



Londonderry School District

Focused Monitoring

Summary Report

June 29, 2012

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Leadership Team .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Achievement Team .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Focused Monitoring Activities.....</b>	<b>6-7</b>
<b>IEP Review Summary.....</b>	<b>7-15</b>
<b>Corrective Action Plan .....</b>	<b>16-17</b>
<b>Action Plan.....</b>	<b>18-20</b>
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Addenda.....</b>	<b>22</b>

**New Hampshire Department of Education  
Bureau of Special Education  
Special Education Program Approval and Improvement Process  
Focused Monitoring District 2011-2012**

**Introduction**

The mission of the Special Education Program Approval Process is to support the advancement of educational results for all learners. This aim is integral to the Focused Monitoring Process in select New Hampshire School Districts, where a strategic and collaborative process is developed to address the Achievement Gap between students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers. To meaningfully address this disparity, a systems perspective is essential to best create strategies that represent gains for all students, including those with unique learning abilities and challenges. Accordingly, the Focused Monitoring Process is designed to incorporate current school and school district improvement goals and strategies in this yearlong effort.

The New Hampshire Department of Education has elected to address the achievement gap as the key performance indicator for meeting the statutory requirements in the NCLB legislation.

**Essential Question:** What educational practices need to be enhanced or replaced to ensure that all students, including those with disabilities, are fully engaged in the general education math curriculum and are demonstrating growth in their mathematical knowledge?

**Date of Report:** June 29, 2012

**Statutory Authority for New Hampshire Department of Education Monitoring**

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) provides federal funds to assist states in educating children with disabilities and requires each participating state to ensure that school districts and other publicly funded educational agencies in the state comply with the requirements of the IDEA and its implementing regulations. New Hampshire state law requires local school districts to provide appropriate special education and related services and requires the State Board of Education (SBE) to establish, monitor and enforce regulations governing the Focused Monitoring process.

The summary report for the Focused Monitoring districts is intended to serve as a record of the work of the Achievement Team during the 2011-2012 school year, and more importantly will contain a limited number of well defined goals that will help focus the District's work by setting a target for student achievement or addressing the factors that impact student achievement. The document is intended to be a synthesis of what the Achievement Team has accomplished, which supports an improvement plan with clear goals, research-based interventions and action steps to achieve the goal of narrowing the achievement gap between students with and without disabilities. Monitoring visits and corrective actions focus on the specific processes related to the 'Key Performance Indicator' that put districts on the "visit" list and are aimed at helping districts improve their performance on that indicator. A statewide group of stakeholders identified the key focus area for New Hampshire school districts.

**New Hampshire Department of Education Technical Assistants: Ed Hendry and Jane Bergeron-Beaulieu**

**Londonderry School District  
Focus Monitoring  
Leadership Team**

Andy Corey	Assistant Superintendent
Linda Boyd	South Elementary School Principal
Mary Coltin	North Elementary School Principal
Carol Mack	Matthew Thornton Elementary School Principal
Denise Pleickhardt	LMS Special Education Director
Connie Biedryzcki	LHS Special Education Director
Bonnie Breithaupt	Moose Hill School Director
Richard Zacchilli	LMS Principal
Debra Setterlund	Elementary Special Education Program Director
Kimberly Carpinone	Director of Pupil Services
Jason Parent	LHS Principal
Ed Hendry	Consultant
Jane Bergeron-Beaulieu	Consultant

**Londonderry School District  
Focus Monitoring  
Achievement Team**

Kimberly Carpinone	Director of Pupil Services
Andrew Corey	Assistant Superintendent
Jason Parent	LHS Principal
Richard Zacchilli	LMS Principal
Connie Biedryzcki	LHS Special Education Director
Denise Pleickhardt	LMS Special Education Director
Mary Coltin	North Elementary Principal
Carol Mack	Matthew Thornton Elementary Principal
Linda Boyd	South Elementary Principal
Debra Setterlund	Elementary Special Education Program Director
Christopher Hunt	South Elementary Assistant Principal
Jill Connors	North Elementary Assistant Principal
Alfred Thompson	Matthew Thornton Elementary Assistant Principal
Wendy Doolittle	North Elementary Speech & Language Pathologist
Beth Sheridan	School Psychologist
Sue Clinghan	South Elementary Special Education Teacher
Judy Duval	South Elementary 5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Teacher
Tara McLaughlin	North Elementary Special Education Teacher
Sharon Cornelissen	North Elementary 1 <sup>st</sup> Grade Teacher
Ann Smith	Matthew Thornton Elementary Special Curriculum
Cara Gannon	Matthew Thornton Special Education Teacher
Kim Speers	LEEP Teacher
Joan Halpin	Moose Hill Special Education Teacher
Betty Wong-Mak	LHS Special Education Teacher
Lynn Coveney	6 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math Teacher
Sue Thornberg	7 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math Teacher
Phyllis Donaldson	7 <sup>th</sup> Grade Special Education Teacher
Danielle Barrett	Parent
Annie Collachi	LMS Curriculum Coordinator
Diane Malley	LHS Curriculum Coordinator
Joanne Blake	LHS Math Teacher

## **Focused Monitoring Activities**

In April 2011 Londonderry School District received notification that it had been chosen as one of the districts to participate in the N. H. Department of Education, Special Education Focused Monitoring Process (FM) for the 2011-2012 school year. Focused Monitoring is a 5 step inquiry process designed to assist districts in examining data and developing a plan to narrow the achievement gap between students with disabilities and all other students. It was the aim of the Londonderry School District to closely align Focus Monitoring inquiries and activities with it's District in Need of Improvement Plan (DINI) and School in Need of Improvement Plan (SINI).

With the establishment of two teams, FM Leadership and FM Achievement, the district embarked upon answering the essential question, "What educational practices need to be enhanced or replaced to ensure that all students, including those with disabilities, are fully engaged in the general math curriculum and are demonstrating growth in their mathematical knowledge?" The district then began the process of analyzing data for root causes.

In keeping aligned with the District's DINI plan, it was determined that the teams' concentration would be math with some further emphasis on transition to and from the elementary to the middle and middle to the high school. Resultantly, three subcommittees were formed; IOWA Assessment Data Collection, Team Teaching Instructional Practices, and Curriculum and Instructional Models. The District's Action Plan outlines the established goals and activities to be achieved by June 2014.

### **5 Step Inquiry Process**

#### **Get Ready for Inquiry**

1. Established Leadership and Achievement Teams
2. Leadership Meeting July 12<sup>th</sup>
3. Achievement Meeting September 21<sup>st</sup>
4. Self Study
5. Created the Essential Question
6. Action Plan Timeline

#### **Organize and Analyze Data**

1. Leadership Team Meetings October 19<sup>th</sup> and November 16<sup>th</sup>
2. Achievement Team Meetings October 27<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup>
3. Vision, Mission, and Moto
4. Strategic Plan
5. DINI and SINI Plans
6. School Board Communication
7. State of the Union
8. Curriculum Coordinating Council
9. Development and Implementation of the Math Survey for Professional Staff
10. Perceptual Data Report

#### **Investigate Factors Impacting Student Achievement**

1. Sub-Committees in the areas of curriculum, instruction, and data
2. IEP Review Process Team Members
3. NECAP Student Data for Identified Students
4. Achievement Team Meeting on January 19<sup>th</sup> and March 22<sup>nd</sup>

## **Determine Effective Practices and Write a Plan**

1. Achievement Team Meeting May 17<sup>th</sup>

## **Curriculum, Instruction and Data Committees Summary Report**

### **Implement, Monitor, and Evaluate**

1. Action Plan
2. School Board Presentation of Response to Intervention
3. Purchase of AIMSweb

## **IEP Review Summary Special Education Compliance Component of NHDOE**

### **Focused Monitoring Process**

#### **Londonderry School District Focused Monitoring Essential Question:**

*What educational structuring/practices need to be modified or enhanced to ensure all students, including those with disabilities, are fully engaged in the general education math curriculum and are demonstrating growth in their mathematical knowledge?*

#### **Londonderry School District**

**Dates of NHDOE Focused Monitoring Compliance and IEP Review: Nov. 29-30, 2011**

**Date of Report: January 25, 2012**

### **Introduction:**

The compliance component of the New Hampshire Department of Education (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 compliance with required special education processes, as well as the review of data related to programming, progress monitoring of students with disabilities, and alignment of Special Education programming with the curriculum, instruction and assessment systems within the school district.

As part of the Focused Monitoring process, the Londonderry School District special and general education staff participated in a structured review of randomly selected IEPs in order to determine the district's level of compliance with the special education process. Because the school district is examining the math achievement gap that exists between students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers, a collective decision was made to conduct IEP reviews on students who had math goals as part of their Individual Education Plan. The review of selected IEPs was conducted by a team in each building with

designed to help the team examine the IEPs for measures of educational benefit and compliance because the IEP is the core of the special educational process.

Review teams were able to conclude whether or not the IEP contained the required elements; if it was reasonably calculated to provide educational benefit; and whether or not the IEP is useful, understandable to a broad audience, and a helpful tool in understanding the child's disability, its impact, and how the school will address this impact.

Data gathered during the IEP process will provide the Londonderry School District Achievement team with valuable information that will inform it about the district's special education process and programming, about the progress of students with disabilities and about the alignment of special education programming with the district's general curriculum, instruction and assessment systems. Findings and corrective actions that result from the IEP Review will be included in the action plan developed by the Achievement team.

#### **Data Collection Activities:**

As part of the NHDOE Focused Monitoring Process, a Special Education compliance review was conducted in the Londonderry School District on November 29-30, 2011. Listed below is the data that was reviewed as part of the compliance review, all of which are summarized in this report.

- Review of randomly selected 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
- 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
- When appropriate, the review of 6 additional high school IEP's, with particular attention paid to Indicator 13, Secondary Transition Planning. For the Londonderry School District this was not applicable as the NHDOE, Bureau of Special Education is conducting an independent Indicator 13 Review at Londonderry High School.

## **SUMMARY OF FINDINGS:**

### **IEP Review Process: Conducted on November 29-30, 2011**

As part of the compliance component of Focused Monitoring, the NHDOE worked in collaboration with the Londonderry 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 determine 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 Londonderry School District were provided with a collaborative opportunity to review 23 in district and out of district 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
- Evidence of progress toward key IEP goals and the documented evidence of student gains over a 3 year period
- Transition plans that have measurable postsecondary goals ( for youth aged 16 and above as required by Indicator 13)
- Evidence of required documentation for preschool programming (for children ages 3-5)

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 LONDONDERRY SCHOOL DISTRICT:**

**Building/District Summary of IEP Review Process**

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

**Include Preschool and Secondary Transitions**

IEPs represent the foundation of the educational program of students with disabilities and ideally should serve as a tool to help teachers provide effective instruction. Was it possible to assess the degree to which IEPs were designed to provide educational benefit (access to, participation and progress in the general curriculum)

1. Though many of the annual goals were not measurable it was very evident that general education teachers were involved in the development of IEP goals.
2. There was clear evidence that students participated in state and district wide assessments aligned to the general curriculum.
3. Accommodations were written in a manner that was useful to the general education teachers. Statements of how the disability affected involvement and progress in the general curriculum were connected to accommodations and or modifications.

How has this process informed future plans for improving the writing of student IEPs and ensuring the student's participation in the general education curriculum?

1. The teams conducting IEP Reviews were in full agreement that in the development and writing of IEPs there is a need for improved application of the district's curriculum and curriculum based measurements in the monitoring of progress of students with disabilities. The one exception to this was at the early childhood level (preschool and kindergarten), where IEPs were found to be measurable, connected to the curriculum, and monitored regularly.
2. All annual IEP goals and related objectives need to be written in measurable terms, including baseline measurements and targeted growth that is monitored regularly.
3. Modifications and accommodations outlined in student IEP's should be reviewed to ensure that they are clearly understood by all and that they are being implemented and monitored.
4. IEP teams would benefit from further professional development in defining functional vs. academic goals and writing both in measurable terms.
5. In looking ahead, the teams conducting the IEP reviews agreed that there should be continued efforts directed toward clearer statements of present levels of performance in IEPs including student interests, performance data, strengths/weaknesses and connection to established goals.

Describe how individual student performance information is conveyed from grade to grade/school to school:

1. At the early childhood level the required elements of transition planning are evident, including transitions from Early Supports and Services, and preschool to kindergarten.
2. For students with more significant disabilities, the transition processes and procedures (from school to school) appear to be more detailed.
3. The district continues to emphasize the importance of transition planning; case managers do their best to ensure that teachers from receiving schools are invited to participate in IEP meetings.
4. The teams reviewing IEPs at the middle and high school determined that, at times, IEPs were not being written to align with the programming that was being provided/implemented at the receiving school.
5. General education teachers who are responsible for receiving students with disabilities indicate they have little input in the development of IEPs they are expected to implement and monitor.
6. At the high school level it was clear that there has been significant emphasis on post secondary transition planning, and while not all of the transition plans met full compliance, in general they were well written including documented evidence of student involvement in developing the plan, post secondary goals that were measurable, transition services that enable the student to meet goals and that when appropriate there is representation of participating agencies.

How will the district further explore the factors that have impacted poor scores for individual students on district math assessments and in the general education curriculum?

1. The district is committed to the continued review of student performance data to identify the factors that are impacting math achievement for all students and to identification of the areas of curriculum, instruction and assessment that need to be refined.
2. While the Response to Intervention model (RTI) is in the process of being universally applied in all of the Londonderry Schools, it is strongly recommended that the administration review current practice to ensure consistency and fidelity of the current RTI practices. Additionally, consideration should be given to assessing the effectiveness of RTI, and the impact upon improved student learning.
3. Based on the initial findings of the IEP reviews, the Focused Monitoring Leadership and Achievement Teams will further explore the data presented in this summary and decide upon next steps.
4. The alignment of IEPs to the general education curriculum will continue to be emphasized and necessary professional development provided.

### **District Wide Strengths:**

1. The district is acknowledged for their willingness to look closely at the math achievement gap that exists between students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers.
2. The district is commended for the wide array of interventions for all students, and for the deliberate alignment between interventions and the general education curriculum.
3. Throughout the district there is a strong core of dedicated, skilled and seasoned staff and administration.
4. In each of the schools there is a deliberate focus on teaching and learning and the leaders at all levels are focused upon instruction.
5. In each of the schools significant emphasis is placed upon the need for use and review of data as related to improved student learning.
6. All goal setting for the district is connected and aligned to a long term strategic plan.
7. Despite the size of the district and the enrollments in each school, the climate and culture in each building appears to be very student centered and welcoming.
8. The central office leadership is committed to improved learning for all students and to ensuring that special education programming is aligned with general education learning expectations.
9. Special Education policy and procedures are all well documented, in compliance and being consistently implemented and monitored in each of the schools.
10. Throughout the district there is a wide array of special education programming, enabling most all students to be provided services in the least restrictive environment.
11. The number of students placed out of district is very low due to the vast special education programming provided in each school.

### **District Wide Suggestions:**

#### **\* Indicates a Finding of Non-Compliance**

1. While the Londonderry School District has been commended for their efforts in developing an RTI model, it is also suggested that the administration take a critical look at the definition of the model and consistency of implementation PreK-12, along with the data that is being collected to document effectiveness of interventions provided.
2. The district appears to have a wealth of data and might benefit from identification of the most critical student data that could be incorporated into a "student profile" that would travel with the student throughout their educational history in the district. This data might be beneficial in the development and monitoring of IEPs.
3. Consider the refinement of IEP progress reports to ensure that they are aligned to the curriculum, and meaningful to general educators, students, and parents.
4. Continued attention should be given to the review of math curriculum and instruction being provided to students with disabilities.
5. Continued professional development is recommended for staff in the use of data and using data in the writing of student IEPs.
6. \*Assure that measurable annual goals are contained in all IEPs and include a baseline and a target in the present levels of performance.
7. Further exploration and review of the current "math leveling and ability grouping" practices at the elementary and middle school levels is recommended. What are the practices and procedures utilized to determine student placement in a level or group? What is the philosophy behind the leveling and grouping practices? How is the district measuring the

learning of individual students to determine the impact of leveling and/grouping on individual student achievement?

### **LEA Focused Monitoring Compliance Application**

As part of the Focused Monitoring data collection activities, the LEA Plan, which includes Special Education procedures, was reviewed. In addition, personnel rosters were submitted to verify that staff providing services outlined in IEPs are qualified for the positions they hold. Also, program descriptions were reviewed and verified, along with follow up and review of any newly developed programs or changes to existing approved Special Education programs. Upon review of all of special education policies and procedures the district was found to be in full compliance. Program descriptions, as submitted by the district, are accurate and no revisions or updating are needed. The personnel rosters were verified by the NHDOE, Bureau of Credentialing, and all staff providing special education services are qualified for the positions they hold.

### **Out of District File Review:**

Based on the random review of two student files for children with disabilities placed out of district, one of which was for a student of age 16+, there were no findings of non-compliance.

### **Students with Disabilities Attending Charter Schools:**

At the time of the Focused Monitoring IEP Review, there were no students with disabilities in the Londonderry School District who were attending Charter Schools.

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

As part to the Focused Monitoring Compliance Component, the NHDOE reviews all requests for new programs in the district, and/or requests for changes to existing programs. The following minor changes were requested for the special education programs in the Londonderry School district:

- Add the disability of Other Health Impairment to the Basic Academic Skills (BAS) program at Matthew Thornton School and the Middle School;
- Add the disability Other Health Impairment to the Program for Success (PFS) at the South Elementary and Middle Schools;
- Add the disability Other Health Impairment to the Academic and Career Training (ACT) and the Emotional Handicapped programs at Londonderry High School;
- Add the disabilities Other Health Impairment and Autism to the Substantially Individual Program at North School;
- Change the name of the Matthew Thornton BAS Program to Primary Academic Learning (PALS)
- Change the name of the Londonderry High School Emotional Handicapped program to STEPS (Students Tackling Emotional and Personal Struggles)

**Building/District Summary of IEP Review, Out-of-District File Review Processes and Additional 6 for Indicator 13:**

Preschool and Kindergarten	3
Elementary School	8
Middle School	5
High School, Age below 16	1
High School, Age 16 or above	6
6 Additional IEPs Reviewed for Ind 13	n/a
Total Number of IEPs Reviewed	23

**Findings of Noncompliance Identified as a Result of the**

**NHDOE Compliance and IEP Review Visit:**

As a result of the 23 IEPs that were selected for the IEP Reviews on November 29-30, 2011, the following Systemic Findings of Noncompliance were identified:

**Child Specific Findings of Noncompliance**

***Please Note: The NH Department of Education, Bureau of Special Education requires Child Specific Findings of Noncompliance be addressed and resolved within 45 days of notification.***

**ED 1109.01(a) (1); CRF 300.320 (a) (2) (i) Elements of an Individualized Education Program**

Findings: Of the twenty-three (23) IEPs that were reviewed, thirteen (13) lacked annual measurable goals.

**ED 1109.01 (a) (1); CFR 300.320 (b) (1) (2) Transition Services**

Findings: Of the six (6) Secondary Transition Plans reviewed for students aged 16 and older, one (1) lacked measurable post secondary goals.

**Systemic Findings of Noncompliance**

***Please Note: The NH Department of Education, Bureau of Special Education requires that Systemic Findings of Noncompliance be addressed in a corrective action plan and met within one year of the date of the report; a template and instructions for such planning will be provided.***

**ED 1109.01(a) (1); CRF 300.320 (a) (2) (i) Elements of an Individualized Education Program**

Based on visits to each of these programs it was determined that district needs to ensure that all IEP goals are written in measurable terms.

**NHDOE SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM APPROVAL AND IMPROVEMENT PROCESS  
CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN FOR FOCUSED MONITORING**

SAU#: 12	NAME OF SAU: Londonderry		SUPERINTENDENT: Nathan Greenberg	
SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTOR: Kimberly Carpinone		DATE OF PLAN: 2/20/2012		
<p><b>SYSTEMIC FINDINGS OF NON-COMPLIANCE:</b> Systemic Findings of Non-compliance are defined as systemic deficiencies that have been identified through the IEP Review Process, which are in violation of state and federal special education rules and regulations.</p> <p>The NHDOE, Bureau of Special Education, requires that all Systemic Findings of Non-compliance be corrected as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the final report date – <b>JANUARY 25, 2013</b>.</p> <p><b>PLEASE NOTE:</b> If applicable, <u>Child Specific Findings of Non-compliance</u> identified through the IEP Review Process and noted separately on the Assurance Form, are required to be resolved within 45 days.</p>				
<b>SYSTEMIC FINDINGS OF NON-COMPLIANCE</b>	<b>CORRECTIVE ACTION</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>EVIDENCE OF COMPLIANCE AND EVIDENCE OF IMPACT ON STUDENTS, AS APPROPRIATE</b>	<b>TIMELINE</b>  (Check appropriate columns below to indicate expected completion time for each activity.)

	4/12	7/12	10/12	1/13
<p><b>ED 1109.01(a) (1); CRF 300.320 (a) (2) (f) Elements of an Individualized Education Program</b> Based on visits to each of these programs it was determined that district needs to ensure that all IEP goals are written in measurable terms.</p>	<p>1. Conduct building level trainings on gathering baseline data, writing measurable goals and using data to report progress to parents. 2. Review of individual IEP drafts prior to IEP meeting with parents to ensure goals meet compliance standards</p>	<p>1. Kim Carpinone 2. Kim Carpinone and building level special education administrators</p>	<p>1. Completed trainings, materials used 2. Compliance IEPs</p>	

Date of follow up visit (or date of acceptance of evidence submitted to indicate correction):  
  
**Note as Met, In Process or Not Met**

**NHDOE SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM APPROVAL AND IMPROVEMENT PROCESS  
CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN FOR FOCUSED MONITORING**

SAU#: 12	NAME OF SAU: Londonderry		SUPERINTENDENT: Nathan Greenberg		
SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTOR: Kimberly Carpinone		DATE OF PLAN: 2-20-2012			
<p><b>SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:</b> Suggestions for improvement, simply stated, are recommendations provided by the visiting team that are intended to strengthen and enhance programs, services, instruction and professional development. While the school or district is not held accountable for follow up on suggestions for improvement, the NHDOE strongly encourages the school or district to seriously consider the suggestions, determine which are most appropriate, and address those in the corrective action plan.</p>					
<b>SUGGESTIONS</b>	<b>IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITY</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>EVIDENCE OF COMPLIANCE AND EVIDENCE OF IMPACT ON STUDENTS, AS APPROPRIATE</b>	<b>TIMELINE</b>	<b>For Use By Technical Assistant At Follow Up Visit</b>
6.*Assure that measurable annual goals are contained in all IEPs and include a baseline and a target in the present levels of performance.	1. Conduct building level trainings on gathering baseline data, writing measurable goals and using data to report progress to parents.	1. Kim Carpinone and Building level special education admin.	Completed trainings, materials used and compliant IEPs	Winter and Spring 2012	Date of follow up visit (or date of acceptance of evidence submitted to indicate correction):  <b>Note as Met, In Process or Not Met</b>

**5. Action Plan:**

The Focused Monitoring Action Plan is intended to describe the specific Goals, Objectives and Strategies that will be implemented as a result of the year long FM Planning Process. This strategic process serves as 'roadmap' for advancing the learning for all students while projecting the specific strategies that will be address the achievement gap between students with unique learning challenges and abilities and their peers. The plan is designed as a document that can be reviewed and revised as necessary throughout the implementation year.

    Londonderry     **SCHOOL DISTRICT**     2012-2014     **ACTION PLAN**

**MEASURABLE STUDENT LEARNING GOAL:** By June 30, 2014 the percentage of students performing below grade level, failing to make 6+ mo. growth in a year's time in math, will decrease from 6% to 3% as measured by the 2014 IOWA assessment.

**OBJECTIVE # 1.** To develop district-wide data driven instruction for math that addresses the proficiency level of all students.

STRATEGIES/ ACTIVITIES	ESTIMATED RESOURCES Budget, Human Resources, Materials	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE Leader and Participants	TIMELINE Begin/End	MONITORING OF IMPLEMENTATION Evidence		EVALUATING RESULTS Evidence of Effectiveness	
				What & by whom	When	What & by whom	When
Continue to develop and implement elementary math tool kits/compacted curriculum, refining instructional models to respond to student needs.	Professional staff, current curriculum materials, Professional Development	Administration, Professional Staff	June 2012- June 2014	Administration	June 2014	Use of tool kit, realigned curriculum, lesson plans, observation, Formative Assessments	June 2014
				Use of tool kit, realigned curriculum, lesson plans, observation, Formative Assessments	June 2014		
Collect data on team teaching	Focus monitoring subcommittee, IOWA scores, Professional development on co-teaching curriculum	Focus monitoring subcommittee	June 2012- June 2013	Focus monitoring achievement team, SERESC consultants Presentation of results to achievement team	June 2013	IOWA results, subcommittee report	June 2013

Develop individual student profile for targeted students based on IOWA results and monitor progress	IOWA scores, data subcommittee, info site	Focus monitoring data team subcommittee	June 2012- June 2013	Focus monitoring achievement team, SERESC consultants Presentation of results to achievement team	June 2013	IOWA results, subcommittee report	June 2013
Use the NESDEC demographic study to target title 1 students for additional support	Report, State approved tutorial services, parent communication	District Office and Administration	June 2012- June 2013	Asst. Superintendent Participation in Supplemental Educational Services by targeted students	June 2013	Information reported to the District from tutorial providers.	June 2013
Codify the RTI process across the district	RTI committee, Current practices, RTI guidelines and board presentation	District Level Administration, Building level RTI team	June 2012- June 2014	RTI team leaders RTI agenda, info site prescribed interventions, RTI file reviews	June 2014	RTI file reviews	June 2014
Identify and purchase a universal screener and progress monitoring tool which is a web based, data managing and reporting system that provides a framework for multi-tiered instruction.	\$1,200 (program) \$2,500 (training) Web access	District Office	Summer 2012	Asst. Superintendent Pupil Services Director Piloting AIMSweb assessment program, District wide screening results,	July 2012	Purchased & download on district computers, District wide report on results,	June 2013

OBJECTIVE # 2\_ To develop an intervention model for math that addresses the instructional needs of a diverse learning population.

STRATEGIES/ ACTIVITIES	ESTIMATED RESOURCES Budget, Human Resources, Materials	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE Leader and Participants	TIMELINE Begin/End	MONITORING OF IMPLEMENTATION Evidence		EVALUATING RESULTS Evidence of Effectiveness	
				What & by whom	When	What & by whom	When
Provide professional development to staff, extending knowledge in the area of math instruction and intervention.	Funding through Measured Progress process, In-house professional	Assistant Superintendent Pupil Services Director Londonderry Professional Staff	June 2014	Administration  Documentation of professional development	June 2014	Reflective discussions and implementation of instructional strategies, evidenced through observation.	June 2014
Review and refine schedules to provide opportunities for intervention.	Administration developed schedules	Building level Administration	June 2013	Building Administration Completed schedules with intervention blocks (WIN blocks, Learning Lab)	June 2013	Increase student access to intervention times/ student schedules.	June 2013
Continued implementation of Professional Learning Communities in the area of mathematics.	Scheduled times for planning and data review	Middle School administration	June 2014	Building Level Administration  PLC agendas	June 2014	PLC minutes and team reflections	June 2014
Develop alternative grouping and intervention models to meet student needs at Middle and High School levels.	Skill analysis assessments including those transitions from sending school, Course offerings based skill	Building Level Administration	June 2014	Building Level Administration  Course descriptions with increased options for a variety of student needs and abilities.	June 2014	School Master schedule and course listings.  Class rosters and student report cards.	June 2014

## **Conclusions**

Throughout the IEP review process, it was evident that the Londonderry School District staff and administration are committed to narrowing the math achievement gap that exists between students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers. Staff and administration are responsive to individual student needs, the IEP review process was well planned, organized and supported at all levels. The district was well prepared and viewed the work as job embedded professional development that would strengthen the skills of staff, as well as further develop programming for students with disabilities. Staff and administration were open to the review process and eager to discuss best practices regarding IEP development and the impact this has upon student performance. The results of this review are accurate and realistic and reflect findings that are currently in process of being addressed by the Londonderry School District.

## **Next Steps**

The Focus Monitoring Leadership and Achievement team will monitor the District's progress on meeting our goals on an ongoing basis.

A presentation will be given to the Londonderry School District outlining the connection between the district's SINI, DINI and FM Plans. Ongoing discussions and review of SINI, DIDI, and FM Plans at building level faculty meetings will be held throughout the year. All plans will be posted on the Londonderry School District website.

# Addenda

## **Get Ready for Inquiry**

1. Established Leadership and Achievement Teams
2. Leadership Meeting July 12<sup>th</sup> Agenda
3. Progress Toward Action Plan Completion Year 1
4. Achievement Meeting September 21<sup>st</sup> Agenda/Minutes
5. Self Study
6. Created the Essential Question

## **Organize and Analyze Data**

1. Vision, Mission, and Motto
2. Strategic Plan
3. Leadership Team Meetings October 19<sup>th</sup> and November 16<sup>th</sup> Agendas
4. Achievement Team Meetings October 27<sup>th</sup>, and November 29<sup>th</sup> Minutes
5. DINI and SINI Plans
6. State of the Union September 27<sup>th</sup>
7. Curriculum Coordinator Council Agendas 9/14, 10/12, 1/18
8. Development of the Math Survey for Professional Staff
9. Perceptual Data Report
10. Visiting On-Site Team
11. Londonderry On-Site Review Team
12. IEP On-Site Review Schedule
13. NHDOE Special Education Approval Focused Monitoring Process Corrective Action Plan

## **Investigate Factors Impacting Student Achievement**

1. Achievement Team Meeting on January 19<sup>th</sup> Agenda/Minutes and March 22<sup>nd</sup> Agendas
2. NECAP Student Data for Identified Students
3. Sub-Committees in the areas of curriculum, instruction, and data

## **Determine Effective Practices and Write a Plan**

1. Achievement Team Meeting May 17<sup>th</sup>
2. Curriculum, Instruction and Data Committees Summary Report

## **Implement, Monitor, and Evaluate**

1. School Board Presentation of Response to Intervention
2. Purchase of AIMSweb