



GRS Cooperative School District
Focus Monitoring Report
June 2011

Submitted by:

Rebecca Hebert-Sweeny, Director of Special Services

SAU 20, 123 Main Street, Gorham, NH 03581

rebecca.hebert-sweeny@sau20.org

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	1 - 2
2. Focused Monitoring Activities.....	2 - 4
3. IEP Review Summary.....	5 - 15
4. Action Plan.....	16 - 18
5. Next Steps.....	19
6. Addenda.....	20

1. 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 are the contributing factors to the achievement gap between students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers, and how can this gap be narrowed?”

Date of Report: June 1, 2011

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 2010-2011 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:

Richard Ayers
Jane Bergeron-Beaulieu

Leadership Team Members:

Paul Bousquet, Principal
Rebecca Hebert-Sweeny, Director of Special Services
Keith Parent, Principal of Gorham Middle High School (6-12)

Karen Cloutier, Principal of EFS (K-5)

Achievement Team Members: Wendy Anderson, Tina Binette, Jen Blair, Lucy Evans, Katrina Fowler, Dan Gorham, Linda Jensen, Amanda Lavigne, Christine Lemoine, Karen Moore, Elaine Stockbridge, Tricia Walsh

IEP Review Team Members:

Helene Anzalone

Marie Fay

Marcy Kelley

Kelly Mask

Kelly Noland

2. Focused Monitoring Activities

The Focused Monitoring Process has a definitive structure and requirements; however, GRS Cooperative School District's process unfolded to meet the unique needs of our district. We met in August and monthly throughout the school year to work on our unique circumstances associated with closing the Achievement Gap between general education and special education students.

On August 23rd-24th, the Achievement Team kicked off its work with a two-day summer institute designed to map out the GRS Cooperative School District FM Year. We reviewed NECAP data relative to the Achievement Gap, examined a process for reviewing data and began an inventory of current initiatives in the GRS Cooperative School District. The next step resulting from our work included a plan of action for communicating FM to the staff and raising general awareness. A "Readiness Survey" would be sent to all staff and the results of this formative assessment would be used to determine where we are as a district in terms of openness to making changes to support this initiative. Plans for initial and ongoing communication were discussed. It was decided that subcommittees would be formed in the following areas:

- Curriculum/Instruction
- Data/Information/Technology
- Communication: Student/Parent/Community

Superintendent Paul Bousquet gave an overview of the FM Process to the all SAU 20 staff at our opening on August 31st.

On September 29th, the Achievement Team began to tackle the Essential Question: "What are the contributing factors to the achievement gap between students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers, and how can this gap be narrowed?" by dissecting district data and determining what additional information was needed. We reviewed and analyzed the result of the FM Readiness Survey and discovered some emerging themes. We stressed the importance of aligning the FM work with other initiatives in the district. Mapping district initiatives became a key component of this process. The initial discussion regarding vertical alignment of curriculum took place including how that process is currently happening at each level and across general and special education. The Data Team noted that 75% of the district felt that we are doing well in this area. The determination was made that gaining access to Performance Pathways, NWEA and NECAP data and becoming more proficient in data analysis were important skills for staff to solidify.

On October 26th, the Achievement Team focused on a review of NECAP result and the Achievement gap. How Response to Intervention is being implemented in each building was discussed at length. Emerging themes from FM Readiness Survey and Achievement Team input began to emerge:

1. Curriculum/Instruction/Assessment:
 - a. Vertical curriculum articulation
 - b. Oversight and supervision of curriculum
 - c. Informed-application of models for instruction/intervention

2. Parent/Family Engagement:
 - a. Agreement/understanding of value of parental/community involvement, and
 - b. Establishing a pro-active district model for parental/family and community involvement

3. District Data Profile:
 - a. Documentation of current district data profile (what data is collected/how it is used)
 - b. Reaching agreement of the “value”, process, and format for district/ building level/grade level and department data set
 - c. Establish district measures for expected student performance

For each element, Curriculum/Instruction/Assessment, Parent/Family Engagement, and District Data Profile the factors and strategies were outlined.

On November 30th, the Achievement Team began to examine more closely the data the district is currently utilizing by asking ourselves the questions: “What data do we use?” and “What additional data do we need to gather?” The process proved beneficial in that it showed quite a list of data points that we are using to inform instruction however it also provided the catalyst for discussing data that we are lacking (formative) and the need for improved accessibility to existing data. The team organized and began to analyze the district’s data.

At our meeting on December 21st, we began to look at connections between the data inventory (11/30/10) and its connection to the district’s data profile. The District Profile looks quite impressive with many outcome measures available such as attendance, graduation rate, SAT scores, etc. The Communication/Parent Involvement Subcommittee developed a Parent Survey for dissemination and talked about strategies to get a good return from parents of students in grades 6-12. EFS used the parent conferences and parent helpers to get 100% return on all parent surveys for attendees. The Curriculum/Instruction/Assessment subcommittee determined that there is currently a written curriculum tied to GLE’s, GSE’s and learning expectations in academic, civic, and social areas and that departments do item analysis and make curricula decisions based on item analysis. However, they noted that the district needs a formal process with data that backs it up and that all subject area departments need to know what the other departments are doing. The Data Subcommittee examined how data is used and determined that there needs to be a profile of test administration at GMS and GHS.

On January 18th, the Achievement Team began to refine our work. The charge was to begin to narrow our focus, identifying the priority areas for the district and the development of a Plan of Action. Priority areas included:

- Curriculum/Instruction/Assessment
- Data
- Parental Involvement/Communication

Curriculum/Instruction/Assessment: connecting curriculum to the state standards and application of strategies to ensure access to the general education curriculum for all students were key mitigating factors in the ensuing discussions.

Data: emerging themes regarding data included creating a district student performance data profile using both normative and summative data. It was noted that this data is needed to inform instruction and that RTI is being

carried out but for it to move forward (and upward in grade levels) this area needs to be targeted for review and development.

Parental Involvement/Communication: agreement that direct correlation between parent involvement and student achievement. Surveys still being developed and will be considered once that information is made available.

At our meeting on February 15th, the charge was to reach consensus on priority areas and begin to identify specific strategies and timelines. At that meeting we brainstormed the “ideals”. The development of a data team and the better utilization of our existing data sources such as Modular Management System, the district’s student information system, and Performance Pathways emerged. The parent surveys were finalized with a distribution time to GMHS parents of mid-March. EFS completed their parent surveys in December.

By March 15th, goals and identified priorities were drafted (rough draft format) and strategies/activities were articulated under each goal.

- All students in the GRS Cooperative School District will have full access to the general curriculum and demonstrate educational progress.
- The GRS Cooperative School District will review, refine and expand its existing RTI model.
- All GRS Cooperative School District staff and administration will become proficient in the use of data to inform instruction
- Possible goal on Parent/Family Engagement

On April 26th, the Achievement Team began to work on refining the goals and filling in the required fields on the action plan template. The action plan components include: strategies, resources, persons responsible, timeline, monitoring of the plan, and evaluating the results. At this meeting the Achievement Team struggled with “estimated resources” because they felt that every item would take additional time and money. The Team discussed how the plan would be brought forward to the District and Community. Initial thoughts included informing staff and school board members at upcoming meetings by adding this item to their agendas. After discussion regarding the Parent/Family Engagement survey results and whether to add this as a Goal, no decision was made.

At our meeting on May 17th, the Achievement Team reached consensus, narrowing our focus. The Achievement Team wrote the Action Plan which includes a well defined strategy for monitoring the plan. Goal areas targeted:

- By June 2012, the GRS Cooperative School District will have written and adopted a K-12 RTI model
- All students in the GRS Cooperative School District will have full access to the general curriculum and demonstrate educational progress as demonstrated by proficiency on NECAP

See #4: Action Plan section of this report

FM Leadership Symposia Series:

The Leadership Team attended a series of training session at SERESC designed to build our knowledge base regarding making data-driven decisions.

August 4th: Kick Off: Making Data Driven Decisions

October 27th- Gathering and Analyzing Data: The Role of Leadership

Jan 7th: Investigating Factors Impacting Student Achievement

March 9th: Access to the General Curriculum Summary Results

The topics and discussions with other administrators were extremely helpful.

3. IEP Review Summary

Special Education Compliance Component of NHDOE Focused Monitoring Process

GRS Cooperative School District

Date of NHDOE Focused Monitoring Compliance and IEP Review:

September 28 and November 30, 2010

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 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.

Data Collection Activities:

As part of the NHDOE Focused Monitoring Process a Special Education compliance review was conducted in the GRS Cooperative School District on September 28 and November 30, 2010. 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 Individualized Education Programs (IEPs)
- Review of Local Education Agency (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
- Review of Preschool Programming for Students with Disabilities
- 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

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS:

I. IEP Review Process: Conducted on September 28 and November 30, 2010

As part of the compliance component of Focused Monitoring, the NHDOE worked in collaboration with the GRS Cooperative 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 GRS Cooperative School District were provided with an opportunity to collaboratively review nine IEPs that were randomly selected. The purpose of the review was to determine if the documents included the following information relative to the student's present level of performance:

- Measurable annual goals relate to specific student needs
- Instructional strategies, interventions, and supports identify and are implemented to support progress toward measurable goals
- Assessment (formative and summative) information is central to the development of annual goals and represents measure of progress toward meeting annual goals
- Accommodations and/or modifications to instruction and support services are determined to support student access to the general curriculum instruction and assessment
- A three-year review of the student's progress in meeting key IEP goals and the documented evidence of student gains
- Evidence of progress toward key IEP goals and the documented evidence of student gains over a three year period
- Transition plans that have measurable postsecondary goals (for youth aged 16 and above)
- Evidence of required documentation for preschool programming for children ages 3-5

The intended outcome of the IEP Review Process is to ensure compliance and the development of a logistical plan for improved communication and collaboration between general and special educators, and 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 GORHAM REGIONAL COOPERATIVE SCHOOL DISTRICT:

Building/District Summary of IEP Review Process

Conclusions/Patterns Trends Identified Through IEP Review Process include:

- **How the process supported recommendations for improving the writing of student IEPs:**
 1. IEP Teams should consider creating an improved application of district curriculum based measures to inform the development and monitoring of IEPs.
 2. All IEPs need to include measurable goals, including baseline measurements and areas of targeted growth.
 3. At the high school level, case managers need to continue their efforts to improve writing of Transition Plans to include annual measurable goals, outside agency involvement, and direct student involvement.

4. All IEPs should include benchmarks or objectives to assist the team in tracking student progress toward meeting established goals.
 5. Modifications and accommodations in student IEP's should be reviewed to insure that they are clearly defined, accurate, being implemented and monitored.
 6. All recent evaluations (special education and district/curriculum assessments) are currently being reviewed through a file review conducted by the school psychologist; this information could be better utilized in developing student IEP's.
 7. Clearer statements of Present Level of Performance in IEPs should be developed and include items such as: student interests, performance data, strengths/weaknesses, and a clear connection to established goals.
- **Describe how individual student performance information is conveyed from grade to grade and school to school:**
 1. The district is encouraged to describe the elements of early learning transitions: ESS to preschool, and preschool to kindergarten.
 2. There are smooth transitions from preschool to kindergarten to first grade as the kindergarten is located within the building and there are ample opportunities to collaborate, share information regarding students and to fully engage parents in the transition process.
 3. The "receiving" schools/teachers between elementary, middle and high school are typically involved in IEP development; if not, teachers are briefed and IEPs are reviewed with them. The transition processes appears to be well coordinated between the middle and high school levels.
 4. Currently there is no system wide electronic method for sharing historic information/essential data on students through a web-based process (e.g. student profiles, student portfolios or use of a PK-12 student data system).
 - **How will the district further explore the factors that have impacted marginal scores for individual students on state assessments?**
 1. The Response to Intervention (RtI) Model is in the process of being universally applied to address many of the factors that impact the achievement gap.
 2. The district continues to focus upon appropriate accommodations (as indicated in their respective IEPs) for students taking the NECAP.
 3. Continued positive reinforcement around participating in the NECAPs could be emphasized in each school.
 4. The alignment of IEP goals to the district curriculum should continue to be emphasized.
 5. The instruction provided in pull out special education settings should be reviewed to ensure alignment with the general education curriculum.
 6. Assessment and monitoring of specialized instruction provided outside of the classroom setting will be reviewed.
 7. All staff continues to work on test-taking skills and strategies with their students.
 8. Tiered interventions for "all" students should continue to be a focus throughout the district.
 9. Further exploration regarding the use of a systemic data management system should be a priority (e.g. Performance Pathways).
 - **Strengths and suggestions identified related to IEP development/progress monitoring and services:**
 - Strengths:**
 - Ongoing development and continuity of the RtI Model.

- The district is acknowledged for their willingness to embark upon systems change, ongoing program improvement and high learning expectations for all.
- The district continues to design and provide comprehensive professional development as related to writing IEPs that have measurable goals and are aligned to the general curriculum.
- Openness of staff to improving curriculum, instruction and assessment for all students.
- Strong awareness on the part of teachers of student needs and the value of parent/school relationships.
- The strides the district has reached in writing measurable IEP and Transition Plan goals are impressive.
- The efforts that continue on improving communication and planning between all of the schools in the district.
- The commitment throughout the district to provide appropriate resources, staffing patterns, class sizes and support for professional development.
- The involvement of staff in IEP review process is characterized by thorough knowledge of the student and commitment to providing the necessary supports.
- The deliberate focus upon instructional leadership in each of the buildings.
- A strong core of very dedicated and seasoned staff in each of the schools.
- A culture of “continuous improvement” evident in the district.
- The strong and competent oversight and vision for special education in the district.
- The positive and constructive support and guidance for an articulate and well-planned process for advancing the learning expectations for all students from the central office.

○ **Suggestions: * Indicates a Finding of Non-Compliance:**

Special Education/IEP's

- *Assure that measurable annual goals are contained in all IEPs and include a baseline and a target or include baseline in the goal's present level of performance (PLOP).
- Address all areas of academic need in IEPs and revise as necessary if the student is not making anticipated progress.
- Improve communication and collaboration between special education and regular education staff where necessary to monitor delivery of special education services and progress.
- Include student interests and strengths in the IEP Student Profile.
- The GRS Cooperative School District may want to review the roles/responsibilities of Para Professionals, along with responsibility for daily supervision.
- Assure understanding by staff and parents of the difference between accommodations and modifications that are outlined in IEPs.
- *Ensure that all transition goals outlined in IEPs are measurable and that transition plans have all required components.
- Assure that transition planning occurs for students turning 14 years of age DURING the implementation of an IEP.
- Use state or district assessment data in developing the student Profile, Present Levels of Performance in the IEP.
- Data needs to be placed in the hands of teachers if they are to incorporate into IEPs. In making this transition, teachers will need support and ongoing professional development.

○ **Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment**

- While the GRS Cooperative School District has been commended for their efforts in developing an RtI model, it is also suggested that the district take a critical look at the definition of the model and consistency of implementation Pre-K-12, along with the data being collected to document effectiveness of interventions provided.
- Improved use of data to inform curriculum, instruction and assessment for all students at all levels.
- The district needs to identify a mechanism for storing data electronically prek-12, and provide supports/professional development to staff and administration in the use of data to inform curriculum, instruction, assessment and development of IEPs.
- As the district looks ahead at the improved use of data, it is strongly encouraged that administration and staff explore the use of a common formative assessment tool for measuring student progress. An example of such an assessment is *AIMSweb*.

District Wide Commendations:

Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment

- There is increasing evidence that both special education and regular education teachers are accessing and using student data to inform curriculum and instruction.
- The varied learning options/interventions within all of the Gorham schools are supportive of all students and enhance the academic learning that occurs.
- Significant emphasis is being placed on the need for review and use of data as related to improved student learning.
- Significant emphasis is being placed on the need for review and use of data as related to improved student learning.
- Staff throughout the district is dedicated and highly skilled.
- Staff throughout the district is dedicated and highly skilled.
- The staff/student ratio within each school is appropriate to meet the varied learning needs of all students.

Culture and Climate/Parent Community Engagement

- The culture and climate in each of the schools is warm, welcoming and child centered.
- Throughout the district there is a collective culture of responsibility for all students.
- The school district has strong connections and utilizes a variety of community resources preschool through college level.
- Throughout the district there is a sense of teamwork: staff and administrators are role models for students.
- Throughout the district there is evidence of meaningful engagement of parents and families in the special education process.

Leadership

- The central office administration is committed to improved learning for all students and ensuring that special education programming is aligned with general education learning expectations.
- The leadership throughout the district has provided a deliberate focus upon special education programming and improving results for all children.
- As evidenced through Focused Monitoring, the district has embraced a comprehensive system wide improvement planning process which includes alignment of all initiatives.

- The district has recently revised all of the special education policies and procedures to ensure compliance with state and special education rules and regulations.
- Ongoing professional development opportunities are available to all staff

LEA Focused Monitoring Compliance Application

As part of the Focused Monitoring IEP Compliance Process, The GRS Cooperative School District Special Education Policy and Procedures were reviewed to ensure that all requirements are met. In order to conduct this review, special education policy and procedures (the Local Plan) was cross referenced with state and federal rules and regulations; listed below is a summary of findings:

- All special education policy and procedures were reviewed and determined to be in compliance.

Out of District File Review:

As part of the NHDOE Focused Monitoring Process, a random review of student records was conducted for children with disabilities who are placed out of district. In order to review these student files, the NHDOE has developed and utilizes a checklist of compliance indicators aligned with state and federal special education rules and regulations.

Based on the review of the two randomly selected student records, there were no citations of noncompliance identified.

Students with Disabilities Attending Charter Schools:

Currently the GRS Cooperative School District has no students with disabilities 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 special education programs in the district, and/or requests for changes to existing programs. At the time of the September 28 and November 30, 2010 Focused Monitoring Compliance Review, there were no requests from the GRS Cooperative School District for approval of new special education programs.

Building/District Summary of IEP Review and Out-of-District File Review Processes

Preschool	1
Elementary School	2
Middle School	2
High School, Age below 16	1
High School, Age 16 or above	1
Out of District	2
Total Number of IEPs Reviewed	9

II. Findings of Non-Compliance Identified as a Result of the NHDOE Compliance and IEP Review Visit:

As a result of the 9 IEPs that were selected for the IEP Reviews on September 28 and November 30, 2010, the following findings of non-compliance were identified:

Ed 1109.01/34CFR 300.320 Measurable Goals

Of the 9 IEPs reviewed, preschool through secondary, 6 did not contain measurable goals.

**ED 1109.01 (a) (1) Transition
CFR 300.320**

For students 16 years and older, transition plans must include all required components.

The one IEP reviewed for a student 16 and older did not include all IEP required components.

Please note: *All finds of non-compliance will need to be addressed in a corrective action plan and met within one year of the date of the Focused Monitoring Summary Report.*

Conclusions:

Throughout the IEP review process it was readily apparent that the staff and administration in the GRS Cooperative School District are committed to narrowing the achievement gap between students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers. The district continues to emphasize the need for program development, providing a full continuum of services and interventions for all students, including those with disabilities. The administration within the district is making a concerted effort to meet the individual needs of all learners through the implementation of a Response to Intervention Model; this is especially evident as it relates to student who have been identified as having learning challenges. The professional development made available to support staff is impressive and there is an emphasis of continuous program improvement. The GRS Cooperative School District was fully supported by the building administration in the planning and implementation of the Focused Monitoring IEP Review Process, and the process was well planned and supported by the building staff and IEP team members. Staff actively participated in the reviews; they were well prepared and used the opportunity as job embedded professional development. The results of this review are accurate and realistic and many are already being addressed or implemented by the GRS Cooperative School District.

NHDOE SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM APPROVAL AND IMPROVEMENT PROCESS
CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN

SAU#: 20	NAME OF SAU OR PRIVATE SCHOOL: GRS Cooperative	SUPERINTENDENT/EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Paul Bousquet
SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTOR: Rebecca Hebert-Sweeny		DATE OF PLAN: 2/7/2011

THE NHDOE, BUREAU OF SPECIAL EDUCATION, REQUIRES THAT ALL FINDINGS OF NON-COMPLIANCE BE CORRECTED AS SOON AS POSSIBLE, BUT NO LATER THAN ONE YEAR FROM THE FINAL REPORT DATE – **January 4, 2012**

FINDINGS OF NON-COMPLIANCE: Findings of non-compliance are defined as deficiencies that have been identified through the Case Study Compliance Review Process, which are in violation of state and federal special education rules and regulations.	For Use By Technical Assistant At Follow Up Visit
--	---

FINDINGS OF NON-COMPLIANCE	IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITY	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	EVIDENCE OF COMPLIANCE AND EVIDENCE OF IMPACT ON STUDENTS, AS APPROPRIATE	TIMELINE				Date of follow up visit (or date of acceptance of evidence submitted to indicate correction):
				(Check appropriate columns below to indicate expected completion time for each activity.) Please note - findings of non-compliance re: individual students must be benchmarked in the first quarter.				Note as Met, In Process or Not Met
				4/11	7/11	10/11	1/12	

Ed 1109.01/34CFR 300.320 Measurable Goals Of the 9 IEPs reviewed, preschool through secondary, 6 did not contain measurable goals.	Professional Development for all relevant staff will be provided to ensure the development of measurable annual goals.	Director of Special Services will work with staff to coordinate professional development	Upon review of IEPs, 100% of randomly selected IEPs will have measurable annual goals. Staff will demonstrate knowledge and understanding measurable annual goals.				X	
--	---	---	---	--	--	--	---	--

				4/11	7/11	10/11	1/12	
<p>ED 1109.01 (a) (1) Transition CFR 300.320</p> <p>For students 16 years and older, transition plans must include all required components. The one IEP reviewed for a student 16 and older did not include all IEP required components.</p>	<p>Professional Development for all relevant staff will be provided to ensure that all Transition Plans include required components.</p>	<p>Special Education Director will work with staff to coordinate professional development.</p>	<p>Upon review of IEPs 100% of randomly selected transition plans will have all required components.</p>				X	

CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN

SAU#: 20	NAME OF SAU OR PRIVATE SCHOOL: GRS Cooperative	SUPERINTENDENT/EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Paul Bousquet			
SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTOR: Rebecca Hebert-Sweeny		DATE OF PLAN: 2/7/11			
<p>SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT: 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>					For Use By Technical Assistant At Follow Up Visit
SUGGESTIONS	IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITY	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	EVIDENCE OF COMPLIANCE AND EVIDENCE OF IMPACT ON STUDENTS, AS APPROPRIATE	TIMELINE	Date of follow up visit (or date of acceptance of evidence submitted to indicate correction):
					Note as Met, In Process or Not Met
*Assure that measurable annual goals are contained in all IEPs and include a baseline and a target or include baseline in the goal's present level of performance (PLOP).	This suggestion will be taken under advisement				

Address all areas of academic need in IEPs and revise as necessary if the student is not making anticipated progress.	This suggestion will be taken under advisement				
Improve communication and collaboration between special education and regular education staff where necessary to monitor delivery of special education services and progress.	This suggestion will be taken under advisement				
Include student interests and strengths in the IEP Student Profile.	This suggestion will be taken under advisement				
The GRS Cooperative School District may want to review the roles/responsibilities of Para Professionals, along with responsibility for daily supervision.	This suggestion will be taken under advisement				

4. Action Plan

The Focused Monitoring Action Plan is intended to describe the specific Goals 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.

GRS Cooperative School District Action Plan:

MEASURABLE STUDENT LEARNING GOAL #1: All students in the Gorham Randolph Shelburne Cooperative School District will have full access to the general curriculum and demonstrate educational progress as demonstrated by proficiency on NECAP.

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
Develop process for K-12 collaboration, communication between general and special education to ensure that instruction and programming provided to <u>all</u> students is aligned to the general curriculum.	Time Materials Money	Dir. Of Special Services in collaboration with teachers and administrators	Draft document by Dec. 2011	What & by whom	When	What & by whom	When
				Minutes of meetings Analysis of the IEPs are written and aligned. Demonstration of students participating in the gen. curriculum. Ongoing feedback from teachers. Report cards – elem.	Ongoing	Results of NECAP, with increased scores evident, and quarterly/trimester report cards.	Ongoing
Align curriculum (Vertical/Horizontal) with cross-curriculum planning. Identify, prioritize and focus upon GLEs, GSEs, and National Common Core Standards.	Software Time Money	NEASC Curriculum Committee All teachers	June 2014	Curriculum will be written, utilized and clearly articulated for everyone to access. Standards based report cards.	June 2014	Students will score proficient or better on NECAP by 2014. Parents will have a better understanding of learning expectations K-12.	June 2014

GRS Cooperative School District Action Plan:

MEASURABLE STUDENT LEARNING GOAL #2:

By June 2012, the Gorham Randolph Shelburne Cooperative School District will have written and adopted a K-12 RTI model.

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
To inventory RTI instructional materials district wide.	Time Money All teachers & staff Space and furniture for storage of RTI materials.	RTI Coordinators, Staff and Administrators	Summer '11 – June '12	What & by whom	When	What & by whom	When
				Achievement Team	Fall Winter Spring	Completed inventory that has been shared with staff.	Spring
Explore, research, pilot various intervention tools as determined by the coordinators at each level.	Opportunities to identify tools (i.e. Prof. Dev. Workshops, peer discussion K-12) Money Time	Teachers and Staff RTI Coordinators	Summer '11 – June '12	Teachers, RTI Coordinators and Administrators Professional Development Committee	At faculty mtgs. PDC mtgs. Admin. Mtgs.	Determining whether the targeted students are demonstrating growth based on data.	Ongoing

The RTI model should include coordination, oversight, and monitoring of RTI at the central office level, building level, and grade level.	Identify RTI Coordinators for elementary, middle and high school levels (2 per level) Time Money	Administrators RTI Coordinators Teachers	Summer '11 – June '12	Administrators and RTI Coordinators	Ongoing	A working knowledge of RTI and its components that can be clearly articulated by all staff.	June 2012
Administrators will develop RTI budget at elem., middle and high school levels in collaboration with the staff who are implementing the program.	Time Money “go-to” person to coordinate	Administrators in collaboration with Staff	As determined by admin. at each level	Completion of a RTI budget	Oct. 2011	RTI budget that has been adopted by the School Board and passed by the citizens at the March 2012 School District Meeting.	March 2012
Develop/adopt a K -12 system/format to monitor, articulate, and inform staff, students, parents and administrators of individual student progress.	Time Money Investigate software/digital format.	Technology Comm. and Technology Coordinators in collaboration with RTI Coordinators and Administration	June 2014	Administrators	Admin. Mtgs.	Data will drive instruction more efficiently.	June 2014

5. Next Steps

Updates on the FM Action Plan will be added to the agendas for school board, administrator, data team and staff meetings to ensure that the FM strategies/activities are infused into the district's ongoing implementation strategies.

For Goal #1, ensure that all students have access the general education curriculum, general and special education staff will work closely to align and deliver instruction. Increasing scores on NECAP, NWEA, and report cards will be the evidence of effectiveness.

For Goal #2, the K-12 RTI model will be developed and adopted. Staff will develop a working knowledge of RTI and its components. RTI research-based tools will be piloted and effectiveness will be determined based upon the growth of targeted students. A working knowledge of RTI and its components will be clearly articulated by staff. RTI budget will be developed and adopted.

6. Addenda

- Edward Fenn (K-5) Family Involvement Survey Results
- Gorham Middle High School Family Involvement Survey Results