives, focus forums, interviews, professional development opportunities and other activities conducted during the year.*

Weare Middle School was designated a School in Need of Improvement (SINI) in the area of Mathematics for the special education sub-group. A year later the Weare District was designated a District in Need of Improvement (DINI), again in the area of Mathematics for the special education sub-group. The same year the Weare District was selected for the Focused Monitoring Special Education Program Monitoring (FM) process for the size of the gap between the mean scaled scores of the special education population and all other students on the NECAP. The Leadership Team decided to write a DINI plan focused on improving math proficiency for special education students and had the FM Team focus on the area of reading improvement for special education students. This decision was made in order to keep focus on improved instruction in both key areas.

The Focused Monitoring District Self-Evaluation Tool was completed by teachers, paraprofessionals, administrators and school board members in September. The strengths noted were Collaboration, Professional Development and Alignment of Curriculum while the weaknesses noted were Improved Student Outcomes, District Decision-making Process, and Parent/Community Participation. Much discussion took place as to possible hypotheses for the gap in achievement. The NECAP and NWEA data was looked at for the past three years to look for trends. The Data Driven Dialogue Model of Predict, Observe and Infer or Question was used to guide the discussion. A blog was set up for the Achievement Team to share minutes, agendas and articles of interest.

The Achievement Team reviewed the SAU 24 Literacy Survey results for the two schools. High scores were in Understanding Literacy, while areas of concern were Scheduling and Consistency of Interventions. A survey was developed and given to staff regarding the tiered approach to reading intervention. While many exciting and passionate discussions took place regarding the reading intervention programs currently in use, it was quickly clear that the district lacked a consistent and universal system of reading interventions that all participants could equally articulate.

Principals in each school completed the Data Inventory indicating what assessments were used, where data was stored and how it was used. It was determined that Weare has sufficient data but does not consistently utilize the depth of analysis of individualized data available through tools such as Performance Pathways and NWEA. Progress monitoring is used but requires further definition and succinct tracking from year to year.

In the area of Curriculum, the Achievement Team noted that the district focus on reading instruction for the prior three years with the adoption of the core curriculum by Houghton Mifflin has had positive results for the students without disabilities, but not similar results for the disabled students. The Team questioned what materials were being used with struggling students, how much time was dedicated to intervention, who was providing the instruction and what core curriculum was used at grades 7 and 8. The findings of the staff questionnaire resulted in the determination that the schools did not have a well-articulated system of interventions and consistent service delivery model nor was intervention staff consistently well trained to provide a seamless delivery of intervention across grades. It was found that staff had an inconsistent understanding of a variety of vocabulary surrounding reading and reading intervention as well.

In the area of Instruction, the Achievement Team looked at the work a previous district work group had done with the Three Tier Model of reading. The SAU 24 Literacy Survey given to all staff the first day of school indicated that schedules do not allow for sufficient time and flexibility to support the literacy initiative nor were there sufficient interventions for under-performing students. A focus group looked at how differentiated instruction (DI) was used in the general education classroom and again found inconsistent understanding and implementation of DI. Once again the information gathered pointed to the need for a well articulated pyramid of interventions with well articulated entry and exit points and staff trained to provide the agreed upon interventions. Focus groups at two grades studied the assessment and instructional data for identified students and found that the system was not well articulated and systematically delivered.

In terms of Culture and Climate it is agreed that general and special educators collaborate on instructional support. Questions arose around staff retention, salary, caseload, and working conditions. One school has recently had a large

turnover of special education staff. Consistent collaboration between general education teachers and special education teachers was questioned. Efforts are underway in both schools to develop professional learning communities with teachers focusing on student outcomes.

The Achievement Team work included the implementation of a Data Cohort class to increase capacity among staff in the area of data analysis. Staff was trained to use Performance Pathways as well as NWEA reports. The group helped build a data template to make data collection and use by classroom teachers more accessible. The FM team then assembled data files on each student for teachers.

The Achievement Team will work in conjunction with the SAU 24 K-9 administrators to build site-based literacy handbooks based on the SAU 24 template. This work insures a consistent approach to literacy across the SAU and ownership by all levels of the organization.

The Weare Schools offered trainings in AIMSweb to support the progress monitoring work being done in reading and special education as well as Wilson training for staff. The FM Team will continue to offer professional development opportunities in the interventions selected by the SAU 24 K-9 Administrators.

## **B. Data Inquiry and Analysis**

### **1. Abstract**

*Include an overview of the underlying or “root cause” issues most likely affecting student achievement. This information will help provide the rationale for the activities to be implemented.*

The primary focus quickly became the lack of a consistent and universal system of reading interventions. Several years have been spent working on the ‘universal’ or core curriculum and now the focus needs to shift to the intervention levels. This work is being drafted at the SAU level with further definition being given at the site level.

### **2. Data Collection Process/Activities**

*Describe the data collection activities that the achievement team engaged in, describe the various methods that were used to examine the data. What existing data sources were identified and used to answer the essential question(s)? In addition to the baseline data, what additional data were needed and how was it gathered? What was the timeline for these activities?*

The Achievement Team examined the NWEA data and the NECAP data for All Other Students and for Special Education Students for the last three years looking at growth targets and overall trends of change in the percent of students obtaining a score of proficient in the area of reading. The Team looked at the alignment of the NWEA with the NECAP as a predictor of NECAP outcomes. Performance Pathways was used to look at individual data as well as Growth data. The data was examined for both cohort groups and grade levels. For students younger than third grade DIBELS scores were used along with NWEA scores to study student growth. NECAP and NWEA data was examined at the October meeting to help develop hypothesis and questions relating to the essential question; additional data was examined in the February, March and April meetings, as well

A Data Inventory was compiled in September/October by each school to address questions about what data is collected, where is it stored, who has access, and how is it used.

Focus Groups were used to look at Differentiated Instruction as well as the movement of students in and out of intervention programs during November and January.

Questionnaires and surveys were used to obtain information about staff readiness for the FM process, district level Literacy and understanding of a tiered approach to reading instruction and intervention. Data was collected in August, September, October and November.

Focus groups were held in January at CWES and WMS to gather information on Special Education programming, including setting (time, location and duration), intervention structure (provider, programs and missed classroom content areas), and student progress (length of time identified, criteria for grouping and progress monitoring methods).

### **3. Data Analysis**

*What were the findings from the data collected? Analyze, disaggregate and summarize data as appropriate and indicate trends or patterns that answer the essential question.*

In answering the essential question: “What are the contributing factors to the achievement gap in reading between students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers, and how may this gap be narrowed?” it was determined that while several initiatives are underway in the district there is inconsistent application and understanding of interventions for students not meeting proficiency standards at the schools. A clear understanding and application of Differentiated Instruction in the general education classroom was not found. Additional data was used to further examine student progress and access to interventions and resulted in the conclusion that a clear, consistent and well articulated system of interventions was not yet established and applied across all grades, classrooms and service providers.

## **C. Special Education Compliance Component NHDOE Focused Monitoring Process**

### **Introduction**

The compliance component of the NHDOE Focused Monitoring Process includes both an internal and external review of Special Education data directly linked to compliance with state and federal Special Education rules and regulations. Data gathered through the various compliance activities is reported back to the school’s Achievement Team, as well as the NHDOE, Bureau of Special Education. This is for the purpose of informing both the district and the NHDOE of the status of the district’s Special Education processes, programming, and progress of students with disabilities and the alignment of Special Education programming with the curriculum, instruction and assessment systems within the school district.

### **Data Collection Activities**

As part of the NHDOE Focused Monitoring Process a Special Education compliance review was conducted in the Weare School District. Listed below is the data that was reviewed as part of the compliance review, all of which are summarized in this report.

- Review of random IEPs
- Review of LEA Focused Monitoring Compliance Application including:
  - Special Education Policy and Procedures
  - Special Education staff qualifications
  - Program descriptions
- Review of all district Special Education programming
- James O Compliance Review (if applicable)
- Review of Out of District Files
- When appropriate, review of student records for students with disabilities who are attending Charter Schools
- Review of parent feedback collected through the focused monitoring data collection activities
- Review of requests for approval of new programs, and/or changes to existing programs

## **I. IEP Review Process, Conducted on March 13, 14 and May 8, 2008**

As part of the compliance component of Focused Monitoring, the NHDOE worked in collaboration with the Weare School District to conduct reviews of student IEPs. The IEP Review Process has been designed by the NHDOE to assist teams in examining the IEP for educational benefit, as well as compliance with state and federal Special Education rules and regulations. The review is based on the fact that the IEP is the foundation of the Special Education process.

**As required by the IEP review process, general and special educators in the Weare School District were provided with a collaborative opportunity to review 4 IEPs that were randomly selected to determine if the documents included the following information:**

- Student's present level of performance
- Measurable annual goals related to specific student needs
- Instructional strategies, interventions, and supports identified and implemented to support progress toward measurable goals
- Assessment (formative and summative) information gathered to develop annual goals and to measure progress toward annual goals
- Accommodations and/or modifications determined to support student access to the general curriculum instruction and assessment
- Identification of who will gather assessment data, where/when it will be gathered and how data is recorded
- The revision of goals and/or objectives/benchmarks to the general education curriculum, instruction and assessment practices when students are not demonstrating success, when appropriate
- Three-year look back at the student's progress toward key IEP goals and the documented evidence of student gains

The intended outcome of the IEP Review Process is not only to ensure compliance, but to also develop a plan for improved communication and collaboration between general and special educators, parents and students in the development, implementation and monitoring of IEPs.

### **BELOW IS THE SUMMARY OF DISTRICT LEVEL FINDINGS THAT RESULTED FROM THE IEP REVIEW PROCESS CONDUCTED IN THE WEARE SCHOOL DISTRICT:**

#### **District Summary of IEP Review Process**

##### **Number of IEPs Reviewed: 4**

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Is there a relationship between the student's needs resulting from his/her disability and the goals?	4	
Are the annual goals measurable (i.e., contain criteria for measurable and achievable progress)?	4	
Is there evidence the student is making progress? (Measuring Progress, #3)	4	
Does this year's goal reflect last year's progress? e.g., more complex goal(s), address needs commensurate with the progress and present levels of performance.) (Longitudinal IEP Review, #4)	4	

#### **Conclusions/Patterns Trends Identified Through IEP Review Process**

- **How has this process informed future plans for improving the writing of student IEPs?**
  1. Participants recognize the significant progress and improvement that has been made in the district in the development and monitoring of IEPs.
  2. The process highlighted the value of spending teachers' time focused on students' access to curriculum and their needs. To do this, a process to select students for discussion should be determined and an agenda for collaborative meetings would be useful.
  3. The process provided a baseline to inform future professional development.

Additional plans for improving the writing of student IEPs can be found in the *\*Suggestions* section below.

- **Describe how individual student performance information is conveyed from grade to grade/school to school:**
  1. The literacy file and cumulative student information sheet is transferred to next year's teacher(s)
  2. Report cards
  3. IEPs are given to teachers; in some cases, prior to the start of school
  4. Informal observation & conversation/discussions occur
  5. Team meetings
  6. Special Educators loop for 2 years in grades 5/6 and 7/8
  7. The high school team attends meetings at the middle school; the 5<sup>th</sup> grade team attends meetings at the elementary school.
  
- **How will the district further explore the factors that have impacted poor scores for individual students on state assessments?**

Part of the Focused Monitoring Action Plan is to address possible causes resulting in poor NECAP scores by:

  1. Focusing on alignment of classroom accommodations with NECAP and district assessment accommodations.
  2. Incorporating NECAP question styles into classroom assessments
  3. Providing instruction on test-taking strategies

- **Strengths and suggestions identified related to IEP development/progress monitoring and services:**

***Strengths:***

1. Collaboration between special and general educators participating in the IEP Review Process
2. Services are responsive to data
3. Progress monitoring is data driven
4. Looping of special educators in grades 5/6 and 7/8
5. Progression of growth was evident from IEP to IEP
6. Effective use of data; triangulation of data

***\*Suggestions:***

1. Formalize process for gathering information from teachers & parents prior to writing IEP
2. In the IEP present levels of performance, tease out / separate functional from academic
3. Fill in all questions in the IEP template/form
4. Provide further training with CAsE IEP program
5. Include more data in profile
6. Review placement change processes
7. Continue to examine accommodations to create a more seamless transition from school to school
8. In the IEP, provide an explanation of why non-proficient areas on the NECAP are not addressed in IEP goals
9. Explore ways to increase parent involvement, e.g. in IEP development
10. Include progress monitoring data in the narrative section of the quarterly progress reports

- **Strengths and suggestions related to the overall education system**

***Strengths:***

1. Training in Professional Learning Communities has been provided to many; implementation is ongoing
2. Communication and collaboration among teachers
3. Positive climate and culture
4. Reflective staff looking for constant improvement
5. Knowledge of current best practice
6. Comprehensive assessment practices

7. Data cohort training to build capacity to locate and use assessments
8. Parent access to grades and homework pages online (Power School)

**Suggestions:**

1. Formalize retention policy and procedure
2. Continue refining the implementation of the Professional Learning Communities model
3. Establish common language and definitions for assessments, e.g. probes, essentials, samples
4. Consider expanding the successful practice of student-led parent conferences to all grades
5. Develop a more systematic approach for sharing student information from grade to grade
6. Provide more scheduled time and guidance/facilitation for collaborative data inquiry

**2. Preschool Review**

**NEW HAMPSHIRE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM APPROVAL AND MONITORING PROCESS  
PRESCHOOL PROGRAM REVIEW FORM**

School District: Weare	SAU#: 24	Date: April 4, 2008
Team Members: Meeta Brown, Coordinator	Colleen Bovi, Technical Assistant	
Tara Brochu, OT	Mary Anne Byrne	
Lisa, COTA	Linda Tansey, Preschool Teacher	
Donna McCarron, SLP		

**Access to Appropriate Preschool Activities**

Ed. 1109.01 Elements of an IEP CFR 300.320 Content of IEP  
Ed. 1109.05, Implementation of IEP 20 U.S.C. 1414 (d)  
Ed. 1115.07, Ed 1119.01(f) Provision of Non-Academic Services/Settings CFR 300.320(a) CFR 300.34 Ed. 1119.03, Full Access to District's Curricula  
Ed. 1107.04 (d) Qualified Examiner  
Ed. 1133.05 (c)(h)(k) CFR 300.320 Program Requirements  
Ed. 1133.20 Protections Afforded to Children with Disabilities  
CFR 300.320(a) (1) (ii) “. . .for preschool children, as appropriate, how the disability affects the child's participation in appropriate activities)”  
CFR 300.320(a) (4) (iii) “To be educated and participate with other children with disabilities and non disabled children”

The Weare Preschool Program provides a continuum of supports and services to approximately 20 children with and without disabilities. There are 40% typical children in one class and 25% in a second classroom. Three sections of preschool operate Mondays through Thursdays between the hours of 8:30-11:20 and 12:30-3:15. The program has a lead teacher, a preschool teacher, one full-time assistant and two individual assistants, a speech pathologist, an occupational therapist and an occupational therapy assistant. Outside related service personnel are also contracted, such as a low-vision teacher, behavior specialist, etc. There are no students placed in community preschool programs. Extended year services are available three mornings a week for four weeks for those children who qualify. Occupational, physical and speech therapy are offered during the EYS program.

There is no written general education curriculum. The team provides a language-based program following the Responsive Classroom model. Thematic units guide instruction. The daily schedule includes free play, circle, work centers, snack, story, recess/dancing/music. Children attending the preschool are included in all school activities and they participate as appropriate. An age appropriate playground is accessible just outside the classroom and provides opportunities for both preschool and kindergarten children.

The Weare Preschool Program staff involves parents in their children’s programs. There is a weekly newsletter informing parents about the themes and other preschool news. Email, phone contact, notebook communication and face-to-face meetings occur. Parents of typical children are seen each day as they bring their children to school. Summer activities are shared. Related services updates are also provided (sensory diets, speech activities, etc.).

**Transition**

**Ed. 1107.02 (h) Process: Provision of FAPE CFR 300.124 Part C Transition**  
**Ed. 1109.01 Elements of an IEP (Transition Services)**  
**Ed. 1109.03, IEP Team CFR 300.321 and 300.321(f)**  
**CFR 300.322 (b) Parent Participation**  
 This includes movement from (a) Early Supports and Services (ESS) to preschool, and b) pre-school to elementary school.

Kristin Menard, Lead Teacher, maintains contact with the Community Bridges Program, Weare’s Early Supports and Services (ESS) provider. IEPs are fully developed and signed by the child’s third birthday. Team members typically do not attend transition meetings. The preschool team follows the special education process for this population, beginning with a referral. Children and their parents are invited in to the preschool where the child is observed. It also provides the opportunity for the parents to see the program in operation and to meet the staff. The team utilizes the HELP assessment completed by ESS to develop the IEP and will conduct additional assessment as needed.

While there is no formal process for transition to kindergarten, the preschool children have opportunity to play with the children and be observed by teachers in the common playground. Kindergarten teachers are involved with developing the IEP. Related services staff may also be called upon to assist with transition. For children transitioning from kindergarten to grade 1, the district has an extended year service called Jump Start, which assists with preparing children for first grade.

**Behavior Strategies and Discipline**

<b><u>Ed. 1109.02 Program</u></b>	<b><u>CFR 300.324</u></b>
<b><u>Ed. 1119.11 Disciplinary Procedures</u></b>	<b><u>CFR 300.530-300.536</u></b>
<b><u>Ed. 1133.07 (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)</u></b>	<b><u>CFR 300.530-300.536</u></b>
<b><u>20 U.S.C. 1415 (K)</u></b>	
<b><u>Child Management – Private Schools</u></b>	<b><u>RSA 169-C Child Protection Act</u></b>

The preschool program utilizes a “stoplight” behavioral approach for the entire program. Children learn the codes for red, yellow and green and respond to the presentation of these color cards. Noncompliance is the main behavioral issue. The district contracts with an outside consultant who works with the staff to develop behavior programs. This consultant will also work with families on an as needed basis.

Professional development opportunities are provided and preschool staff participates in PTAN activities. Topics include autism spectrum disorders, Picture Exchange Communication System (PECS), Brigance training, Brain Gym, integrated therapies, Wilson Language and case management.

**Assessment**

<b><u>Ed. 1109.02 Program</u></b>	<b><u>CFR 300.324</u></b>
<b><u>Ed. 1119.11 Disciplinary Procedures</u></b>	<b><u>CFR 300.530-300.536</u></b>
<b><u>Ed. 1133.07 (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)</u></b>	<b><u>CFR 300.530-300.536</u></b>
<b><u>20 U.S.C. 1415 (K)</u></b>	
<b><u>Child Management – Private Schools</u></b>	<b><u>RSA 169-C Child Protection Act</u></b>

The district (SAU –wide) has selected the Brigance® Inventory of Early Development II (IED-II) to meet the Preschool Special Education Outcomes requirement. While there were some challenges early on the team will meet the entry deadlines.

The Weare preschool staff is tracking skills for growth using an Excel spreadsheet. Formative assessments are being used as well. Specific skills are targeted and tracked. The team is using data more frequently for continuous monitoring of programs. As children move into kindergarten, assessments such as the DIBELS and NWEA are administered. The biggest challenge with data is time management.

The preschool speech/language pathologist conducts informal child find screenings. If children are flagged for further assessment, a referral is made and appropriate assessment tools are suggested, including the HELP, the Brigance, the Goldman-Fristoe Test of Articulation, the Peabody Picture and the Expressive One-Word Picture Vocabulary Tests, Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals, Visual Motor Integration and Sensory Profile.

### **Strengths and Suggestions**

The Weare Preschool Program offers a nice continuum of services for its young children. Evaluations are thorough and are completed with the 45-day time frame. The team is professional, works well together and does an exceptional job integrating therapies and services into the program. There is good home-school communication using a variety of methods. Weekly team meetings allow for building a common vision and developing appropriate strategies and plans to meet the needs of all children. Professional development opportunities and ability to secure outside consultation are areas of strength in Weare. The physical layout of the program and its proximity to the kindergarten program allows for smooth and effective transition.

Based on this preschool program review, it is suggested:

1. The preschool team review its child find procedures and develop a written plan to include a calendar for continuous public awareness activities, screening and evaluations designed to locate, identify, and refer as early as possible all young children with disabilities and their families who are in need of Early Intervention Program (Part C) or Preschool Special Education (Part B/619) services of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).
2. Curriculum and assessment alignment between preschool and kindergarten is suggested.
3. Policies and procedures for all aspects of preschool programming should be reviewed and updated.

Because there is no written general education curriculum, the Weare Preschool is cited per Ed. 1119.03, Full Access to District's Curricula). The district will identify appropriate activities to meet the area of noncompliance in their corrective action plan

### **3. Other**

#### **a. Parent Feedback**

As part of the Focused Monitoring Process, parents participated as members of the Achievement Team, providing inquiry and insight throughout the year. As part of the Focused Monitoring Action Plan for 2008-2009, parents will be a part of the task force that investigates effective and authentic parent involvement. The group will develop and implement a plan to increase parent involvement in the schools, with the goal of ultimately improving student achievement.

#### **b. Personnel**

The Bureau of Credentialing verified that the staff in the Weare School District has appropriately certified staff.

#### **c. Out of District File Review and Monitoring of James O Consent Decree**

Based on the random review of 1 student file for children with disabilities placed out of district there were no citations. There are no court ordered student placements from Weare.

#### **Commendations:**

- The Weare School District has a wide array of programs and services resulting in only 1 student placed out of district at this time.
- For the student placed out of the district, the Weare Special Education Coordinator monitors the programming in a very comprehensive manner, and all the student's records are well maintained and in compliance.

**d. Students with Disabilities Attending Charter Schools:**

There are no students attending Charter Schools from the Weare School District.

**e. Requests for Approval of New Programs and/or Changes to Existing Programs:**

Weare has not made a request for approval of new programs and/or changes to existing programs.

**f. Policies and Procedures**

The updated Weare School District Special Education Policies and Procedures Manual complies with all the applicable New Hampshire Rules for the Education of Students with Disabilities.

**4. Citations of Non-Compliance Identified**

- As a result of the 4 IEPs that were reviewed March 13, 14 and May 8, 2008 the following citation of non-compliance were identified:

**Ed 1115 Placement of Children with Disabilities**

In response to student progress with special education interventions, service changes have been made (e.g. with the Reading Specialist in the Reading Room) that constitute a change of placement. Placement changes need to be made in accordance with 34 CFR 333.552 and require parental consent.

- As a result of the preschool program review, the following citation of non-compliance was identified:

**Ed 1119.03 Curricula**

The preschool has not adopted a formal curriculum that is required in order to demonstrate that students are being provided access to general education curriculum.

**Please Note:** *These citations of non-compliance will need to be addressed in a corrective action plan and met within one year of the date of the report; a template is located at the end of this summary.*

**5. District Wide Commendations**

- Staff and administration are caring, dedicated, and skilled.
- During the IEP Review Process, the staff and administration engaged openly in the discussions, were most receptive to constructive suggestions and demonstrated strong abilities to reflect and improve upon practices.
- It was clear that staff, administration and parents work hard to develop IEPs to meet the varied needs of the student population
- The emphasis on high quality, job embedded professional development aligned with the Weare School District’s goals for improvement, has been notable and has resulted in improved curriculum, instruction and assessment, ultimately resulting in improved outcomes for students.
- The wide array of programming in the district to meet the varied learning needs of all children is impressive.
- A positive working relationship between general and special educators was evident during the IEP Review Process.
- The strong leadership at all levels is visionary, guiding the district in implementation of research-based best practices such as Professional Learning Communities, effective use of data to inform instruction and the establishment of a well-articulated Pyramid of Interventions for improved literacy learning.

## SECTION II

### The Improvement /Action Plan

## WEARE SCHOOL DISTRICT FOCUSED MONITORING ACTION PLAN

**Goal** The percent of students with disabilities in grades 4-8 making their growth target in reading will increase from 42% to 46% on the October 2008 NECAP and 51% on the October 2009 NECAP.

#### Program Objective

1. Develop and implement a consistent and universal system of reading interventions.

<b>Implementation Steps</b> <i>What Will Be Done?</i>	<b>Responsibilities</b> <i>Who Will Do It?</i>	<b>Resources</b> <i>(Funding/Time/People/Materials)</i>	<b>Timeline</b> <i>By When? (Day/Month)</i>
<b>1. Complete SAU 24 Pyramid of Interventions framework which includes criteria for movement</b>	<i>K-9 A Team</i>	<b>Administrative time</b>	<b>June 2008</b>
<b>2. Complete Intervention Manual according to areas of reading and levels of intervention</b>	<i>Admin, Reading teachers, special education teachers</i>	<b>Time, stipends for team members</b>	<b>September 08</b>
<b>3. Complete data 'binders'</b>	<i>Admin, Team Leaders/ Coordinators</i>	<b>Time, stipends for team members</b>	<b>September 08</b>
<b>4. Use PLC model to focus discussion on student outcomes using student data to implement the Pyramid of Interventions</b>		<b>Time, Manual, Data Binders</b>	<b>On-going 08-09</b>

#### Implications For Professional Development

Roll out of materials, PLC modeling, Specific intervention training, Data analysis

#### Implications For Family Involvement

Overview of Pyramid of Interventions for parents

## WEARE SCHOOL DISTRICT FOCUSED MONITORING ACTION PLAN

**Goal** The percent of students with disabilities in grades 4-8 making their growth target in reading will increase from 42% to 46% on the October 2008 NECAP and 51% on the October 2009 NECAP.

**Program Objective**

**2.To develop a plan for parent involvement in the schools, in the special education process and in the improvement of student outcomes.**

<b>Implementation Steps</b> <i>What Will Be Done?</i>	<b>Responsibilities</b> <i>Who Will Do It?</i>	<b>Resources</b> <i>(Funding/Time/People/Materials)</i>	<b>Timeline</b> <i>By When? (Day/Month)</i>
1. Establish representative team	<i>Admin</i>	stipends for staff	9/08
2. Establish baseline	<b>The Team</b>	research sources – books, etc	<b>Open Hse</b>
3. Conduct research around best practice in parent involvement		supplies	10/08
3. Set goals		food	10/08
5. Implement		Survey	on-going
6. Evaluate			<b>June 09</b>

**Implications For Professional Development**  
Dissemination of work, PLC, parent conference training/techniques

# WEARE SCHOOL DISTRICT FOCUSED MONITORING ACTION PLAN

**Goal** The percent of students with disabilities in grades 4-8 making their growth target in reading will increase from 42% to 46% on the October 2008 NECAP and 51% on the October 2009 NECAP.

**3. Program Objectives**

**IEP's will identify appropriate classroom accommodations which are aligned with acceptable NECAP accommodations. IEP goals will be directly related to the district curriculum and address student needs as identified through student data. Students will receive instruction in best practices around strategies for assessment.**

<b>Implementation Steps</b> <i>What Will Be Done?</i>	<b>Responsibilities</b> <i>Who Will Do It?</i>	<b>Resources</b> <i>(Funding/Time/People/Materials)</i> <i>Time</i>	<b>Timeline</b> <i>By When? (Day/Month)</i> <b>Monthly monitoring</b>
<p><b>1) Investigate if and how effective accommodations are being used in each building.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are classroom accommodations aligned with testing accommodations?</li> <li>• Are IEP goals directly related to the district curriculum?</li> <li>• Are teachers working collaboratively?</li> </ul> <p><b>2) Based on findings, programs and strategies will be developed to meet the needs of all students.</b></p> <p><b>3) Classroom assessment will mirror NECAP style questions and strategies.</b></p>	<p><b>Building Administrators; Special Education Coordinator</b></p>		

**Implications For Professional Development**

**Train all staff about acceptable accommodations and how to effectively implement, Item analysis of Release Questions, Analysis of directions, types of questions and formats for answering**