

New Hampshire
Department of Education

IDEA Part B Special Education
Annual Performance Report (APR)
For FFY 2007
(2007 – 2008)

Submitted February 1, 2009
Revised April 7, 2009

*New Hampshire Department of Education
Bureau of Special Education*

*State Director of Special Education
Santina Thibedeau
101 Pleasant Street
Concord NH 03301*

*For copies of the Annual Performance Report and the State Performance Plan,
contact the Bureau at (603) 271-3741 or visit our website:
<http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/instruction/bose.htm>*

Notice of Nondiscrimination

The New Hampshire Department of Education does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, marital status, national/ethnic origin, age, sex, sexual orientation, or disability in its programs, activities and employment practices.

*The following person has been designated to handle inquiries
regarding the nondiscrimination policies:*

*Brenda Cochrane, Human Resources Administrator
(603) 271-3743 bcochrane@ed.state.nh.us*

Table of Contents	Pages
Indicator 1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.	1-7
Indicator 2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.	8-10
Indicator 3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments.	11-20
Indicator 4. Rates of suspension and expulsion.	21-24
Indicator 5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21: A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day; B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	25-28
Indicator 6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers.	29
Indicator 7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved outcomes.	30-31
Indicator 8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.	32
Indicator 9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.	33-35
Indicator 10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	36-39
Indicator 11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days (or State established timeline).	40-42
Indicator 12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third	

Table of Contents	Pages
birthdays.	43-47
Indicator 13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals	48-50
Indicator 14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.	51-55
Indicator 15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.	56-62
Indicator 16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.	63-64
Indicator 17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer.	65-66
Indicator 18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.	67-68
Indicator 19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.	69-70
Indicator 20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.	71-74
IDEA Data Report Table 6	
IDEA Data Report Table 7	

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Stakeholder Input

In the development of the State Performance Plan (SPP) and the Annual Performance Report (APR), submitted on February 1, 2009, the NHDOE sought input and shared data with key stakeholders including the NH Special Education State Advisory Committee on the Education of Children/Students with Disabilities (SAC). During the SAC monthly meetings, the NHDOE provided information and data, soliciting input and feedback from SAC members. In addition, the NHDOE sought input from the NH Family-Centered Early Supports & Services Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) on indicators related to preschool special education.

Details about stakeholder input that is specific to a given indicator are found in the overview section for that indicator.

Technical Assistance

The NHDOE sought technical assistance for the February 1, 2009 submission of the SPP and APR as follows:

- Participated in OSEP's teleconferences regarding the SPP and APR;
- Sought and used guidance materials from the Regional Resource and Federal Centers (RRFC) website: <http://www.rfcnetwork.org>;
- Received ongoing consultation from our OSEP State Contact;
- Support from OSEP-funded Technical Assistance Center such as DAC (formerly WESTAT and NCSEAM), CADRE, ECO, NECTAC, NPSO, NSTTAC;
- Participated in activities sponsored by and sought technical assistance from the Northeast Regional Resource Center (NERRC);
- Accessed materials found on the IDEA 2004 website: <http://idea.ed.gov/explore/home>;
- Attended OSEP-sponsored conferences for Part B and Section 619

Details about technical assistance are found in the related indicators. For example, Indicator 15 includes detailed information about the extensive support from DAC to support the NHDOE in systematically developing tracking and documentation methods to ensure fidelity of data and to build the general supervision system.

SPP Corrections, Updates, and Revisions

In order to improve the readability of the document, the NH Department of Education (NHDOE) has made minor clerical changes to the SPP based on stakeholder input. The SPP overview section has been updated to include current information, such as the latest submission date, current website links, and information on revisions.

The NHDOE has revised four indicators in the NH Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010 for submission to OSEP on February 1, 2009. These revisions include:

- Indicator 7: revised sections based on OSEP requirements to describe updates to the State's outcome measurement system and to provide progress data.
- Indicator 8: completely revised because NH has implemented a new process for measuring how schools have facilitated parent involvement. This new process was based on a statewide census of all parents of children with IEPs and a new measurement system. New surveys have also been submitted.
- Indicator 15: improvement activities have been revised to ensure they enable the State to correct noncompliance in a timely manner.
- Indicator 20: improvement activities have been revised to ensure they enable the State to provide required data, demonstrating compliance with the timely and accurate data requirements in IDEA.

The NHDOE has informed the public of these revisions in the overview section of the SPP and APR as well as within the revised indicators.

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

As required by the US Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), revised sections of the SPP have been submitted to OSEP and the entire SPP (including revisions) has been posted on the NHDOE website by the February 1, 2009 deadline.

Public Reporting

The New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) makes its State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) available through public means, including posting on the NHDOE website, distribution to the media and distribution through public agencies (20 USC 1416 Section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I)). The NHDOE reports annually to the public (through this same dissemination process) on the progress and/or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets found in the SPP using the Annual Performance Report (APR). The revised SPP and the FFY 2007 APR submitted February 1, 2009 are posted on the NHDOE website at:

<http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/instruction/SpecialEd/2008%20SPP%20APR/February2008APRSPP.htm>

In addition to posting on the NHDOE website, copies are distributed to: the NH State Board of Education; the NH Special Education State Advisory Committee on the Education of Children/Students with Disabilities (SAC); NH Special Education Administrators Association; the Family Resource Connection, State Library and the Parent Information Center. Paper and electronic copies on CD will be available upon request from the Bureau of Special Education, NHDOE. These documents are available in alternate format upon request.

As required by OSEP, the NHDOE reports annually to the public on specific performance of each local school district in the state on the targets set out in the SPP by posting District Data Profiles on the NHDOE website. These profiles report the performance of each local school district regarding the indicators in the SPP. On January 4, 2008, the NHDOE issued FY 08 Memo #21, *Public Reporting of District Special Education Data (District Data Profiles) and District Determinations*.

<http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/instruction/SpecialEd/documents/documents/FY2008Memo21DistrictDataProfiles.pdf>

The 2006-2007 & 2005-2006 District Data Profiles can be viewed at

<http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/instruction/SpecialEd/DistrictDataProfiles.htm>

Indicator 1 Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development

Technical Assistance

The NHDOE worked with the OSEP-funded Data Accountability Center (DAC) and the North East Regional Resource Center (NERRC) to resolve data collection issues and to establish cell size for public reporting for this indicator.

The OSEP State Contact provided consultation to the State on issues related to data collection, analysis and public reporting for this indicator.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement: Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2007-2008	For 2007-2008, the percentage of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma will be 87%.

Overview of FFY Data

FFY 2004 – Baseline Year: 73%

FFY 2005 – First year of Data: 72%

FFY 2006 – Second year of Data: 75%

FFY 2007 – Third year of Data: 71%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (reporting period July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008):

Calculation

Percent = [(# of students with IEPs who graduated divided by # of students with IEPs, 17 – 21 years old, eligible to graduate) times 100]

$$71\% = [(1,403 / 1,978) \times 100]$$

Explanation of Calculation

Total number of students with IEPs, 17 to 21 years old, eligible to graduate1,978
Total number of students with IEPs who graduated in 2007-2008 1,403

The NHDOE used the following process to determine the number of students with IEPs, 17 to 21 years old, eligible to graduate. First, we gathered from the Federal Annual IDEA Data Report Table 4 the total number of students with IEPs age 17 to 21 who exited special education (2,711) in the 2007-2008 school year. The table reflects students who have exited special education. We subtracted students who exited special education who would not be eligible to graduate from the total number of students with IEPs who exited.

Total # of students with IEPs age 17 to 21 who exited special education '07-'08.....	2,711
Minus (-) Students, age 17 to 21, who transferred to regular education.....	241
Minus (-) Students, age 17 to 21, who received a certificate.....	62
Minus (-) Students, age 17 to 21, deceased.....	9
Minus (-) Students, age 17 to 21, who moved, known to be continuing.....	391
Minus (-) Students, age 17 to 21, who reached maximum age.....	30
Total number of students with IEPs age 17 to 21 eligible to graduate.....	1,978

Note regarding transition to new methodology for next year's calculation

While analyzing the data points for this indicator, the NHDOE, Bureau of Special Education determined that there were two ways to calculate the numbers of students with IEPs age 17 to 21 who are eligible to graduate. The method used in the SPP and APR through the February 1, 2009 submission involves subtracting out students *Not Eligible to Graduate* in a variety of categories from the total number of students who exited special education. In the proposed method, the NHDOE will, for the next APR submission (FFY 2008 APR for 2008-2009), add the *number of youth with IEPs who exited special education in the Dropped out category* to the *number of youth who exited special education in the graduated category*. The result of the calculation is identical regardless of which methodology is used, as can be seen by comparing the table below to the table above. The new method will use fewer data points in the calculation. It is also important to note that the federal special education exit category of dropped out is not the same as the state category of drop out from public education. The federal special education

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

exit category of dropped out includes students who: moved, not known to be continuing; youth whose status is unknown, GED recipients, students who drop out, and other reasons.

Age	# Youth with IEPs who exited Special Education in the Dropped Out Category	# Youth with IEPs who exited Special Education in the Graduated Category	Total
17	147	9	156
18	220	770	990
19	140	468	608
20	54	122	176
21	14	34	48
TOTAL	575	1,403	1,978

The number of students with IEPs age 17 to 21 eligible to graduate is equal to the number of students who dropped out plus the number of students who graduated with a regular high school diploma.
 $575 + 1,403 = 1,978$.

Definition

RSA 186-C: 9 Education Required states that an educationally disabled child “shall be entitled to continue in an approved program until such time as the child has acquired a high school diploma or has attained the age of 21, whichever occurs first...” New Hampshire does not recognize alternative diplomas, IEP diplomas, the GED, certificates of attendance or any other form but a regular high school diploma for the purposes of counting a child as fulfilling the diploma exiting requirement of RSA 186-C:9. To earn a regular high school diploma, a child must, as specified in the Minimum Standards for Public School Approval effective 7/1/05, Section Ed 306.27, earn “a minimum of 20 credits for a regular high school diploma, unless the local school board has set a requirement of more than 20 credits for a regular high school diploma, in which case the local credit requirement shall apply”. In NH, a regular high school diploma is conferred by the local school board.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

Note: The NHDOE reports improvement activity completed or not completed based on the expectations for the reporting period. Many activities are ongoing and will be continued in the next year even though they have been completed for the reporting period. In addition, many of the activities reported in Indicator 1 are referenced in other related indicators.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 1: Completed

The NH Department of Education (NHDOE), Bureau of Special Education, was awarded a three year dropout prevention grant during the 2005-2006 school year, from the US DOE Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, entitled Achievement for Dropout Prevention and Excellence II (APEX II). This federal project focuses on reducing New Hampshire’s high school dropout rates and using flexible approaches to help adolescents who have already dropped out of schools reenter to complete their secondary education. This is a state-wide project being implemented at ten high schools in the state that have higher than average dropout rates. The APEX II model consists of two complimentary interventions to target dropouts and students at-risk: *Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)* and *Rehabilitation for Empowerment, Natural Supports, Education and Work (RENEW)*. Seven of the ten high schools experienced a reduction in dropouts from the 2005-2006 school year to the 2006-2007 school year. The NHDOE contracts with the *National Dropout Prevention Center (NDPC)* at Clemson University to act as the outside evaluator for this grant. The NDPC provided ongoing technical assistance,

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

conducted on-site visits throughout the year, and provided a grant performance report at the end of the year.

Third year outcomes and performance measures demonstrated successes as well as challenges. PBIS and RENEW implementation require major high school reform, particularly PBIS which necessitates change on the part of administration, teachers, and staff in their day to day interactions and expectations of students to overall improve school climate. Four of the ten high schools have made significant progress with implementation of PBIS and RENEW, fully achieving third year goals. Five high schools are implementing many aspects of PBIS and RENEW, and with a fourth year, would be on track for successful implementation. One high school has decided to discontinue implementation of school-wide efforts through PBIS and intensive efforts through RENEW. As a result, the number of participating high schools for the third year was nine. APEX II anticipates requesting a one-year no-cost extension to continue this project through a fourth year.

Highlights of project activities during the 2007-2008 school year include: middle to high school transition training and capacity building; dropout prevention and recovery teams formed and working; PBIS Universal team and Targeted team development and training; individual intensive RENEW services provided to students; consultation for the development of behavioral expectation systems, including reporting, data compilation, and analysis.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 2: N/A

The Governor did not hold a Dropout Summit during FFY 2007. The NHDOE continued to work with the legislature and others to address statewide issues around Drop Outs.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 3: Completed

As stated in the SPP, the New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE), Bureau of Special Education sought grants from the USDOE to support youth with IEPs graduating with a regular high school diploma. The NHDOE was recently awarded a \$3.85 million State Personnel Development Grant from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs. The State will receive \$770,000 each year for five years. The grant project, entitled *NH-RESPONDS: Professional Development for Excellence in Education*, will address early care and education (toddlers and preschoolers), elementary, middle, and high school children and youth with disabilities to include the full range of mild, moderate, and severe disabilities through local school district demonstration sites throughout the state. Specific targeted outcomes include (a) improved social/emotional skills, (b) improved acquisition and use of literacy knowledge and skills, (c) reductions in major problem behaviors, suspensions, expulsions, and dropping out of school, and (d) increased rates of graduation, competitive employment, and enrollment in postsecondary education.

To accomplish these ends, *NH-RESPONDS* seeks to reform and improve pre-service personnel preparation and in-service professional development systems in order to improve the knowledge and skills of general and special education teachers, early intervention personnel, related services personnel, paraprofessionals, and administrators. *NH RESPONDS* will design, deliver, and evaluate scientifically-based practices in the following areas: (1) Response to Intervention (RTI) to include systems of positive interventions and supports (PBIS), and literacy instruction, and (2) secondary transition supports for students with emotional/ behavioral challenges. The project also seeks to improve local school district systems of recruiting, hiring, and retaining education and related services personnel who are highly qualified in these areas.

NH RESPONDS is a collaborative effort of the NHDOE, Bureau of Special Education, Bureau of Credentialing, Bureau of Career Development; NH Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Children, Youth, and Families, Division of Developmental Services, Family Centered Early Supports and Services; Parent Information Center; NH Association of School Administrators; and NH Association of Special Education Administrators, *NH-RESPONDS* provides for a comprehensive and coordinated system of supported, evidence based, pre-service and in-service professional development activities systematically delivered in partnership with the NH Center for Effective Behavioral Interventions and Supports; the Institute on Disability, University of New Hampshire; teacher preparation programs at four

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Institutions of Higher Education (Plymouth State University, Rivier College, Keene State College, and University of New Hampshire); and several local school demonstration sites to be selected throughout the state.

During FFY 2007 five demonstration sites were chosen, and the project anticipates the selections of two to three high school sites in December 2008. During the summer of 2008 the project began meeting with the five demonstration sites. Trainings in literacy, behavior, RTI and Secondary Transition will not begin until FFY 2008.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 4: Completed

The Bureau of Special Education at the NH DOE reassessed SPP targets and determined them to be rigorous and measurable.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 5: Completed

The Bureau of Special Education published District Data Profiles with all required indicators within the specified timelines from OSEP. On September 25, 2007, the NHDOE provided guidance to districts on reporting requirements in FY 08 Memo #12 *District Reporting Requirements for Children Exiting Special Education*.

<http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/instruction/SpecialEd/documents/documents/FY08Memo12ExitingSpecificInstructionsMemo.pdf>

NH SPP Improvement Activity 6: Completed

The Bureau of Special Education, which provides technical assistance to schools through trainings and professional development, revised the technical assistance program in FFY 2006 to enhance support to districts and to ensure that special education administration, faculty and staff were provided with the necessary tools and techniques to support the success of their students. An RFP for Technical Assistance Consultants (TA Consultants) went out in spring 2007 and five TA Consultants were hired in the summer of 2007. The new process for technical assistance allows for schools or districts to request technical assistance around a specific area of need, weakness or noncompliance. The Bureau then assigns a TA consultant to provide the desired assistance. Schools/districts in turn provide feedback to the Bureau through an initial evaluation and a six-month follow-up evaluation around the success or failure of the assistance. This enables the Bureau to continue improvement in their technical assistance regarding the education of students with disabilities, in turn, supporting their successful completion to high school graduation.

The new TA Consultant Project went into affect during the 2007-2008 school year. The five TA Consultants provided ongoing support to districts in the following areas: writing measurable IEP goals and objectives; development, implementation, and management of IEPs; behavior intervention planning; transition planning; parental involvement; data driven goals and objectives; review of policies and procedures; issues of confidentiality; case management; revision of Special Education plan and parent handbook; parent mentoring; SAU supervision and communication structure; accommodations and modifications; IEP case studies; time management; timeliness of evaluations; effective progress measures; Autism Spectrum Disorder; Tourette's Syndrome; curriculum based measurable goals; data driven measurable goals; written prior notice; RTI development and implementation; related services in Individual Program Approvals (IPAs); best practice in IEP development. Twenty school districts received direct services, upon request. TA Consultants served as trainers for NHDOE programs, such as the Educational Surrogate Parent Program, IEP Facilitation Program, Alternate Assessment, Measured Progress, and provided trainings to districts on data input into the NH Special Education Information System (NHSEIS) database. TA Consultants also supported the Bureau with telephone support to districts and parents.

A second RFP for TA Consultants went out in the summer of 2008 and two new TA Consultants are expected to be hired for FFY 2008. The five TA Consultants that were hired for FFY 2007 had their contracts renewed during the summer of 2008 for the upcoming FFY 2008 school year.

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

On July 12, 2007, FY 08 Memo #2 *Technical Assistance Consultants* was disseminated to districts regarding the process to access this technical assistance.

<http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/instruction/SpecialEd/documents/documents/FY08Memo2TechnicalAssistanceConsultants.pdf>

NH SPP Improvement Activity 7: Completed

New Hampshire's student-centered *Follow the Child* Initiative focuses on four domains of personalized learning and assessment for the success of each child: personally, socially, physically and academically. During the 2007-2008 school year the NHDOE continued implementation of this initiative, providing opportunities to help outfit teachers and administrators with the tools and techniques necessary to create classrooms and schools focused on the success, aspirations and well-being of each child. A student's learning pathway is determined by students, parents, and educators together, with short-term and long-term goals drawing on resources inside and outside of school. This initiative is intended to encourage more students to graduate from high school, and to ensure that those graduates are better prepared for their next steps in life.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 8: Completed

NH Senate Bill 18 (SB 18), which raises the compulsory age of public education from 16 to 18, passed in FFY 2006 and goes into effect July 1, 2009, FFY 2008. At that time students will no longer be able to drop out of school unless they are 18 years of age or older. This is expected to increase high school graduation rates while decreasing dropout rates for all students.

As a result of SB 18, the Department of Education requested in its FY 08 and FY 09 budget funds for alternative education. The Department of Education was awarded \$2.1 million for dropout prevention. The State Dropout Prevention and Recovery Council was created to oversee the spending of this money with a plan to create a regional, state-wide system of dropout prevention. An RFP for new programs was released July 1, 2007 to address alternative programming needs and interventions in high schools. Alternative education grants were awarded to successful school applicants in FFY 2007. Schools receiving alternative education grants will be able to implement new programs for students who seek alternative methods of education and job training to successfully complete high school and become a contributing member of their community during FFY 2008 and FFY 2009.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

The NHDOE did not meet the target for 2007-2008.

State Actual Data: 71% Target: 87%

This represents four percentage points below the actual graduation rate for youth with IEPs of 75% for 2006-2007. It is difficult to determine a specific cause for slippage in this Indicator. Many activities are newly implemented and require time before effect can be measured. NH continues to review the improvement activities and assess the effectiveness as implementation moves forward.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007

There were no revisions to the Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2007 in the State Performance Plan for this Indicator.

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The development of the NH Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007 is described in the Overview section of the APR.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement: Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2007-2008	The dropout rate for youth with IEPs will be 3.5%.

Overview of FFY Data

- FFY 2004 – Baseline Year: 3.8%**
- FFY 2005 – First year of Data: 3.9%**
- FFY 2006 – Second year of Data: 3.0%**
- FFY 2007 – Third year of Data: 3.9%**

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (reporting period July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008):

Calculation

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs ages 14 to 21 who were exited from special education under the dropped out category minus estimated percentage of the return rate for students with disabilities who drop out in one school year and return the following school year)/ (# of youth with IEPs ages 14-21 in the 12/1 Child Count plus the estimated percentage of students with disabilities who may drop out in the beginning of a school year)]

$$[510/(13,088+117) * 100] = 3.9\%$$

Explanation of Calculation

The NHDOE used the same calculation for determining dropout rates for students with IEPs that is used for all students. However, according to the NHDOE, Bureau of Information Services, the NH DOE does not disaggregate data for students with IEPs. Therefore, estimations needed to be made. The estimations that were made were for the return rate and September dropouts.

In order to compute a dropout rate for IEP youth comparable to the dropout rate for all youth, it was necessary to do the following: assume that youth with IEPs have the same subsequent year return rate (18%) and same September dropouts (23%) as the general high school population. These estimations are provided by the Office of the Commissioner, Chief Information Officer, and are based on actual numbers for all students. On November 26, 2007, the NHDOE issued FY 08 Memo #18 *Calculating the Dropout Rate for Students with Disabilities* to assist the field with understanding the calculation.

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

<http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/instruction/SpecialEd/documents/documents/FY2008Memo18DropOut.pdf>. Below are the steps used for the calculation.

As a first step, we determine the total number of students enrolled with IEPs age 14 to 21. This was based on the Enrollment Count of 12/1/07 (federal Annual IDEA Data Report Child Count Table 1). This number was 13,088.

Next, we calculated the estimated number of youth that did not return in fall 2008 and the estimated pre-12/1/07 Dropouts through the following steps:

1. Identify the 2007-2008 Dropout Count number based on the federal Annual IDEA Data Report Table 4. This number was 622.
2. Estimate number that returned September 2008 by multiplying the Dropout Count number (622) by the estimated return rate of 18% ($622 * 18\% = 112$)
3. Estimate the number of dropouts that did not return by subtracting the Dropout Count number (622) by the 112 youth estimated to return. ($622 - 112 = 510$)
4. Estimated the number of youth with IEPs that dropped out pre-12/1/07 by multiplying the estimated number of dropouts by the estimated drop percentage ($510 * 23\% = 117$)

Lastly, we inserted the numbers into the calculation:

Percent = [(Estimated # of Dropouts that did not return/Enrollment count 12/1/07+ Estimated pre-12/1/07 Dropouts)].

$$[510/(13,088+117)* 100] = 3.9\%$$

NHDOE Definition of Dropout

According to the Bureau of Information Services, the definition of dropout includes GED recipients, students who fail to return to school after the summer, and students whose status is unknown. This same definition applies to students with IEPs and includes students who reach the age of 21 without receiving a diploma or certificate.

The definition of a dropout found on the NHDOE website is as follows: "Definition of a dropout: A 2007-2008 dropout is any student who completed the 2006-2007 school year but did not return to school in September 2007, or any student that dropped out during the 2007-2008 school year and did not return by October 2, 2008. Not counted as dropouts are students who were home schooled, suspended/ temporarily expelled, transfers, truants, incarcerated, or deceased."

(<http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/data/ReportsandStatistics/DropOuts/DropOuts%202006-2007/Dropouts%202006-2007%20Frameset.htm>)

A student who drops out, returns, and drops out again during the same school year is reported as a dropout only once, as of the last dropout date. According to the New Hampshire Department of Education's Information Services, any student that leaves a school to pursue a GED is counted as a dropout.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

NH Improvement Activity 1: Completed

The NH Bureau of Special Education's dropout prevention project, *Achievement for Dropout Prevention and Excellence II* (APEX II), held a Leadership Institute in August 2008. The 2008 Leadership Institute successfully invited all New Hampshire high schools to attend, and saw not just NH high schools attend, but high schools from surrounding states (Vermont) as well. The goal of the 2008 Summer Institute was to share the APEX II model and success stories with other high schools who are interested in implementing PBIS and RENEW.

NH Improvement Activity 2: Completed

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

NH Bureau of Special Education funds the *New Hampshire Center for Effective Behavioral Interventions and Supports* (NH CEBIS) which is an organization devoted to implementing Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) statewide. A multi-year process, the PBIS project works with different cohorts of schools as they move through the PBIS program. In FFY 2007 NH CEBIS continued working with their active sites, which is now numbered at one hundred and thirty-nine schools, spread out across five different cohorts. Cohort 5, which was created during FFY 2007 will be the last cohort of schools to receive training and supports from NH CEBIS under the PBIS project. For FFY 2008 NH CEBIS intends to focus PBIS efforts district-wide, with the goal of having all schools in one district implementing PBIS. Under past PBIS practices with individual schools scattered throughout the state and throughout the districts, it was possible for an individual PBIS school to send their students or receive students from non-PBIS schools. NH CEBIS believes the new focus will be more successful and sustainable in schools that have implemented PBIS district-wide.

NH Improvement Activity Cluster

Improvement activities related to this indicator are interrelated with Indicator 1: Graduation Rates.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

The NHDOE did not meet the target of 3.5% for 2007-2008.

State Dropout Rate for Youth with IEPs: 3.9% Target: 3.5%

This represents 0.9% percentage point slippage in performance from the 2006-2007 results when the dropout rate was 3.0%. It is difficult to determine a specific cause for slippage in this Indicator. Many activities are newly implemented and will require time before effect can be measured. NH continues to review the improvement activities and assess the effectiveness as implementation moves forward.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007

There were no revisions to the Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources in the State Performance Plan for this Indicator.

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The development of the NH Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007 is described in the Overview section of the APR.

Technical Assistance

The New Hampshire Department of Education Bureau of Special Education accessed information from the National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO) to support the development of this indicator. Specifically, this TA supported the NHDOE in ensuring that data from the federal *Annual IDEA Table 6 Report of the Participation and Performance of Students with Disabilities on State Assessment* are consistent with the data used in this indicator. <http://cehd.umn.edu/nceo/indicator3/default.html>. The tables in this indicator were developed with assistance from the Northeast Regional Resource Center (NERRC), based on guidance from NCEO.

Data for this indicator were provided by the NHDOE, Bureau of Accountability. These data are based on October 2007 New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP) results for Grades 3-8 and 11 and the 2006-2007 NH-Alternate Assessment results for Grades 2-7 and 10. For more information regarding the NH state assessment, please visit www.ed.state.nh.us/necap.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup (children with IEPs)}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size in the State})] \times 100$.
- B. Participation rate =
 - a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;
 - b. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = $[(b) \div (a)] \times 100$);
 - c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = $[(c) \div (a)] \times 100$);
 - d. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = $[(d) \div (a)] \times 100$); and
 - e. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = $[(e) \div (a)] \times 100$).

Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above.

Overall Percent = $[(b + c + d + e) \div (a)]$.

- C. Proficiency rate =

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

<p>a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;</p> <p>b. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100);</p> <p>c. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations (percent = [(c) divided by (a)] times 100);</p> <p>d. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = [(d) divided by (a)] times 100); and</p> <p>e. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards (percent = [(e) divided by (a)] times 100).</p> <p>Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above.</p> <p>Overall Percent = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)].</p>
--

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2007-2008	<p>A. District AYP Target: 44% of NH districts will demonstrate adequate yearly progress for the students with disabilities subgroup.</p> <p>B. Participation Rate Target: The state will maintain or increase a participation rate of no less than 96.18% of students with disabilities participating in statewide assessment.</p> <p>C. Proficiency Targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reading Proficiency: 48.23% of students with IEPs across all grades 3-8 and 10 will show proficiency in reading. ▪ Mathematics Proficiency: 56.89% of students with IEPs across all grades 3-8 and 10 will show proficiency in mathematics.

Overview of FFY Data	A. District AYP Data	B: Overall Participation Rate	C. Proficiency Rate
FFY 2004 – Baseline Year	42%	96.18%	Reading Proficiency: 33.45% Mathematics Proficiency: 44.59%
FFY 2005 – First year of Data (Grade10 only)	District AYP was not determined for this reporting period (see FFY 2005 APR)	Reading Participation: 97.24% Mathematics Participation: 96.64%	Reading Proficiency: 41.49% Mathematics Proficiency: 31.81%

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

FFY 2006 – Second year of Data (Grade 3-8)	41%	Reading Participation: 98.8 % Mathematics Participation: 98.6%	Reading Proficiency: 29.12% Mathematics Proficiency: 28.36%
FFY 2007- Third year of Data (Grade 3-8 and 11)	35%	Reading Participation: 97.8% Mathematics Participation: 97.6%	Reading Proficiency: 31.9% Mathematics Proficiency: 26.9%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (reporting period July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008):

3A. Calculation of AYP:

3A. Percent = [(# of districts meeting the State’s AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup (children with Individual Education Plans (IEPs) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size in the State)] times 100.

$$35\% = [(48/136) \times 100]$$

Explanation of AYP determination for this indicator:

Indicator 3A measures the percent of districts that met the State’s AYP objectives for progress in both content areas for the disability subgroup.

2008 AYP determinations for districts are based on an index system using:

- October 2007 New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP) results for Grades 3-8 and 11,
- the 2006-2007 NH-Alternate Assessment (NH ALT) results for Grades 2-7 and 10.

<http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/News/ayp08.htm>

The AYP determination method included the following measures:

Step 1: The total # of districts receiving an AYP determination minus the # of districts with too small a cell size ($n < 11$) to be measured in the disability subgroup.

$$136 = 162 - 26$$

136 districts met the criteria for a sufficient cell size in the disability subgroup to be measured in that subgroup for AYP.

Step 2: The Bureau of Accountability then determined that of the eligible 136 districts, 48 districts met the State’s AYP objectives in both content areas and across all applicable grade levels for the disability subgroup.

Step 3: Percent = Total number of districts meeting the State’s AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup divided by the total number of districts with sufficient cell size for the disability subgroup to be measured.

$$\text{Percent} = 48/136 \times 100$$

$$35\% = [(48/136) \times 100]$$

The percent of districts meeting the State’s AYP objective for progress for the disability subgroup is **35%**.

3B. Calculation of Participation Rate of Reading and Mathematics:

B. Participation rate =

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

- a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;
- b. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100);
- c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = [(c) divided by (a)] times 100);
- d. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = [(d) divided by (a)] times 100); and
- e. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = [(e) divided by (a)] times 100).

Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above.

Overall Percent = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)].

Overall Reading Participation Percent = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)] X 100

% = [(b + c + d + e) / (a)] X 100

97.8% = [(4,068+12,253+0+1,027 / 17,737) X 100

Overall Math Participation Percent = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)] X 100

% = [(b + c + d + e) / (a)] X 100

97.6% = [(3,961+12,321+0+1,033)/17,737] x 100

3B. Explanation of Reading Participation Rate:

Statewide Assessment 2007-2008	Table 1. READING ASSESSMENT PARTICIPATION							TOTAL	
	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11	Count	Percent
a) Children with IEPs	2043	2309	2609	2662	2747	2727	2640	17737	
b) Children in Regular Assessment with no Accommodations	349	376	495	531	608	706	1003	4068	22.9%
c) IEPs in Regular Assessment with Accommodations	1518	1768	1906	1949	1973	1825	1314	12253	69.1%
d) IEPs in Alternate Assessment against Grade-Level Standards	State does not have alternate assessments that tests children against grade level standards.								
e) IEPs in Alternate Assessment against Alternate Standards	151	142	172	168	140	143	111	1027	5.8%
Overall (b+c+d+e)	2018	2286	2573	2648	2721	2674	2428	17348	97.8%
%	98.8%	99.0%	98.6%	99.5%	99.1%	98.1%	92.0%		

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Reading Participation: Account for any children included in a. but not included in b., c., d., or above:
a. -b.-c.-d.-e. = children in a. but not in b., c., d. or e.

$$17,737-4,068-12,253-0-1,027= 389$$

Of the **389** children with IEPs in the assessed grades who did not participate, **69** had medical exemptions and **320** were absent from school during the testing period.

3B. Explanation of Math Participation Rate:

Statewide Assessment 2007-2008	Table 2. MATH ASSESSMENT PARTICIPATION							TOTAL	
	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11	Count	Percent
a) Children with IEPs	2043	2309	2609	2662	2747	2727	2640	17737	
b) Children in Regular Assessment with no Accommodations	330	333	469	526	623	696	984	3961	22.3%
c) IEPs in Regular Assessment with Accommodations	1535	1804	1928	1946	1952	1828	1328	12321	69.5%
d) IEPs in Alternate Assessment against grade-Level Standards	State does not have alternate assessments that tests children against grade level standards.								
e) IEPs in Alternate Assessment against Alternate Standards	151	142	172	174	140	143	111	1033	5.8%
Overall (b+c+d+e)	2016	2279	2569	2646	2715	2667	2423	17315	97.6%
%	98.7%	98.7%	98.5%	99.4%	98.8%	97.8%	91.8%		

Math Participation: Account for any children included in a. but not included in b., c., d., or e., above:

a. -b.-c.-d.-e. = children in a. but not in b., c, d. or e.

$$17,737-3,961-12,321-0-1,033=422$$

Of the **422** children with IEPs in the assessed grades who did not participate, **85** had medical exemptions and **337** were absent from school during the testing period.

3C. Calculation of Proficiency Rate:

C. Proficiency rate =

- a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;
- b. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100);
- c. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations (percent = [(c) divided by (a)] times 100);

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

- d. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = [(d) divided by (a)] times 100); and
- e. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards (percent = [(e) divided by (a)] times 100).

Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above.

Overall Percent = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)].

Overall Reading Proficiency Percent = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)].

$$\% = [(b + c + d + e) / (a)] \times 100$$

$$31.9\% = [(1,787 + 3,172 + 0 + 696) / 17,737]$$

Overall Math Proficiency Percent = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)].

$$\% = [(b + c + d + e) / (a)] \times 100$$

$$26.9\% = [1,244 + 2,862 + 0 + 670] / (17,737)$$

3C. Explanation of Proficiency Rate

In the New Hampshire Assessment Program there are four achievement levels on the New England Common Program (NECAP) and the New Hampshire Alternate Assessment Program. These levels describe a student's proficiency on the content and skills taught in the previous grade.

NHDOE reported students who scored at levels 3 and 4 as proficient in the federal Annual IDEA Table 6 [Report of Participation and Performance of Students with Disabilities].

3C. Explanation of Calculation of Reading Proficiency:

Statewide Assessment 2007-2008	Table 3 READING ASSESSMENT (Proficiency)							TOTAL	
	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11	Count	Percent
a) Children with IEPs	2043	2309	2609	2662	2747	2727	2640	17737	
b) Children in Regular Assessment with no Accommodations	218	197	236	237	301	261	337	1787	10.1%
c) IEPs in Regular Assessment with Accommodations	472	499	511	552	542	340	256	3172	17.9%
d) IEPs in Alternate assessment against Grade-Level Standards	State does not have alternate assessments that tests children against grade level standards.								
e) IEPs in Alternate Assessment against Alternate Standards	113	98	125	129	82	94	55	696	3.9%
Overall (b+c+d+e)	803	794	872	918	925	695	648	5655	31.9%
%	39.3%	34.4%	33.4%	34.5%	33.7%	25.5%	24.5%		

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

OSEP measurement requires the NHDOE to account for any children included in a. but not included in b., c., d., or e., above: a.-b.-c.-d.-e.=children included in a but not in b, c, d, or e.

17,737-1,787-3,172-0-696= 12,082

Of the **12,082** children included in a. but not included in b., c., d., and e., **69** had medical exemptions, **320** were absent and **11,693** scored below proficient. None of these tests were invalidated as none of them had non-comparable accommodations.

3C. Explanation of Calculation of Math Proficiency:

Statewide Assessment 2007-2008	Table 4 MATH ASSESSMENT (Proficiency)							TOTAL	
	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11	Count	Percent
a) Children with IEPs	2043	2309	2609	2662	2747	2727	2640	17737	
b) Children in Regular Assessment with no Accommodations	192	167	212	210	211	194	58	1244	7.0%
c) IEPs in Regular Assessment with Accommodations	601	563	594	469	383	220	32	2862	16.1%
d) IEPs in Alternate Assessment against Grade-Level Standards	State does not have alternate assessments that tests children against grade level standards.								
e) IEPs in Alternate Assessment against Alternate Standards	113	101	119	120	85	85	47	670	3.8%
Overall (b+c+d+e)	906	831	925	799	679	499	137	4776	26.9%
%	44.3%	36.0%	35.5%	30.0%	24.7%	18.3%	5.2%		

OSEP measurement requires the NHDOE to account for any children included in a. but not included in b., c., d., or e., above: a.-b.-c.-d.-e.=children included in a but not in b, c, d, or e.

17,737-1,244-2,862-0-670=12,961

Of the **12,961** children included in a. but not included in b., c., d., or e., **85** had medical exemptions, and **337** were absent and **12,539** scored below proficient. None of these tests were invalidated as none of them had non-comparable accommodations.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007: July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008):

NH SPP Improvement Activity 1: Completed

The *Beyond Access for Assessment Accommodations* grant provided support to NH schools and IEP teams to determine appropriate use of accommodations to maximize the potential for students with

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

disabilities to access and progress in the general curriculum. This grant also helped NH schools and IEP teams explore the option of transitioning students from participating in the Alternate Assessment to the NECAP. To learn more about this go to <http://www.iod.unh.edu>.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 2: Completed

From October 2007 until June 30, 2008, New Hampshire partnered with Montana, Maine, Rhode Island and Vermont to work on the *Enhanced Assessment Grant* to study the assessment needs of high school students with disabilities regarding reading comprehension. The project activities involved the identification of students, test manipulations, and the development of items for the test manipulations. To learn more about this go to: <http://www.measuredprogress.com>

NH SPP Improvement Activity 3: Completed

The *General Supervision Enhancement Grant* (NH-GSEG): *Gaining Access to What Students with Cognitive Disabilities Know* was awarded for 2007-2010. From October 2007 until June 2008, the NHDOE worked on the results of initial studies of student characteristics and the grade level equivalent alignment (GLE) and refined the focus to support the compliance agreement under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act between the United State Department of Education and the New Hampshire Department of Education. The project analyses of the grade level equivalents; the content analysis of targeted skills and the final analysis of the findings can be found on the resource website for the GSEG projects:

<http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/curriculum/NHEIAP%20Alt%20Assessment/2007-2008%20Alt/AdditionalResourcesandLinks.htm>

NH SPP Improvement Activity 4: Completed

The NHDOE has adopted new administrative rules effective June 30, 2008. There was no need to revise the administrative rules regarding participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessment.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 5: Completed

The NHDOE Bureau of Accountability and Bureau of Special Education has provided ongoing professional development and technical assistance relative to the **participation rate** of students with disabilities on statewide assessments within the opportunities available in the following grant activities :

- o *Beyond Access for Assessment Accommodations project*
- o *Enhanced Assessment Grant*
- o *Gaining Access to What Students with Cognitive Disabilities Know project*

NH SPP Improvement Activity 6: Completed

The NHDOE Bureau of Accountability and Bureau of Special Education has provided ongoing professional development and technical assistance relative to **accommodations and modifications**, assisting schools, districts, and non-public special education programs as they align curriculum, instruction, and assessment to demanding content standards in mathematics and reading within the opportunities available in the following grant activities :

- o *Beyond Access for Assessment Accommodations project*
- o *Enhanced Assessment Grant*
- o *Gaining Access to What Students with Cognitive Disabilities Know project*

NH SPP Improvement Activity 7: Completed

In the spring of the 2007-2008 school year, the NHDOE applied for a grant from the USDOE to support the participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments to design an online option for students to participate in the New England Common Assessment Program entitled: *Examining the Feasibility, Effect and Capacity to Provide Universal Access Through Computer- Based Testing*. The NHDOE was awarded the grant in October 2008.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 8: Completed

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

The NHDOE supported a consultant to work directly through the Bureau of Accountability to provide technical support to school districts regarding the implementation of the NH-Alt assessment.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 9: Completed

The NHDOE continued to review and revise SPP targets to determine if they continue to be rigorous and measurable; and to strengthen improvement activities, timelines, and resources to ensure that they are effective for meeting the targets of the Annual Performance Report (APR) to be submitted February 1, 2009 and each year thereafter the NHDOE, with broad stakeholder input.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

3A. District AYP Target: The NHDOE did not meet the target of **44%** for 2007-2008.

State Actual Data: **35%** Target: **44 %**

NCLB requires that all students perform at proficient or above by the school year 2013-2014. Based on this requirement, the New Hampshire NCLB statewide performance targets (Annual Measurable Objectives or AMO) for meeting AYP have increased significantly from last year. As a result, many more districts did not meet AYP for all students and subgroups for 2007-2008. Many of the improvement activities for AYP are newly implemented and require time before effect can be measured. The NHDOE has improvement activities designed to specifically address AYP. The NHDOE continues to review these improvement activities and assess the effectiveness as implementation moves forward.

3B. Participation Rate Target: The NHDOE met the target of **96.18%** for 2007-2008.

State Actual Data for Reading Participation: **97.8%** Target: **96.18%**.

State Actual Data for Math Participation: **97.6%** Target: **96.18%**

3C. Proficiency Target:

Reading: The NHDOE did not meet the target of **48.23%** for 2007-2008.

State Actual Proficiency Rate for Reading: **31.9%** Target: **48.23%**

Math: The NHDOE did not meet the target of **56.89%** for 2007-2008.

State Actual Data Proficiency Rate for Mathematics: **26.9%** Target: **56.89%**

While the state did not meet the target for proficiency in reading, there was progress from last year, moving from 29.12% to 31.9% proficiency.

The state did not make progress in the area of math; however, it is important to note that the data from 2006-2007 represented NECAP assessment on grades 3 through 8 and the Alternate Assessment only. Therefore it is difficult to make comparisons across the years. The NHDOE has improvement activities designed to specifically support students with increasing proficiency in the statewide assessment. The NHDOE continues to review these improvement activities and assess the effectiveness as implementation moves forward.

The NH Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP required the NHDOE to respond to the following:

3B and 3C: "Based on the change in the timing of the administration of the grade 10 test, the State did not submit the required data for grade 10 and the State must provide the required data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009."

The NHDOE, Bureau of Special provided the required data in the FFY 2007 APR due February 1, 2009.

Attachment

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

The New Hampshire Federal Annual Report Table 6, *Report of the Participation and Performance of Students with Disabilities on State Assessments by Content Area, Grade, and Type of Assessment* has been included as an attachment in this indicator.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007

There were no revisions to the Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources in the State Performance Plan for this indicator.

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The development of the NH Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007 is described in the Overview section of the APR.

Technical Assistance

The NHDOE accessed the SPP/APR calendar on the RRFC website for guidance in developing this indicator. The NHDOE participated in the NERRC sponsored technical assistance call offering guidance on the development of this indicator.

The NHDOE sought technical assistance from NERRC (Northeast Regional Resource Center) through teleconferences to gain a better understanding of the components of this indicator. The NHDOE used the information in the teleconferences to develop the table in the improvement activity.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and
- ~~B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.~~

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.
- ~~B. Percent = [(# of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race ethnicity) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.~~

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2007-2008	<p>A. No more than 2.2% of school districts in New Hampshire (four districts) will suspend or expel a child with a disability in excess of 2% of each district's total population of children with disabilities for more than ten days.</p> <p>B. No more than 2.2% of school districts in New Hampshire (four districts) will suspend or expel a child with a disability from specific racial and ethnic groups in excess of the percentage represented by each group of the total identified students with disabilities in the school district.</p>

FFY 2004 – Baseline Year: 1.7% or 3 districts

FFY 2005 – First year of Data: 2.26% or 4 districts

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

FFY 2006 – Second year of Data: 0.62% or 1 district

FFY 2007 – Third year of Data: 4.32% or 7 districts

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (reporting period July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008):

Calculation

Percent = [(# of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year) divided by the (# of districts in the State) times 100.]

$$4.32\% = [(7/162)*100]$$

Explanation of Calculation

The NHDOE used the data reported in the federal Annual IDEA Data Report Table 5, Section A(3)(B): *Report of Children with Disabilities Unilaterally Removed or Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 days*. The NHDOE then compared these numbers of suspended or expelled students against the total number of students with IEPs in each district. In order to determine the total number of students with IEPs in each district, the NHDOE generated district data from NHSEIS. The NHDOE calculated the percent of children with disabilities in each district who were suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days. New Hampshire has 178 school *districts of residence*. Of these 178 school *districts of residence*, 162 school districts have schools. During 2007-2008, there were 162 school districts in which data was analyzed for suspension/expulsion.

1. Of the 162 school districts, there were 155 school districts (95.67%) that did not have a significant discrepancy in the suspension and expulsion of children with disabilities.
2. Of the remaining 7 (4.32%) school districts, all exceeded the 2% threshold for “significant discrepancy.”

Districts that exceeded the 2% threshold for “significant discrepancy” for suspension/expulsion			
	<i># students with IEPs suspended/expelled more than 10 days</i>	<i>Total # of students w/ IEPs</i>	<i>% students w/ IEPs</i>
District # 1	3	72	4.16%
District # 2	26	530	4.90%
District # 3	14	525	2.66%
District # 4	8	218	3.66%
District # 5	7	120	5.83%
District # 6	5	54	9.25%
District # 7	10	258	3.87%

Definition of “Significant Discrepancy” in rates of suspension and expulsion for greater than 10 days: After reviewing the data with stakeholders including the NH State Advisory Committee on the Education of Children/Students with Disabilities, the NHDOE determined that a “significant discrepancy” in New

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Hampshire is defined as any percentage of students with IEPs suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days in a school year that is greater than 2% of all students with IEPs in the district. Upon further review and consideration of the small enrollment number of NH districts, it was determined that a small cell size would not yield statistically relevant information and would be potentially revealing of personally identifiable information. Therefore, the NHDOE will use the same cell size as the State Assessment and will not include for analysis districts with fewer than 11 children with disabilities in a given category. In other words, districts with 10 or fewer children with IEPs will not be included in the analysis for 4A and districts with 10 or less children with IEPs by race/ethnicity category will not be included in the analysis for 4B.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

NH SPP Improvement Activity 1: Completed

The NHDOE, through a review of the data for 2007-2008, determined that 7 districts had a significant discrepancy in the rate of children with disabilities receiving suspension or expulsion in excess of 10 days.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 2 & 3: Completed

Data Year	# of Districts with Significant Discrepancies	# of Districts where review resulted in noncompliance	# of Districts where noncompliance was verified as corrected within one year	# of Districts where noncompliance was subsequently verified as corrected
FFY 2007 July 1, 2007- June 30, 2008	7	Review to be conducted and reported in the APR submission of 2/1/10	NA	NA
FFY 2006 July 1, 2006- June 30, 2007	6	1	0	0

Description of review of district policies, procedures and practices regarding suspension and expulsions for FFY 2006:

In accordance with New Hampshire Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table, The NHDOE took the following actions regarding the six (6) school districts that were identified in 2006-2007 school year as having a significant discrepancy, that is, suspensions and expulsions for more than ten days that exceeded 2% of each district's total population of children with disabilities.

1. On May 23, 2008, the Bureau sent a letter to each of the 6 districts requiring them to review, and if appropriate, revise policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), or similar positive behavioral student supports,

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

and a review of the procedural safeguards in place in the district as per 34 C.F.R. 300.170(b);

2. The NHDOE conducted follow up technical assistance calls with each of the districts within the next 2 weeks after the letters were sent. During these calls, the districts requested guidance regarding reporting requirements for suspension/expulsion data.
3. The NHDOE, with each of the districts, conducted an in-depth analysis of the districts' suspension and expulsion reporting practices. Based on this analysis it was determined that 5 of the 6 districts had misidentified some students in the category of suspensions/expulsions. Data issues included but are not limited to: after a suspension had ended, some students had absences from school which were reported as additional days of suspension; some students were suspended and then placed at an out-of-district placement or an interim alternative educational setting but reported as suspended for the entire period.
4. After completing the required review, each of the 5 districts with data issues provided evidence of appropriate policies, procedures and practices related to this indicator.
5. The one district that exceeded the threshold for significant discrepancy in suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days for the school year 2006-2007 was required to take the following steps to address the significant discrepancy:
 - Review, and revise as appropriate, local policies and procedures related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), or similar positive behavioral student supports, and a review of the procedural safeguards in place in the district as per 34 C.F.R. 300.170(b);
 - Review the suspension and expulsion policies and procedures of more than 10 days involving students with disabilities;
 - Consider expanding positive behavioral supports and intervention as alternatives to suspensions or expulsions for students with IEPs; and
 - Develop and assess activities intended to reduce suspension and expulsion of students with IEPs.

NH Improvement Activity Cluster

Improvement activities related to suspension and expulsion of students with disabilities in special education are interrelated with three other indicators in our State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Plan (APR) to include:

- Graduation Rates – Indicator 1
- Drop Out Rates – Indicator 2
- Transition Services Indicator 13

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

The NHDOE has not met the target of 2.2% for 2007-2008.

State Actual Data: 4.32% (7 of 162) districts Target of 2.2%

There is no clear evidence to explain slippage in this indicator. The NHDOE will prioritize this indicator for the next work plan with the Data Accountability Center (DAC) and the North East Regional Resource Center (NERRC).

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007

There were no revisions to the Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources in the State Performance Plan for this indicator.

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The development of the NH Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007 is described in the Overview section of the APR.

Technical Assistance

The NHDOE accessed the SPP/APR calendar on the RRFC website for guidance in developing this indicator.

The Data Accountability Center (DAC) provided technical assistance to the NHDOE regarding State data definitions for environments in comparison to federal definitions used for the annual federal report. As a result, the NHDOE provided FY 09 Memo # 6 *Educational Environments* in August of 2008.

(<http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/instruction/SpecialEd/Memos/documents/FY2009Memo6EducationalEnvironments.pdf>)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:

- A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;¹
- B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or
- C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs removed from regular class less than 21% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2007-2008	A. As demonstrated through data collected for the federal Annual IDEA Data Report, Table 3 for December 1, 76.5% of children with IEPs will be removed from regular class less than 21% of the day. B. As demonstrated through data collected for the federal Annual IDEA Data Report, Table 3 for December 1, 3.3% of children with IEPs will be removed from regular class

¹ At the time of the release of this package, revised forms for collection of 618 State reported data had not yet been approved. Indicators will be revised as needed to align with language in the 2005-2006 State reported data collections.

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

	<p>greater than 60% of the day.</p> <p>C. As demonstrated through data collected for the federal Annual IDEA Data Report, Table 3 for December 1, 4.3% of children with IEPs will be served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p>
--	---

Overview of FFY Data	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.
FFY 2004 – Baseline Year:	75.5%	3.3%	4.3%
FFY 2005 – First year of Data:	76.3%	3.2%	4.3%
FFY 2006 – Second year of Data:	65.03%	13.34%	4.00%
FFY 2007 – Third year of Data:	51.70%	22.62%	3.2%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (reporting period July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008):

Calculation

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs removed from regular class less than 21% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
 $51.70\% = [(13,520) / (26,149)] \text{ times } 100.$
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
 $22.62\% = [(5,916) / (26,149)] \text{ times } 100.$
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
 $3.2\% = [(837) / (26,149)] \text{ times } 100.$

Explanation of Calculation

In previous reporting periods, data reported in the federal Annual IDEA Data Report, *Table 1 Report of Children with Disabilities receiving Special Education under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* and *Table 3 Part Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Implementation of FAPE Requirements* were used for this indicator. For July 1, 2007-June 30, 2008, the NHDOE did not have the complete data from certain districts for Table 3 at the time of submission of the APR. The NHDOE continues to work with districts to comply with data submission for this federal table. The NHDOE will consider the timely submission of data for federal report requirements as a special factor that affects the districts determination in meeting the requirements of Part B of IDEA. The NHDOE has based the numbers for the calculation of this indicator on the data available in the statewide data system (NHSEIS): 26,149 children with IEPs ages 6-21 with placement data on 12/1/2007.

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

When OSEP developed the SPP/APR measurements for this indicator, data were reported based on percent of time a student was removed from regular class (i.e. removed from class less than 21% of the day). The NHDOE reported in the SPP/APR based on time removed from the regular class measurement. The federal tables have been revised and now require states to report based on amount of time the student is inside the regular class (i.e. inside the regular class greater than 80% of the day). The NHDOE reports in the federal tables based on the amount of time the student is in the regular class.

As in the past, the NHDOE has not included the non-duplicated counts for youth in correctional facilities and children parentally placed in private schools in the reported data for the APR.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

NH SPP Improvement Activity 1: Completed

The NHDOE has engaged in improvement activities which address the timely correction of noncompliance identified through monitoring (see Indicator 15).

NH SPP Improvement Activity 2: Completed

The NHDOE has analyzed the data on students who have been court ordered to public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placement.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 3: Completed

After the NHDOE analyzed the data and participated in the Court Improvement Project group sponsored through the NH Department of Justice, it was determined there was no need for next steps regarding the percentage of youths being court ordered to public or private separate schools, residential placements, homebound or hospital placements.

An outcome of the Court Improvement Activity Project is the development of protocols for judges to assist them in making informed decisions such as joinder, appointment of counsel, referral for evaluation, residential placement decisions and protocols regarding confidential juvenile records for students that have been identified as having disabilities or may have disabilities are involved with the court system.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 4: Completed

The NHDOE has engaged in multiple initiatives to support children and youth with IEPs age 6-21 being educated in the Least Restrictive Environment. Please see improvement activities in Indicators 1, 2, 4, 13, and 14.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 5: Completed

The NHDOE engaged the OSEP funded Data Accountability Center (DAC) and the Northeast Regional Resource Center (NERRC) in onsite, telephone and email technical assistance specific to this indicator. This resulted in a work plan which was submitted to the OSEP State Contact for NH. The work plan included the following components:

- Develop data system management routines that increase the likelihood of timely and accurate data submission (618) for 2007-08 and 2008-09 and production of 2006-2007 and 2008-09 public reporting, including documentation necessary for reporting to be valid, reliable, interpretable, and transparent.
- Refine the collection and correction of noncompliance data as it relates to reporting for this indicator.
- Develop a general supervision system that will track collection of initial monitoring data, follow up correction of noncompliance, and reporting for this indicator.

Consultants from the NHDOE also attended the DAC/OSEP sponsored accountability and leadership conference in August 2008 for additional technical assistance and resources.

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

5A. The NHDOE did not meet the target for 2007-2008 for part A of this Indicator.

State Actual Data: 51.70% Target: 76.5%

5B. The NHDOE did not meet the target for 2007-2008 for part B of this Indicator.

State Actual Data: 22.62% Target: 3.3%

5C. The NHDOE exceeded the target for 2007-2008 for part C of this Indicator.

State Actual Data: 3.2% Target: 4.3%

It is difficult to determine under 5A and 5B a specific cause for slippage in this Indicator. The NHDOE continues to implement improvement activities to support children with IEPs being educated in the Least Restrictive Environment.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007

There were no revisions to the Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources in the State Performance Plan for this indicator.

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The development of the NH Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007 is described in the Overview section of the APR.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 6: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of preschool children with IEPs who received special education services in settings with typically developing peers) divided by the (total # of preschool children with IEPs)] times 100.

According to OSEP, based on changes in 618 State-reported data collection, States do not need to report on Indicator 6 in the FFY 2006 APR due Feb 1, 2008 or in the FFY 2007 APR due February 1, 2009.

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The development of the NH Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007 is described in the Overview section of the APR.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):
 - a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
 - b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
 - c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
 - d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
 - e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):
 - a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
 - b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
 - c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets/Actual Target Data for FFY 2007

According to OSEP, this is a new indicator. As instructed by OSEP in the *Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) Indicator Support Grid* dated 11/9/07, baseline and targets will be established in the February 1, 2010 SPP. Therefore, there is no target or target data for this indicator in this reporting period (July 1, 2007-June 30, 2008).

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) requires improvement activities to be developed once baseline has been determined. Baseline will be determined in the February 1, 2010 SPP submission.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:

The NH State Performance Plan (SPP) (submission date February 1, 2009) has been revised pursuant to the OSEP requirements for Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes in the *Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) Indicator Support Grid* dated 11/9/07. The revised State Performance Plan (submission date 2/1/09) includes a description of how the state ensures that data are valid and reliable, improvement activities for remaining years of the SPP, and progress data on preschool outcomes.

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The development of the NH Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007 is described in the Overview section of the APR.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2007-2008	The percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities will be 77%.

This indicator has been revised in the February 1, 2009 State Performance Plan and is referenced here in the FFY 2007 APR. The content of this indicator has been revised to address *OSEP Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) Part B Indicator Measurement Table: Instructions for Indicators Measurement* of June 6, 2008 sent by OSEP to the NHDOE. The NHDOE has ensured that data submitted February 1, 2009 in the SPP are derived from census data through a method approved by OSEP.

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The development of the NH Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007 is described in the Overview section of the APR.

Technical Assistance

The NHDOE worked closely with Julie Bollmer Data Accountability Center DAC/WESTAT in the development of this indicator. Technical assistance included specific guidance regarding the appropriate use of the weighted and alternate risk ratio in analyzing NH student data. The NHDOE also utilized guidance from OSEP/Westat: http://www.nichcy.org/Laws/IDEA/Documents/Training_Curriculum/B-resources.pdf.

Additional technical assistance was obtained through *RRFC/SPP/APR Calendar*, including the resources: *Evidence sources to determine if disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification (5/29/08)* and *Questions and Answers on under-representation for Indicators 9 & 10: <http://www.rffcnetwork.org/nerrc>*

The NHDOE received technical assistance from the North East Regional Resource Center (NERRC) specific to this indicator through a teleconference and Power Point presentation that addressed OSEP expectations for disproportionality.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2007-2008	The percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification will be zero (0%).

FFY 2004 – Baseline not required by OSEP

FFY 2005 – Baseline Year: 0%

FFY 2006 – First Year of Data: 0%

FFY 2007 – Second Year of Data: 0%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (reporting period July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008):

Calculation

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification divided by the (#of districts in the state)] times 100.

$$0\% = [(0)/(177)] \times 100$$

Explanation of Calculation

The data analyzed is the same data reported to OSEP in the federal Annual IDEA Data Report IDEA Part B Child Count Table 1-16 Students ages 6 – 21 served under IDEA, Part B, by race/ethnicity and state: Fall 2007. <https://www.ideadata.org/PartBData.asp> All racial/ethnic groups (i.e., American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black, Hispanic, and White), as required by OSEP, were included in the analysis. A weighted risk ratio was used in analyzing district data based on a cell size of at least 40 students in the racial/ethnic group enrolled in the district and at least 10 in the comparison group. The comparison group is those students identified as receiving special education and related services. The cell size was selected to protect individually identifiable student information. The *OSEP/Westat technical guide: Methods for Assessing Racial/Ethnic Disproportionality in Special Education: A Technical Assistance Guide, July 2007* (<https://www.ideadata.org/TAMaterial.asp>) was used in developing this analysis. The NHDOE chose to use risk ratios and used the electronic spreadsheet developed by WESTAT that calculates both weighted and un-weighted risk ratios to determine state and district level data.

Of the 178 districts, only 12 districts met cell size criteria of at least 40 students in the racial/ethnic group enrolled in the district and at least 10 in the comparison group in the racial/ethnic group in special education. Of the 12 districts, none had over-representation (a weighted risk ratio above 3.00) for American Indian, Asian, Black, Hispanic, or White students or under representation (a weighted risk ratio below 0.33) for American Indian, Asian, Black, Hispanic, or White students. The NHDOE determined, for the school year 2007-2008, that no districts had disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic student groups in special education and related services.

Definition

The NHDOE has defined disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services as a weighted risk ratio above 3.00 for over-representation and a weighted risk ratio below 0.33 for under-representation.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

NH SPP Improvement Activity 1: Completed

There were no districts identified in 2007-2008 with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 2: N/A

There were no districts identified in 2007-2008 as having disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services. If there had been disproportionate representation, the NHDOE policy is to determine if this is based on inappropriate identification. Since there were no districts with a disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services, the NHDOE did not need to implement the policy regarding inappropriate identification.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 3: Completed

Technical assistance consultants were available to school districts upon request or as directed by the Bureau to assist with a review of policies, procedures, and practices of special education child find, referral, evaluation, and identification of students in all racial/ethnic groups to ensure equitable consideration for special education and related services.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 4: Completed

The NHDOE, through a variety of initiatives, promoted diversity and issues related to disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

inappropriate identification.

NH Improvement Activity Cluster

Improvement activities related to this indicator are interrelated with two other indicators in our State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Plan (APR) to include:

- Graduation Rates – Indicator 1
- Educational Environments – Indicator 5

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

The NHDOE met the target for 2007-2008.

State Actual Data: 0% Target: 0%

Timely Correction of Noncompliance identified in FFY 2006

For FFY 2006, there were no findings of noncompliance identified through the NHDOE analysis of disproportionate representation based on inappropriate identification in specific disability categories. In addition, there were no findings of noncompliance regarding disproportionate representation based on inappropriate identification in the 2006-2007 reporting period that were identified through the NHDOE General Supervision systems (monitoring, due process hearings, etc.).

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007

There were no revisions to the Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources in the State Performance Plan for this indicator.

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The development of the NH Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007 is described in the Overview section of the APR.

Technical Assistance

The NHDOE worked closely with Julie Bollmer Data Accountability Center DAC/WESTAT in the development of this indicator. Technical assistance included specific guidance regarding the appropriate use of the weighted and alternate risk ratio in analyzing NH student data. The NHDOE also utilized guidance from OSEP/Westat http://www.nichcy.org/Laws/IDEA/Documents/Training_Curriculum/B-resources.pdf.

Additional technical assistance was obtained through *RRFC/SPP/APR Calendar*, including the resources: *Evidence sources to determine if disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification (5/29/08)* and *Questions and Answers on under-representation for Indicators 9 & 10.* (<http://www.rffcnetwork.org/nerrc>).

The NHDOE received technical assistance from the North East Regional Resource Center (NERRC) specific to this indicator through a teleconference and Power Point presentation that addressed OSEP expectations for disproportionality.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2007-2008	The percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification will be zero (0%).

FFY 2004 – Baseline not required by OSEP

FFY 2005 – Baseline Year: 0%

FFY 2006 – First Year of Data: 0%

FFY 2007 – Second Year of Data: 0%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (reporting period July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008):

Calculation

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification divided by the (#of districts in the state)] times 100.

$$0\% = [(0) / (177)] \times 100$$

Explanation of Calculation

The data analyzed is the same data reported to OSEP based on the data reported in the federal Annual IDEA Data Report IDEA Part B Child Count Table 1-16 Students ages 6 – 21 served under IDEA, Part B, by race/ethnicity and state: Fall 2007. <https://www.ideadata.org/PartBData.asp>. All racial/ethnic groups (i.e., American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black, Hispanic, and White), as required by OSEP, were included in the analysis. A weighted risk ratio was used in analyzing district data based on a cell size of at least 40 students in the racial/ethnic group enrolled in the district and at least 10 in the comparison group(s). The comparison group is those students identified in specific disability categories (specific learning disability, mental retardation, autism, other health impaired, speech language impaired, and emotional disturbance). The cell size was selected to protect individually identifiable student information. The *OSEP/Westat technical guide: Methods for Assessing Racial/Ethnic Disproportionality in Special Education: A Technical Assistance Guide, July 2007* (<https://www.ideadata.org/TAMaterial.asp>) was used in developing this analysis. The NHDOE chose to use risk ratios and used the electronic spreadsheet developed by WESTAT that calculates both weighted and un-weighted risk ratios to determine state and district level data.

Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Of the 178 districts, only 12 districts met cell size criteria of at least 40 students in the racial/ethnic group enrolled in the district and at least 10 in the comparison group in the racial/ethnic group in specific disability categories. Of the 12 districts, three had disproportionate representation in specific disability categories.

District # 1: Under-representation of White students in the specific category of Mental Retardation (weighted risk ratio of 0.26)

District # 2: Over-representation of White students in the specific category of Other Health Impaired (weighted risk ratio of 3.04)

District # 3: Over-representation of White students in the specific category of Emotional Disturbance (weighted risk ratio of 7.22).

Determination of Inappropriate Identification

For the three districts that had disproportionate representation in specific disability categories, the NHDOE took the following actions to determine if the disproportionate representation in specific categories was the result of inappropriate identification:

- Notified the 3 districts in writing of the over or under representation in the specific categories;
- For both under and over representation, examined the districts policies, procedures, and practices of special education child find, referral, evaluation, and identification of students in all racial/ethnic groups to ensure equitable consideration for special education and related services, including:
 - The availability and use of intervention strategies prior to referral for special education evaluation;
 - The selection and use of evaluation instruments and materials;
 - The selection and use of evaluation criteria; and
 - The reasons for referral and evaluation for specific disability categories and evaluation.
- Required a written assurance from the district that special education policies and procedures related to this indicator were in compliance with NH Rules and IDEA;

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

- Offered a Technical Assistant Consultant to assist with district review and revision, as appropriate, the policies, practices and procedures;

The NHDOE has determined, based on this process, that none of the 3 districts had disproportionate representation in specific categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.

Definition

The NHDOE has defined disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services as a weighted risk ratio above 3.00 for over-representation and a weighted risk ratio below 0.33 for under-representation.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

NH SPP Improvement Activity 1: Completed

The NHDOE monitored the 3 districts that were identified as having disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories. Based on the examination of the districts, it was determined that none of the districts had disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories based on inappropriate identification.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 2: N/A

There were no districts identified in 2007-2008 as having disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification so there is no noncompliance.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 3: Completed

Technical assistance consultants were available to school districts upon request or as directed by the Bureau to assist with a review of policies, procedures, and practices of special education referral, evaluation, and identification of students in all racial/ethnic groups to ensure equitable consideration for special education and related services.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 4: Completed

The NHDOE, through a variety of initiatives, promoted diversity and issues related to disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

NH Improvement Activity Cluster

Improvement activities related to this indicator are interrelated with two other indicators in our State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Plan (APR) to include:

- Graduation Rates – Indicator 1
- Educational Environments – Indicator 5

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

The NHDOE met the target for 2007-2008.

State Actual Data: 0% Target: 0%

Timely Correction of Noncompliance identified in FFY 2006

For FFY 2006, there were no findings of noncompliance identified through the NHDOE analysis of disproportionate representation in specific disability categories based on inappropriate identification. In addition, there were no findings of noncompliance regarding disproportionate representation based on inappropriate identification in the 2006-2007 reporting period that were identified through the NHDOE General Supervision systems (monitoring, due process hearings, etc.).

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007

There were no revisions to the Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources in the State Performance Plan for this indicator.

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The development of the NH Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007 is described in the Overview section of the APR.

Technical Assistance

The NHDOE accessed the OSEP funded RRFC website for technical assistance regarding this indicator. Resources reviewed included: *Investigative Questions for Part B Indicator 11* and *Local Corrective Action Plans: Collection and Use of Valid and Reliable Data for Determining Factors Contributing to Noncompliance*. <http://spp-apr-calendar.rrfnetwork.org/>

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator 11: Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

<p>Measurement:</p> <p>a) # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.</p> <p>b) # determined not eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).</p> <p>c) # determined eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).</p> <p>Account for children included in a but not included in b or c. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.</p> <p>Percent = [(b + c) divided by (a)] times 100.</p>
--

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2007-2008	100% of children with parental consent to evaluate will be evaluated within the state established timelines.

FFY 2004 – Baseline not required by OSEP

FFY 2005 – Baseline Year: 81.1%

FFY 2006 – First Year of Data: 95%

FFY 2007 – Second Year of Data: 77%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (reporting period July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008):

Calculation

Percent = [(b + c) divided by (a)] times 100.

77% = [(45+ 3392) / (4,473)] x 100

Explanation of Calculation

The NHDOE has provided the following explanation for each component of the calculation:

- a) # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Parental consent to evaluate was received for 4,473 children between July 1, 2007 and June 30, 2008. This was for initial evaluations only.

b) # determined not eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).

45 children were determined NOT eligible for special education with evaluations completed within State established timeline.

c) # determined eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).

3,392 children were determined ELIGIBLE for special education with evaluations and eligibility determinations completed within State established timeline.

All New Hampshire School Districts are required to enter student information regarding referrals and initial evaluations for special education into the New Hampshire Special Education Information System (NHSEIS). These data in NHESIS on initial evaluations were then analyzed to determine district level compliance with this indicator.

Account for children included in a. but not included in b or c. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

a - b - c = # of children with initial evaluations completed beyond the timeline

$$(4,473 - 45 - 3,392) = 1,036$$

Of the 4,473 children for whom parental consent for initial evaluation was received, 1,036 children did not have eligibility determined within State established timelines. The 1,036 children are in 81 districts. Therefore, the NHDOE has made 81 findings of noncompliance related to this indicator.

The range of days beyond the timelines are in the table below for 973 students.

1-15 Days Beyond Timeline	16-30 Days Beyond Timeline	31-45 Days Beyond Timeline	46-60 Days Beyond Timeline	+60 days Beyond Timeline
315	181	108	58	311

In addition to the 973 students in the table above, there were 63 students with incomplete evaluation data. Therefore, these 63 students have not been included in the range of days beyond timeline. The NHDOE will investigate this during the corrective action of noncompliance phase.

Reasons for delays included statewide school closures, difficult travel, and power outages, caused by the snowiest winter in over 100 years. Also contributing to delays: a continuing critical shortage of available qualified examiners; a shortage of qualified medical and psychiatric personnel to diagnose autism, and a lack of comprehensive backup or contingency planning when difficulties in scheduling examinations and evaluation meetings occurred.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

NH SPP Improvement Activity 1: Completed

The NHDOE has completed the following actions during the 2007-2008 school year in order to assist school districts that were identified as having noncompliance related to this indicator in 2006-2007:

- For the February 1, 2008 APR the NHDOE determined that in 2006-2007 there were 219 children with parental consent for initial evaluation that did not have evaluations completed within State timelines. These children were in 58 school districts. Consistent with OSEP guidance, the NHDOE considers all incidences identified by a single process as one finding.

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Therefore this resulted in 58 findings of noncompliance. On June 10, 2008, letters were sent to all 58 school districts specific to their level of compliance with timeliness of initial evaluations for the school year 2006-2007.

- Districts identified at three levels of compliance (Level 1, 90-99%; Level II, 75-89%, and Level III, 0 – 74%) were required to submit Corrective Action Forms to the Bureau on or before July 15, 2008.
- Corrective action plans were reviewed and written assurances of specific actions taken at the local district level were reviewed by the NHDOE and verified for correction of noncompliance.
- Each district that was identified at Level 3 (0- 74% compliance) were contacted by phone and provided individual assistance and direction in addressing the issues of non-compliance regarding timeliness of initial evaluations.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

The NHDOE did not meet the target of 100% for 2007 -2008.

State Actual Data: 77% Target: 100%

The NHDOE will prioritize this indicator for the next work plan with the Data Accountability Center (DAC) and the Northeast Regional Resource Center (NERRC).

Timely correction of noncompliance

All findings of noncompliance identified in 2006-2007 relate to this indicator have been corrected as soon as possible but in no case longer than one year from identification.

Year of Findings	Total Findings of Noncompliance w/ Indicator 11	Findings verified as corrected within one year	Findings subsequently verified as corrected	Total Findings corrected as of submission	Findings of Noncompliance remaining
FFY 2007 July 1, 2007- June 30, 2008	81	To be reported in the FFY 2008 APR			
FFY 2006 July 1, 2006- June 30, 2007	58	58	0	58	0

Five of the five outstanding findings of noncompliance from FFY'05 have been subsequently corrected.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007

There were no revisions to the Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources in the State Performance Plan for this indicator.

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The development of the NH Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007 is described in the Overview section of the APR.

Stakeholder Input

The NHDOE met with parents, representatives of school districts and parent organizations for input on the effectiveness of improvement activities, specifically the activities of the Supporting Successful Early Transitions (SSECT).

Technical Assistance

The NHDOE accessed the OSEP funded RRFC website for technical assistance regarding this indicator. Resources reviewed included the *Early Childhood Part C and Part B Requirements Related to Transition, Transition Timeline Flow Chart, the OSEP Policy Letter to Mary Elder, Texas, Local Corrective Action Plans: Collection and Use of Valid and Reliable Data For Determining Factors Contributing To Noncompliance*, and the *Early Intervention to Early Childhood Tracking Form*.

The NHDOE and the SSECT project have benefited from technical assistance from the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC), the National Early Childhood Transition Center (NECTC), and the Data Accountability Center (DAC) specifically with:

- Tools to support districts with reviewing and revising, if appropriate, policies, procedures and practices to promote smooth transitions;
- Guidance for districts and early intervention providers to develop effective Interagency Agreements
- Systemic development of data systems to ensure accurate and timely data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.

Account for children included in a but not included in b, c or d. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a – b – d)] times 100.

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2007-2008	By June 30, 2008, 100% of NH children eligible for Part B Section 619 preschool special education who received Part C early intervention (ESS) will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday. Any noncompliance identified will result in targeted or intensive technical assistance to support improvement and will be corrected as soon as possible but no later than one year from the date of identification of the noncompliance.

FFY 2004 – Baseline Year: 58.96%

FFY 2005 – First year of Data: 88.26%

FFY 2006 – Second year of Data: 66%

FFY 2007 – Third year of Data: 92%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (reporting period July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008):

Calculation

Percent = [(c) divided by (a – b – d)] times 100.

$$92\% = [(553)/(741-84-56) * 100$$

Explanation of Calculation

Data for this indicator was provided to the NHDOE by districts through an Excel workbook. The NHDOE reviewed the data to ensure it was complete and accurate. Districts with data that required additional explanation were contacted. For example, if the IEP was reported as implemented prior to the child's date of birth or if additional justification was needed for delays.

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.

From July 1, 2007-June 30, 2008, there were 741 children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.

- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.

84 of those referred were determined to be NOT eligible prior to their third birthdays.

- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

553 of those found eligible had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.

There were 56 children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.

Account for children included in a. but not included in b, c or d. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the delays:

741-84-553-56= 48 children included in a. but not in b, c or d.

Range of Days Beyond Third Birthday	1-15 Days	16-30 Days	31-45 Days	46-60 Days	>60 days
# of children with delays	10	13	6	2	17

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Reasons for Delays included:

- Meeting too close to 3rd birthday (parent(s) needed more time to consider proposal)
- Transition information not timely
- Summer birthdays
- Personnel schedule conflicts
- Lack of coordination of staff
- Waiting for specific evaluations and shortage of specialists

Corrective actions for findings of noncompliance for July 1, 2007- June 30, 2008 require districts to further analyze reasons for delay and the range of days.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

NH SPP Improvement Activity 1: Completed

The Policy Manual, which was developed with NH Department of Health and Human Services (NHDHHS) and the NHDOE, has been used with ESS providers, families and school districts to support the transition process consistent with IDEA, federal Part B regulations, and NH laws/rules. The NHDOE and the lead agency for Part C (NH Department of Health and Human Services or NHDHHS) have been gathering input from stakeholders for revisions to the manual.

Effective June 30, 2008, the NH Rules for the Education of Children with Disabilities, ED 1105.04 included specific language for early transitions. Districts are required to have a written early transition process for children exiting early intervention which assures that any child who is potentially a child with a disability is evaluated and eligibility for special education is determined prior to the child's third birthday. If the child is determined to be a child with a disability eligible for special education and related services, the district must ensure that an IEP is developed and implemented on or before the child's third birthday. The transition process in Ed 1105.04(a) shall include a written interagency agreement between the LEA and the local area agencies.

From July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008 the NHDOE issues the following policy memos related to this indicator:

- FY 08 Memo #1: Process for reporting Data on Children Referred and Found Not Eligible for Special Education
<http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/instruction/SpecialEd/documents/documents/FY2008Memo1ProcessforReportingData.pdf>
- FY 08 Memo # 19: Issuing of SASID (State Assigned Student Identification) Numbers to Children Prior to Their Third Birthday
<http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/instruction/SpecialEd/documents/documents/FY2008Memo19SASIDNumbers.pdf>
- FY 08 Memo #32 Family-Centered Early Supports & Services (ESS) Notification to Local School Districts for Child Find
<http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/instruction/SpecialEd/documents/documents/FY08Memo32FamilyCenteredEarlySupportsESS.pdf>
- FY 08 Memo #36: Verification of Data for Children Referred from Family-Centered Early Supports & Services (ESS) (IDEA PART C) to Preschool Special Education (IDEA Part B)
<http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/instruction/SpecialEd/documents/documents/FY08Memo36VerificationDataESS.pdf>
- FY 08 Memo #37 Family-Centered Early Supports & Services (ESS) Notification to Local School Districts for Child Find: Update
<http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/instruction/SpecialEd/documents/documents/FY08Memo37ChildFindESS.pdf>

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

NH SPP Improvement Activity 2: Completed

Fall 2007-June 2008: districts involved in NHDOE monitoring process were reviewed for compliance with this indicator and other related requirements relative to early transitions. Any noncompliance identified will be corrected as soon as possible but no later than one year from the date of identification. Data on this has been included in Indicator 15.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 3: Completed

The NHDOE (619) and NHDHHS (Part C) continued to jointly fund the Supporting Successful Early Childhood Transitions (SSECT) project. SSECT universal supports were available to families, early intervention providers and preschool special educators through the website (<http://picnh.org/ssect>). SSECT staff provided technical assistance to parents, providers, and school personnel around transition requirements and quality practices. SSECT staff also provided ongoing feedback to the NHDOE regarding barriers and successes within local districts.

SSECT has provided intensive supports to assist with the development of regional Interagency Agreements between early intervention and preschool special education. As of the submission of the February 1, 2009 APR, SSECT has supported:

- The implementation of regional interagency agreements in 4 of the 10 regions in the state, including the review and revision of agreements as needed.
- The development of regional interagency agreements in 3 of the 10 regions in the state, including joint training between early intervention and preschool special education, intensive review of district policies and procedures, and collaborative problem-solving around systems issues with early intervention and districts. The agreement is then implemented as a trial and then reviewed and revised as needed prior to official signature by administrators. This includes a review to ensure the agreement is consistent with the NH Rules for the Education of Children with Disabilities, ED 1105.04.
- Preparation to begin the process with the remaining 3 regions with draft interagency agreements to be completed by spring 2009.
- SSECT has worked closely with the NHDOE to identify districts with ongoing barriers to smooth transitions. SSECT assisted districts with finding(s) of noncompliance in this area to develop corrective action plans.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

The NHDOE has made significant progress in this indicator, moving from 66% to 92% compliance. We believe this is due in large measure to the NH Rules requirement for districts to have a written transition process and to the success of the SSECT project.

The NHDOE did not meet the target for 2007-2008.

State Actual Data: 92% Target: 100%

Timely Correction of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2006

As stated in the *OSEP Timely Correction Memo 09-02*, child-specific noncompliance identified and subject to a specific timeline requirement cannot be corrected on a child basis. Since the development and implementation of IEPs for these children are subject to a specific timeline requirement there is no correction on a child basis.

On October 27, 2008, the NHDOE issued written findings of noncompliance to 27 districts based on the level of noncompliance. Corrective action was required within 60 days of the notice. These findings were issued in 2008-2009 and the NHDOE anticipates verification of correction within that year. Therefore the NHDOE will report on their correction in the FFY 2008 APR for July 1, 2008-June 30, 2009 in both Indicator 12 and Indicator 15.

- 3 Districts at Level I: 90%-99% compliance
- 9 Districts at Level II: 75%-89% compliance
- 15 Districts at level III: \geq 74%

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Explanation of Delay in Written Findings of Noncompliance

The NHDOE experienced challenges with generating complete and accurate data from the statewide data system for the February 1, 2008 submission of the FFY 2006 (July 1, 2006-June 30, 2007) data. The NHDOE received technical assistance from the OSEP funded Data Accountability Center for the development of data system routines that increase the likelihood of timely and accurate data submission and the production of public reporting, including documentation necessary for reporting to be valid, reliable, interpretable, and transparent. In addition, the NHDOE received guidance from OSEP at the August OSEP Leadership and National Accountability Conferences regarding the process for issuing findings of noncompliance.

In May 2008, based on the work with DAC, the NHDOE required all districts to manually submit complete and accurate 2006-2007 data for this indicator through an Excel workbook. In the summer of 2008 the NHDOE provided technical assistance to districts to ensure the quality of the data. This process was completed in late August 2008. The results are provided below:

July 1, 2006- June 30, 2007 Indicator 12 Data	Compliance	a. # referred	b. NOT eligible	c. IEP by third birthday	d. Parent Delay
August 2008: After technical assistance and data verification with districts 87%=423/(611-66-59)	87%	611	66	423	59
February 1, 2008 submission of FFY 2006 APR 66%=152/(257-26)*100	66%	257	26	152	unknown

Note regarding correction of noncompliance for July 1, 2007-June 30, 2008:

The NHDOE has implemented a more timely process for data verification, identification of noncompliance and verification of correction of noncompliance for the 2007-2008 data. As of the submission of the APR, the NHDOE has completed the data review process. Written findings of noncompliance for 2007-2008 will be issued no later than April 30, 2009 (within 3 months from the time of written notification to the district of the finding). Correction of noncompliance will be as soon as possible but in no case longer than one year from notification. The NHDOE will verify the correction within that timeframe.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007

There were no revisions to the Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources in the State Performance Plan for this indicator.

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The development of the NH Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007 is described in the Overview section of the APR.

Technical Assistance

The NHDOE sought technical assistance from NSTTAC (National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center) through teleconferences to gain a better understanding of the components of this indicator. The NHDOE used the information in the teleconferences to provide professional development to school districts to have a better understanding of secondary transitions.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 13: Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2007-2008	100% of youth aged 16 and above will have an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

FFY 2004 – Baseline not required by OSEP

FFY 2005 – Baseline Year: 75%

FFY 2006 – First Year of Data: 40%

FFY 2007 – Second Year of Data: 56%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (reporting period July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008):

Calculation

Percent = [(# of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

$56\% = 23/41 * 100$

Explanation of Calculation

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Files were selected for this indicator through the onsite monitoring process. Forty-one (41) files met the indicator's criteria of age 16 and above. Of the 41 files reviewed, 23 IEPs included coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that reasonably enabled the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

Improvement Activities Completed

NH SPP Improvement Activity 1: Completed

The NHDOE has continued to participate in the NH Transition Community of Practice (COP) Coordinating Group and activities of this group. The NH Transition COP 2007-2008 activities included the development and implementation of the Annual NH Secondary Transition Summit that was held April 3, 2008 with 179 participants, including students, parents, teachers, special education administrators, transition coordinators, vocational rehabilitation counselors, consultants, and employers. Other NH Transition COP activities included: Mentoring month job shadow activities, and the ongoing communication and posting resources via Sharedwork.org website.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 2: Completed

The NHDOE through the NH State Improvement Grant II funded two Regional Secondary Transition Centers (Transition Resource Network located in the Southeastern part of the state and Monadnock Center for Successful Transitions located in the Southwestern part of the state) to provide training and technical assistance to LEAs and other key project partners. This training included evidence-based secondary transition planning strategies and practices to increase the capacity of local communities to provide appropriate secondary transition services to students ages 14-21, with emphasis on students with disabilities. These two centers provided Transition Outcomes Projects (TOPS) training and technical assistance to five LEAs. The TOPS program is an extensive ongoing training around transition requirements including how to write measurable post-secondary goals, how to conduct appropriate transition assessments, development and implementation of coordinated transition services that lead to improved successful post-secondary outcomes.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 3: Completed

The NHDOE used our Technical Assistance Consultants to provide technical assistance and training from July 1, 2007- June 30, 2008. This technical assistance related to transition was provided to seven LEAs and two private special education programs upon request or as directed by the state. There were five trainings on transition planning, four on writing measurable goals and objectives or assisting the LEAs with their policies and procedures related to transition services. Seven out of the nine trainings provided were ongoing consisting of between two to six sessions over a period of up to six months to ensure changes in practice.

The NHDOE, Bureau of Special Education and the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation both had active membership in the NH Transition COP. As indicated above this COP developed the Annual NH Secondary Transition Summit held April 3, 2008, which included transition trainings to students, parents, and school district personnel who attended.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 4: Completed

Additionally, the NHDOE has availed itself of the technical assistance offered by the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC) to guide the DOE work. New Hampshire did send a team to the NSTTAC Secondary Transition State Planning Institute in Charlotte, NC in May 2008 which included representation from The New Hampshire Department of Education, Transition Resource Network at Strafford Learning Center, NH Vocational Rehabilitation, Monadnock Center for Successful Transitions, Alvirne High School, and LinkAbilities. This technical assistance provided additional resources that helped professionals working in the field to have a better understanding of this indicator. Evaluations of this technical assistance reflected that participants believed that they had a clearer understanding of coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that reasonably enabled the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

NH SPP Improvement Activity 5: Completed

The NHDOE has explored alternative methods for obtaining the transition data rather than through the program approval/monitoring process. The NH NSTTAC state planning team did explore alternative ways to address these issues. The NHDOE consulted with national technical assistance consultants to start exploring other ways in which to obtain this data so that a greater number of records may be reviewed.

NH Improvement Activity Cluster

Improvement activities related to transition of high school aged students with disabilities in special education are interrelated with three other indicators in our State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Plan (APR) to include:

- Graduation Rates – Indicator 1
- Drop Out Rates – Indicator 2
- Post School Outcomes – Indicator 14

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

The NHDOE did not meet the target of 100% for 2007-2008.

State Actual Data: 56% Target: 100%

New Hampshire made progress from FFY 2006 from 40% to 56%, however the target of 100% was not met. Many activities for this indicator are newly implemented and require time before effect can be measured. The NHDOE continues to review the improvement activities and assess the effectiveness as implementation moves forward.

The NHDOE recognizes a small number of files were included in this review process. In addition, due to changes in the monitoring process (from cyclical to focused monitoring), all districts will not necessarily be monitored during the SPP. Therefore, the NHDOE continues to explore options to ensure a larger number of IEPs and all districts by 2010-2011 are monitored for this indicator.

Timely Correction of Noncompliance identified in FFY 2006

In the 2006-2007 reporting period, the NHDOE identified 18 IEPs through the onsite monitoring process in noncompliance for this indicator. Sixteen of the 18 issues were corrected as soon as possible but in no case longer than one year. Of the two remaining issues, which were both systemic, one has subsequently been corrected. The NHDOE continues to take enforcement action, including monitoring and mandatory technical assistance, for the one remaining district that did not meet the timeline.

$$94\% = 17/18 * 100$$

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007

There were no revisions to the Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources in the State Performance Plan for this indicator.

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The development of the NH Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007 is described in the Overview section of the APR.

Stakeholder Input

The NHDOE sought input and shared data with the New Hampshire Transition Community of Practice Coordinating Group regarding Indicator 14.

Technical Assistance

The NHDOE sought technical assistance from the National Post School Outcomes Center through teleconferences and the website. The NHDOE also received support from DAC and NERRC. The TA included specific strategies for data collection and improvement activities for professional development, increasing response rate, improving outcomes and public reporting. The NHDOE reviewed resources on the NPSO Center website, including the *Indicator 14 SEA Timeline with NPSO Resources* chart and used the *NPSO Part B Indicator 14 APR Writing Suggestions and Examples* in the development of the indicator.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 14: Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of youth assessed who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2007-2008	87% of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.

Overview of FFY Data:

FFY 2004 – Baseline not required by OSEP

FFY 2005 – Baseline not required by OSEP

FFY 2006 – Baseline Year: 87%

FFY 2007 – First Year of Data: 91%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (reporting period July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008):

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Calculation

Percent = [(# of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of youth assessed who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school)] times 100.

$$91\% = [(302)/(331)] * 100$$

Explanation of Calculation

The following process was used to determine the post school outcome results:

First, we added the number of youth who were competitively employed only to those enrolled in postsecondary school/training only and those with both. Definitions for competitively employed and enrolled in postsecondary school/training are in the NH State Performance Plan.

$$\begin{aligned} &121 \text{ Competitively employed only} \\ &+ 26 \text{ Enrolled in postsecondary school/training only} \\ &\underline{+155} \text{ Both competitively employed and enrolled in postsecondary education/training} \\ &= 302 \end{aligned}$$

Then we divided that number by the total respondents to the survey (331).

Response Rate

Response Rate = Total # of Respondents to the Survey divided by Total # of Leavers.

Total # of Leavers (exitors): # of youth (ages 16-21) who had IEPs and exited during the 2006-2007 school year for the following reasons: graduated with a high school diploma, received a certificate, reached maximum age, or dropped out. = 2360

Total # of Respondents to the Survey (assessed) = 331

$$331/2360 = 14\% \text{ Response Rate}$$

By the survey return deadline date of July 31, 2008, the NH DOE received 331 completed surveys from the 2360 youth sent surveys. This was a 14% response rate.

302 of the 331 youth (91%) indicated that they were competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.

The NHDOE was notified that 26 surveys were returned because they were undeliverable by the US Post Office. That small number does not impact the response rate.

The following table provides an analysis of the *response rate returned* according to specific demographic categories such as specific disabilities, gender, and other categories. Based on the National Post School Outcomes Center Response Calculator, the NHDOE divided the number of leavers in a specific demographic category by the number of leavers in that demographic who responded to the survey. In other word, if there were 1183 leavers in the demographic category of Learning Disability and 166 of these youth responded, the NHDOE divided $166/1183*100=14.03\%$.

Response Rate by Demographic	Target Leaver Totals	Response Totals	Response Rate By Demographic
Overall	2360	331	14.03%
Learning Disabilities (LD)	1183	166	14.03%
Emotional Disturbance (ED)	358	35	9.78%
MR Mental Retardation (MR)	113	24	21.24%
All Other disability categories (AO)	706	106	15.01%
Female	826	129	15.62%
Male	1534	202	13.17%

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Minority (MIN)	59	7	11.86%
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	6	0	0.00%
Dropped Out of School (DOS)	526	33	6.27%

Representativeness

The NHDOE used the National Post School Outcomes Center Response Calculator for calculations reported in the table below. *Target Leaver Representation* is the percentage all Leavers (exiters) within each Targeted demographics category. *Respondent Representation* is the percentage of surveys returned from all Targeted demographic categories. *Difference* is the difference between the representation of each Targeted group within all Leavers and among all returned surveys.

	Over -all	LD	ED	MR	AO	Female	Male	MIN	LEP	DOS
Target Leaver Totals	2360	1183	358	113	706	826	1534	59	6	526
Response Totals	331	166	35	24	106	129	202	7	0	33
Target Leaver Representation		50.13%	15.17%	4.79%	29.92%	35.00%	65.00%	2.50%	0.25%	22.29%
Respondent Representation		50.15%	10.57%	7.25%	32.02%	38.97%	61.03%	2.11%	0.00%	9.97%
Difference		0.02%	-4.60%	2.46%	2.11%	3.97%	-3.97%	-0.39%	-0.25%	-12.32%

LD, Minority, and Limited English Proficient (LEP) responded to the survey at a rate consistent with their representation in the Total Leaver Group based on the calculations the following was identified:

- Females were slightly over represented in the sample.
- Males were slightly under represented in the sample.
- ED was slightly under represented in the sample.
- Dropout was significantly under represented in the sample.

The National Post School Outcomes Center (NPSO) considers Differences greater than +/- 3% to be indicators of over or under representation. These are indicated by shading in the chart above.

- The NHDOE will not be specifically addressing the differences of greater than +/- 3% found for ED, Males and Dropout identified for this 2007-2008 year. The NHDOE is cautious to interpret and/or use these results given our low survey response rate during this second year of post school outcomes data collection.
- A goal for the future will be to obtain a more consistent response rate among all demographic groups of Leavers by:
 - Identifying possible reasons for higher or lower response rates.
 - Identifying strategy to assure stronger engagement, where needed.
 - Identifying strategies to assure consistent rate of responding by all groups.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

NH SPP Improvement Activities (Data Collection and Systems Administration)

NH SPP Improvement Activity 1: Completed

The NHDOE provided a policy and procedures memo, FY 08 Memo # 12 to the field clarifying the definitions of exiting student categories to be used in the New Hampshire Special Education Information Systems (NHSEIS).

<http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/instruction/SpecialEd/documents/documents/FY08Memo12ExitingSpecificInstructionsMemo.pdf>

The NHDOE provided policy and procedure memos, FY 08 Memo #33 and FY 08 Memo #42 to the field relative to the post-school outcomes collection, verification and reporting requirement system.

<http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/instruction/SpecialEd/documents/documents/FY08Memo33VerificationofExitingStudentData.pdf>

<http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/instruction/SpecialEd/documents/documents/FY08Memo42PostSchoolOutcomesSurvey.pdf>

NH SPP Improvement Activity 2: Completed

The NHDOE participated in National Post School Outcomes Survey (NPOS) Technical Assistance Center monthly technical assistance calls and contacted Jane Falls from NPOS for technical assistance on indicator measurement calculations, target setting, and in particular strategies for improving our survey response rates.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 3: Completed

The NHDOE reviewed our post school outcomes data collection process and made adjustments to our verification of data and provided clarification on exit reasons to increase our survey response rate and/or improve the post school outcomes results. We were able to maintain our response rate of 14%. We also were able to provide dropout and ELL data this year because of improvements in our data collection process.

NH SPP Improvement Activities (Post School Outcomes)

NH SPP Improvement Activity 4: Completed

The NHDOE through the NH State Improvement Grant II funded two Regional Secondary Transition Centers (Transition Resource Network located in the Southeastern part of the state and Monadnock Center for Successful Transitions located in the Southwestern part of the state) to provide training and technical assistance to LEAs and other key project partners. This training included evidence-based secondary transition planning strategies and practices to increase the capacity of local communities to provide appropriate secondary transition services to students ages 14-21, with emphasis on students with disabilities. The training and technical assistance provided by these two centers included:

- Transition Outcomes Projects (TOPS) training and technical to five LEAs. The TOPS program is an extensive ongoing training around transition requirements including how to write measurable post-secondary goals, how to conduct appropriate transition assessments, development and implementation of coordinated transition services that lead to improved successful post-secondary outcomes.
- Sixty (60) Work-based and project-based learning experiences that supported youth development and built youth leadership skills.
- Collaboration with community agencies to provide training to approximately 400 graduating youth in work related skills that were then put into practice at three organized Job Fairs held in their regions in which 73 employers participated.
- Collaboration with our state Parent Training Information center (PTI) to provide 10 transition planning workshops for 73 parents, students and families in their regions, and they provided other transition related workshops statewide on topics such as labor laws and benefits to over 200 participants.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 5: Completed

The NHDOE used our Technical Assistance Consultants to provide technical assistance and training from July 1, 2007- June 30, 2008. This technical assistance related to transition was provided to seven LEAs and two private special education programs upon request or as directed by the state. There were five trainings on transition planning, four on writing measurable goals and objectives or assisting the LEAs with their policies and procedures related to transition services. Seven out of the nine trainings provided

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

were ongoing consisting of between two to six sessions over a period of up to six months to ensure changes in practice.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 6: Not Completed

The NHDOE Technical Assistance Consultants shall provide trainings to educators in each of the 5 regions of the state in the Spring to explain the post school outcomes collection requirements, process and data and provide strategies for increasing student awareness and participation in the post school outcomes survey. This activity was not provided in the Spring as planned due to schools unavailability to schedule trainings due to many snow days in the Winter of 2007-2008. The NHDOE plans to provide these trainings in the 2008-2009 school year.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 7: Completed

The NHDOE has continued to participate in NH Transition Community of Practice (COP) Coordinating Group and activities of this group. The NH Transition COP 2007-2008 activities included the development and implementation of the Annual NH Secondary Transition Summit that was held April 3, 2008 with 179 participants, including students, parents, teachers, special education administrators, transition coordinators, vocational rehabilitation counselors, consultants, and employers. Other NH Transition COP activities included: Mentoring month job shadow activities, and the ongoing communication and posting resources via Sharedwork.org website.

NH Improvement Activity Cluster

Improvement activities related to post school outcomes of students with disabilities in special education are interrelated with three other indicators in our State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Plan (APR) to include:

- Graduation Rates – Indicator 1
- Drop Out Rates – Indicator 2
- Transition Services Indicator 13

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

The NHDOE exceeded the target of 87% for 2007-2008.

State Actual Data: 91% Target: 87%

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007

There were no revisions to the Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources in the State Performance Plan for this indicator.

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The development of the NH Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007 is described in the Overview section of the APR.

Technical Assistance

The NHDOE would like to acknowledge the work completed in response to the June 6, 2008 OSEP letter regarding NH's determination of need assistance for two consecutive years. NHDOE has been advised of the available sources of technical assistance to address Indicator 15. The NHDOE has been working with the Data Accountability Center (DAC) through the development of the FFY 2007 APR. As a result of this technical assistance the NHDOE developed a work plan with both DAC and NERRC with two areas of priorities 1) Ensure the quality of the data reported in the SPP/APR submission of February 1, 2009 and 2) Review requirements for reporting local program performance to the public to ensure NH is able to produce reports for Spring 2008 (data from 2006-2007) that are of high quality. A copy of this work plan has been submitted to our OSEP contact person. The activities in the work plan have given the NHDOE an opportunity to analyze our data management routines and data definitions to ensure valid, accurate and timelines of data submission. In the reporting of this indicator, NHDOE has made significant progress in the correction of non-compliance within one year.

The NHDOE also sought technical assistance from NERRC (Northeast Regional Resource Center) through teleconferences to gain a better understanding of the components of this indicator. The NHDOE used the information in the teleconferences to provide professional development to school districts. The NHDOE used the Part B Indicator 15 Self-Calculating Worksheet for the development of this indicator found on the RRFC website. The NHDOE also benefited from a NERRC teleconference for guidance on the *Indicator 15 worksheet and the Indicator 15 Correction of Previous Noncompliance worksheet*.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and enforcement actions that the State has taken.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2007-2008	100% of issues of noncompliance will be corrected as soon as possible but no later than one year from the date of identification of the noncompliance.

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

FFY 2004 – Baseline Year: 83%

FFY 2005 – First year of Data: 72%

FFY 2006 – Second year of Data: 72%

FFY 2007 – Third year of Data: 91%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (reporting period July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008):

Calculation

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.
- Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.
- a. 170 findings of noncompliance were identified in 2006-2007.
- b. 155 corrections were completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification in 2007-2008.

$$91\% = (155/170) * 100$$

Explanation of Calculation

Ninety-one percent (91% or 155 out of 170) of findings of noncompliance identified in 2006-2007 were corrected as soon as possible but no later than one year from the date of identification of the noncompliance. Ten of the fifteen remaining findings of noncompliance were corrected prior to the February 1, 2009 submission. The five remaining findings were in 4 districts. The NHDOE is taking the following enforcement actions with these districts: In order to ensure correction of the remaining findings as soon as possible, the NHDOE will consider redirection of funds if the issues are not corrected by the grant period (July 1, 2009). Prior to that time, the NHDOE will continue to do regular monitoring of these districts, require additional corrective action to identify the root cause(s) of the issue(s) and strategies for correction, and require mandatory technical assistance.

The NHDOE has disaggregated by APR indicator the status of timely correction of noncompliance findings identified by the NHDOE during FFY 2006 (see Part B Indicator 15 worksheet below). In responding to the compliance indicators (Indicators 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13) the State has specifically identified and addressed the noncompliance identified in this table in each of those indicators. This includes findings of noncompliance for local education agencies.

PART B INDICATOR 15 WORKSHEET

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification	# of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was subsequently verified	# of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction has not been verified
1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. 2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other					

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification	# of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was subsequently verified	# of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction has not been verified
14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	1	1	1		
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	2	2	2		
7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrated improved outcomes.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings					
4A. Percent of districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other					
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings					
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 - educational placements.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	3	3	3		
6. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 - early childhood placement.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	2	2	2		
8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	1	1	1		
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	1	1	1		

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification	# of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was subsequently verified	# of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction has not been verified
10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other					
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings					
11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	60	68	64	4	
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	1	1	1		
12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	4	4	4		
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings					
13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable student to meet the post-secondary goals.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	18	18	16		1
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings					
Other areas of noncompliance: IEP Measurable Goals- Findings based on IEPs that did not contain measurable annual goals	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	13	13	9	2	2
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings					

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification	# of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was subsequently verified	# of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction has not been verified
Other areas of noncompliance: IEP Process- Findings in IEP process such as meeting notices, IEP team composition, Written Prior Notice	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	11	16	14	1	1
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	11	27	27		
Service Provision- Findings in the failure to provide special education or related services as detailed in the IEP						
Other areas of noncompliance: Certification/Personnel Standards- Findings of personnel who were not appropriately certified or meeting the appropriate personnel standards.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	7	11	8	3	
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	2	2	2		
Administration/Programs- Findings in the administration of special education programs or in the policy and procedure of programs.						
Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b			170	155		
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100.			(b) / (a) X 100 =	155/170* 100= 91%		

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

NH SPP Improvement Activity 1: Completed

The NHDOE engaged the OSEP funded Data Accountability Center (DAC) and the Northeast Regional Resource Center in onsite, telephone and email technical assistance specific to this indicator. This resulted in a work plan which was submitted to the OSEP State Contact for NH. The work plan included the following components:

- Develop data system management routines that increase the likelihood of timely and accurate data submission (618) for 2007-08 and 2008-09 and production of 2006-2007 and 2008-09 public reporting, including documentation necessary for reporting to be valid, reliable, interpretable, and transparent.
- Refine the collection and correction of noncompliance data as it relates to reporting for this indicator.
- Develop a general supervision system that will track collection of initial monitoring data, follow up correction of noncompliance, and reporting for this indicator.

Consultants from the NHDOE also attended the DAC/OSEP sponsored accountability and leadership conference in August 2008 for additional technical assistance and resources.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 2: Completed

The NHDOE has revised the data collection process for onsite monitoring including: new forms and technical assistance to the onsite team regarding data collection. The NHDOE continues to review their processes and make improvements as necessary. The NHDOE has also used feedback from districts to help improve this process.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 3: Completed

The on-site monitoring team implemented a regular status review of districts that were coming up to a year of identification of noncompliance. The team made efforts to connect with the districts at least a few months before the end of the one year to ensure that correction has occurred. If districts were out of compliance beyond a year, the NHDOE continued to take measures to ensure that correction was completed as soon as possible.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 4: Completed

The NHDOE worked actively with programs that had issues of noncompliance that extended beyond one year. They were given the opportunity to receive additional technical assistance offered at no cost to the districts provided by the Technical Assistant Consultants or TAC's. The NHDOE implemented several different forms of enforcement including letters from the Commissioner indicating that funds could be in jeopardy, and meetings with the Superintendent or Department Head to discuss the remaining findings. The NHDOE continues to offer trainings to assist districts. Trainings have been offered giving guidance in areas such as the NH Rules of Children with Disabilities, Focused Monitoring, new special education director's trainings, special education directors training, and special education for the general educator.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 5: Completed

Districts that are part of the Focused Monitoring process have received financial grants to assist in their efforts for improvement. They were given \$10,000 at the start of the process in year one, and were given an additional \$10,000 at the start of their year for implementing their improvement plan. This grant assisted them with things such as professional development and costs associated with the improvement process.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

The NHDOE did not meet the target of 100% for 2007-2008.

State Actual Data: 91% Target: 100%

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

The data show that the NHDOE has made progress in this indicator, moving from 72% to 91% compliance.

Timely Correction of Noncompliance

The NHDOE has provided the following table and explanation of the correction of noncompliance.

Indicator 15 Correction of Previous Noncompliance Worksheet				
Year of Identification Findings of Noncompliance	<i># of LEAS w/Remaining Noncompliance</i> FFY 2006 APR Submission of February 1, 2008	<i># of Findings Remaining Uncorrected</i> as of FFY 2006 APR Submission of February 1, 2008	<i># of Remaining Findings Verified</i> as Corrected as of the FFY 2007 APR submission of February 1, 2009	# of Findings Remaining Uncorrected
FFY 2005 July 1, 2005- June 30, 2006	7	10	7	3 findings from two LEAs

In the APR submitted in February 2008, there were 10 issues of noncompliance found in 2005-2006 that were not corrected within the required timelines. Seven of these issues have been subsequently corrected. The remaining 3 findings of noncompliance are from 2 districts. The issues are reflective of systems issues within the programs and require significant changes to correct. The NHDOE had approved corrective action plans with timelines for each of the programs.

The NHDOE has also taken the following enforcement actions with the 2 local school districts that continued to have the 3 findings of noncompliance:

- Onsite visits for technical assistance specific to these findings;
- Onsite compliance verification visits;
- Review of implementation of corrective action for progress or lack of progress.

In order to ensure correction of the remaining findings as soon as possible, the NHDOE will consider redirection of funds if the issues are not corrected by the next grant period (July 1, 2009). Prior to that time, the NHDOE will continue to do regular monitoring of these districts, require additional corrective action to identify the root cause(s) of the issue(s) and strategies for correction, and require mandatory technical assistance.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007

The NHDOE has revised the improvement activities in order to ensure compliance with this indicator. The revised improvement activities are in the SPP submitted on February 1, 2009.

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The development of the NH Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007 is described in the Overview section of the APR.

Technical Assistance

The NHDOE has accessed the CADRE Technical Assistance Center for support for this indicator. This technical assistance included the CADRE Part B Table 7 Error Checker for the development of Table 7.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 16: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2007-2008	NHDOE will maintain 100% compliance with the 60 day time limit, or a 60 day time limit extended only for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

FFY 2004 – Baseline year: 100%

FFY 2005 – First year data: 100%

FFY 2006 - Second year of data: 100%

FFY 2007 – Third year of data: 100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (reporting period July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008):

Calculation

Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

100% = [(14 + 21) divided by 35] times 100.

Explanation of Calculation

The Bureau of Special Education gathered the number of complaints for the time period of July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008. The Bureau of Special Education identified 14 complaints with reports issued within the timeline and 21 complaints with reports issued within extended timelines. There was a total of 35 complaints with reports issued.

Data for this indicator are provided in the attached federal annual Table 7, *Report of Resolution Under Part B, of The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 2007 – 08*.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

NH SPP Improvement Activity 1: Completed

The NHDOE reviewed the complaint investigators rosters and determined that the NHDOE Special Education Complaint Investigators have not had more than 3 active complaints under investigation at any given time.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 2: Not Completed

NHDOE Special Education Complaint Investigators were not able to complete 100% of active investigations within 35 days of their receipt of the complaint documentation. The NHDOE's policy is that all investigators will complete their investigations within 35 days unless exceptional circumstances exist. The Department will provide professional development to all investigators in FY 09. The department will modify its policies and procedures to reassign any complaint that has not been timely completed.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 3: Completed

The complaint officer for NHDOE has provided ongoing monitoring and evaluation of NHDOE Special Education Complaint Investigators, including the utilization (effective September, 2004) of a data-based system to track the time to complete investigations. The NHDOE will develop a written evaluation to include adherence to timelines, accuracy, quality and clarity of written reports and adherence to consistency of NH's special education administrative rules for complaint investigators.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 4: Completed

All complaints were processed and resolved within the timeline or timeline with exceptional circumstances for particular complaints.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 5: Completed

The NHDOE has posted on the NHDOE's website a summary of the previous fiscal years complaint findings.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

The NHDOE met the target of 100% for 2007-2008.

State Actual Data: 100% Target: 100%

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008:

There were no revisions to the Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines Resources in the State Performance Plan for this indicator.

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The development of the NH Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007 is described in the Overview section of the APR.

Technical Assistance

The NHDOE has accessed the CADRE Technical Assistance Center for support for this indicator. This technical assistance included the CADRE Part B Table 7 Error Checker for the development of Table 7.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 17: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2007-2008	100% of fully adjudicated hearings will be completed within 45 days or the 45 day timeline with proper extensions granted.

FFY 2004 – Baseline year: 79%

FFY 2005 – First year of data: 100%

FFY 2006 – Second year of data: 100%

FFY 2007 – Third year of data: 100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (reporting period July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008):

Calculation

Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100

100% = [(12+4)/16]*100

Explanation of Calculation

The Office of Legislation and Hearings provided the number of due hearings fully adjudicated for the time period of July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008. The Office of Legislation and Hearings identified that 100% (16 out of 16) of the fully adjudicated hearings were completed within the 45 day timeline or the 45 day timeline with extensions granted to a date certain. Of the 16 full adjudicated hearings, 12 were completed within the 45 day timeline and 4 were completed within the extended timeline.

Data for this indicator are provided in the attached federal annual Table 7, *Report of Resolution Under Part B, of The Individuals With Disabilities Education Act 2007 - 08*

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

NH SPP Improvement Activity 1: Completed

The NHDOE internal committee has assessed the effectiveness of the training which the NHDOE provides to the hearing officers. The trainings for 2007-2008 include changes to IDEA 2004 and subsequent case law and NHDOE administrative procedures for hearings and hearing officers' responsibilities.

The NHDOE staff and hearing officers participated in the 16th Annual Education Law Conference which included sessions specific to dispute resolution.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 2: Completed

The NHDOE conducts ongoing evaluations of the hearing officers' performance regarding compliance with timelines and process.

The NHDOE has published a *Users' Guide to Administrative Process* to assist the field in understanding the administrative process for dispute resolution.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

The New Hampshire Department of Education has met the target by achieving 100% for 2007 – 2008.

State Actual Data: 100% Target: 100%

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:

There were no revisions to the Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines in the State Performance Plan for this Indicator.

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The development of the NH Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY is described in the Overview section of the APR.

Technical Assistance

The NHDOE has accessed the CADRE Technical Assistance Center for support for this indicator. This technical assistance included the CADRE Part B Table 7 Error Checker for the development of Table 7.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 18: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2007-2008	The baseline has been established at 38.7% of written settlement agreements reached through the resolution session process.

FFY 2004 – No Data – NH did not meet the threshold for reporting.

FFY 2005 - No Data – NH did not meet the threshold for reporting.

FFY 2006 – Baseline year – 38.7%

FFY 2007 – First year of Data – 100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (reporting period July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008):

Calculation

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100

100% = [(19 divided by 19)] times 100

Explanation of Calculation

The Office of Legislation and Hearings provided the number of resolution meetings for the time period of July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008. The Office of Legislation and Hearings identified that 100% (19 out of 19) of the resolution sessions resulted in written settlement agreements.

Data for this indicator are provided in the attached federal annual Table 7, *Report of Resolution Under Part B, of The Individuals With Disabilities Education Act 2007 – 08.*

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

NH SPP Improvement Activity 1: Completed

The NHDOE has developed training materials to provide training to LEA personnel, NHDOE Technical Assistance Consultants, and other interested parties in the area of “Facilitated Special Education Meetings”.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 2: Completed

The NHDOE has provided comprehensive training resulting in additional trained facilitators to:

- Directly facilitate special education team meetings upon request;
- Train groups of individuals to facilitate special education team meetings;
- Train groups of individuals to implement facilitation and other alternative dispute resolution processes;
- Provide model strategies to develop local capacity to resolve issues in dispute at the earliest opportunity and in the most efficient manner.

The NHDOE has developed a data base of individuals that have successfully completed the facilitation training.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

The NHDOE exceeded the target of 45% for 2007-2008.

State Actual Data: 100% Target: 45%

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008

There were no revisions to the Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources in the State Performance Plan for this indicator.

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The development of the NH Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY is described in the Overview section of the APR.

Technical Assistance

The NHDOE has accessed the CADRE Technical Assistance Center for support for this indicator. This technical assistance included the CADRE Part B Table 7 Error Checker for the development of Table 7.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2007-2008	During this period 81% of mediations will result in a signed written agreement.

FFY 2004 – Baseline Year: 77.61%

FFY 2005 – First year of Data: 88.33%

FFY 2006 – Second year of Data: 51.5%

FFY 2007 – Third year of Data: 100%

Target Data for FFY 2007 (reporting period July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008):

Calculation

Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

100% = [(13 + 0) divided by 13] times 100.

Explanation of Calculation

The Office of Legislation and Hearings provided the number of mediations requests and mediations held for the time period of July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008. The Office of Legislation and Hearings identified that 100% (13 out of 13) mediations resulted in a signed written agreement.

Data for this indicator are provided in the attached federal annual Table 7, *Report of Resolution Under Part B, of The Individuals With Disabilities Education Act 2007 – 08.*

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

NH SPP Improvement Activity 1: Completed

The NHDOE has incorporated the workable suggestions made by the stakeholders, including information gathered from the surveys sent to individuals immediately after a mediation is held, to improve the percentage of mediations that result in a successful written agreement.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 2: Completed

The NHDOE's diligent attention to the changes in rules, process, and data collection has resulted in New Hampshire achieving a mediation success rate of 100% for 2007 - 2008.

NH SPP Improvement Activity 3: Completed

The NHDOE has tracked and reported both the number and percentage of agreements to achieve a consistent mediation success rate of 100%.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

The NHDOE has exceeded the target of 81% for 2007-2008.

State Actual Data: 100% Target: 81%

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:

There are no revisions to the Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines in the State Performance Plan for this Indicator.

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The development of the NH Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007 is described in the Overview section of the APR.

Technical Assistance

The NHDOE would like to acknowledge the work completed in response to the June 6, 2008 OSEP letter regarding NH's determination of needs assistance for two consecutive years. NHDOE has been advised of the available sources of technical assistance to address Indicator 15. The NHDOE has been working with the Data Accountability Center (DAC) through the development of the FFY 2007 APR. As a result of this technical assistance, the NHDOE developed a work plan with both DAC and NERRC with two priority areas: 1) Ensure the quality of the data reported in the SPP/APR submission of February 1, 2009 and 2) Review requirements for reporting local program performance to the public to ensure NH is able to produce reports for Spring 2008 (data from 2006-2007) that are of high quality. A copy of this work plan has been submitted to our OSEP contact person. The activities in the work plan have given the NHDOE an opportunity to analyze our data management routines and data definitions to ensure valid, accurate and timely data submission. In the reporting of this indicator, NHDOE has made significant progress in the correction of non-compliance within one year.

In addition to this technical assistance, the NHDOE accessed the SPP/APR calendar website to review reference documents and used Attachment 2: Part B Indicator 20 Data Rubric to complete the calculations for this indicator.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

State reported data, including 618 data and annual performance reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity; placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and
- b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring error free, consistent, valid and reliable data and evidence that these standards are met).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2007-2008	Section 618 and APR Data will be 100% compliant.

FFY 2004 – Baseline Year: 100%

FFY 2005 – First year of Data: 95%

FFY 2006 – Second year of Data: 85.6%

FFY 2007 – Third year of Data: 89%

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (reporting period July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008):

Calculation

$$89\% = [(73)/82.26] \times 100$$

Explanation of Calculation

Submission of SPP/APR Data

The NHDOE continued to implement a data verification process to ensure consistent, valid and reliable data. The NHDOE has used a data verification process for Indicators 3A, 7, 12, 13 and 14.

Submission of 618 data (Federal Tables)

The NHDOE used different databases for the collection of the 618 data for the federal tables. Tables 1, 3, 4 and 5 are generated using information from the New Hampshire Special Education Information System (NHSEIS). Table 2 is generated using information from the NHDOE Bureau of Credentialing. Table 6 is generated using information from the NHDOE Bureau of Accountability and Table 7 is generated using the database from the NHDOE Office of Legislation and Hearings and Bureau of Special Education, Complaint Officer.

NHSEIS was designed using data collection instruments which ensure that data entered into the system is valid and reliable. NHSEIS provides an error message with explanation when data is entered that is incorrect and gives districts an opportunity to resubmit the data. The NHDOE offered technical assistance and training to districts. NHDOE staff members are available to assist districts on a daily basis with NHSEIS.

The NHDOE received authority on June 30, 2007 to enter Table 1 Child Count through EDEN. However, DAC did grant permission for the NHDOE to postpone submission of data for Table 1 through EDEN until 2/1/09.

Reporting to the Public

As required by OSEP, the NHDOE reported to the public on the specific performance(s) of each local school district in the state on the targets set out in the SPP. The 2006-2007 District Data Profiles can be reviewed at:

<http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/instruction/SpecialEd/DistrictDataProfiles.htm>

SPP/APR and 618 Scoring Rubrics

The NHDOE calculated data for the SPP/APR and 618 data using the scoring rubrics at:

<http://spp-apr-calendar.rfcnetwork.org/explorer/view/id/141>

Part B Indicator 20 - SPP/APR Data			
APR Indicator	Valid and reliable	Correct calculation	Total
1	1		1
2	1		1
3A	1	1	2
3B	1	1	2
3C	1	1	2
4A	1	1	2
5	1	1	2
7	1	1	2
8	1	1	2
9	1	1	2
10	1	1	2
11	1	1	2

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

12	1	1	2
13	1	1	2
14	1	1	2
15	1	1	2
16	1	1	2
17	1	1	2
18	1	1	2
19	1	1	2
		Subtotal	38
APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points (5 pts for submission of APR/SPP by February 2, 2009)		5
	Grand Total		43

Part B Indicator 20 - 618 Data					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Date Note Requests	Total
Table 1 – Child Count Due Date: 2/1/08	0	1	1	1	3
Table 2 – Personnel Due Date: 11/1/08	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 3 – Ed. Environments Due Date: 2/1/08	0	1	0	1	2
Table 4 – Exiting Due Date: 11/1/08	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 5 – Discipline Due Date: 11/1/08	1	0	0	N/A	1
Table 6 – State Assessment Due Date: 2/1/09	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
Table 7 – Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/1/08	1	1	1	N/A	3
				Subtotal	16
			Weighted Total (subtotal X 1.87; round ≤.49 down and ≥ .50 up to whole number)		30
Indicator #20 Calculation					
A. APR Total					43
B. 618 Total					30
C. Grand Total (A) +618 Grand Total (B)					73
				Total N/A in APR	0
				Total N/A in 618	3.74
				Base	82.26
D. Subtotal (c divided by Base)=					0.886
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D X 100) =					88.6%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

NH SPP Improvement Activity 1: Completed

In February and March, 2008 the NHDOE worked with NERRC and Bruce Bull to develop the process of assuring the timely and accurate data submission from the districts. Through the Data Quality Report in NHSEIS the districts have a report which allows the districts to verify their data.

The NHDOE held bi-weekly teleconferences to provide information and technical assistance to districts regarding data entry into NHSEIS. The minutes from the teleconferences were posted to the main page in NHSEIS for districts' use. FY'08 Memo #14:

<http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/instruction/SpecialEd/documents/documents/FY2008Memo14NHSEISWeeklyForum.pdf>

NH SPP Improvement Activity 2 : Completed

The creation of a data dictionary describing all data field in NHSEIS was initiated on May 28, 2008.

The NHDOE provided the following memos to districts:

- FY'08 Memo #7 – required data fields in NHSEIS:
<http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/instruction/SpecialEd/documents/documents/FY2008Memo7NHSIESGuidanceREVISEDINSTRUCTIONS.pdf>
- FY'08 Memo #10 – clarified of the SEA roles in the collection of student level information:
<http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/instruction/SpecialEd/documents/documents/FY2008Memo10WebBasedNHNHSEIS.pdf>
- FY'08 Memo #16 and #22 – timelines provided to the LEA for state and federal reports:
<http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/instruction/SpecialEd/documents/documents/FY2008Memo16PreschoolOutcomesSPP.pdf> and
<http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/instruction/SpecialEd/documents/documents/FY2008Memo22ChildCount.pdf>
- FY'08 Memo #41 – clarification of special education categorical endorsement areas:
<http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/instruction/SpecialEd/documents/documents/FY08Memo41SPEDCategorical.pdf>

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

The NHDOE has made significant progress in this indicator, moving from 85.6% compliance in 2006-2007 to 92% compliance in 2007-2008. We believe this is due in large part to the technical assistance received from DAC and NERRC and the work that was accomplished within our work plan.

The NHDOE did not meet the target 2007-2008.

State Actual Data: **89%** Target: 100%

As noted in OSEP's review of the previous APR

The NHDOE did not meet the due date of February 1, 2008 for Table 3 submission. Table 3 due February 1, 2008 has been submitted prior to the submission of this APR. Many school districts were not timely in their submission of the placement data for this table submission. The NHDOE will determine this as a special factor when making district determinations for 2007-2008.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007

There are no revisions to the Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines in the State Performance Plan for this Indicator.

New Hampshire Department of Education
 Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
 OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
 AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
 OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
 PROGRAMS

TABLE 6
 REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 1 OF 18
 OMB NO. 1820-0659
 FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

2007-2008

STATE: NEW HAMPSHIRE

SECTION A. ENROLLMENT DATA FOR THE MATH ASSESSMENT¹

DATE OF ENROLLMENT COUNT: OCTOBER

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH IEPs (1)	ALL STUDENTS (2)
3	2045	14686
4	2309	15089
5	2609	15295
6	2662	15439
7	2747	15922
8	2727	16371
HIGH SCHOOL (SPECIFY GRADE:) 11	2640	16467

¹At a date as close as possible to the testing date.

New Hampshire Department of Education
 Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
 OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
 AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
 OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
 PROGRAMS

TABLE 6
 REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 2 OF 18

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

2007-2008

STATE: NEW HAMPSHIRE

SECTION B. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK REGULAR ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS	
	TOTAL (3)	SUBSET (OF 3) WHO TOOK THE ASSESSMENT WITH ACCOMODATIONS (3A)
3	1867	1541
4	2142	1818
5	2399	1933
6	2474	1967
7	2577	1959
8	2526	1844
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	2303	1349

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

New Hampshire Department of Education
 Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
 OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
 AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
 OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
 PROGRAMS

TABLE 6

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 3 OF 18

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

2007-2008

STATE: NEW HAMPSHIRE

SECTION B. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT			
	TOTAL (4)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT WAS BASED ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (4A)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT WAS BASED ON MODIFIED ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (4B)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT WAS BASED ON ALTERNATE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (4C)
3	151	0	0	151
4	142	0	0	142
5	172	0	0	172
6	168	0	0	168
7	140	0	0	140
8	143	0	0	143
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	111	0	0	111

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 4 OF 18

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

2007-2008

STATE: NEW HAMPSHIRE

SECTION B. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS COUNTED AS NONPARTICIPANTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH NCLB				
	STUDENTS WHOSE ASSESSMENT RESULTS WERE INVALID ¹ (5)	STUDENTS WHO TOOK AN OUT OF LEVEL TEST (6)	STUDENTS WHO DID NOT TAKE ANY ASSESSMENT		
			PARENTAL EXEMPTION (7)	ABSENT (8)	EXEMPT FOR OTHER REASONS ² (9)
3	0	0	0	18	9
4	0	0	0	25	0
5	0	0	0	22	16
6	0	0	0	20	0
7	0	0	0	29	1
8	0	0	0	56	2
HIGH SCHOOL :	11	0	0	169	57

¹Invalid results are assessment results that cannot be used for reporting and or aggregation due to problem in the testing process (e.g. students do not take all portions of assessment, students do not fill out the answer sheet correctly) or changes in testing materials that resulted in a score that is not deemed by the State to be comparable to scores received by students who took the assessment without these changes.

²In a separate listing, report the number of students who did not take an assessment for other reasons by grade and specific reason.

Please provide the reason(s) for exemption.

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 5 OF 18

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

STATE: NEW HAMPSHIRE

2007-2008

SECTION C. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT

REGULAR ASSESSMENT BASED ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (10A)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	1	2	3	4						10A ROW TOTAL ¹
		Achievement Level									
3	NECAP	614	460	668	125	0	0	0	0	0	1867
4	NECAP	767	645	634	96	0	0	0	0	0	2142
5	NECAP	1061	532	691	115	0	0	0	0	0	2399
6	NECAP	1189	606	602	77	0	0	0	0	0	2474
7	NECAP	1328	655	519	75	0	0	0	0	0	2577
8	NECAP	1471	641	373	41	0	0	0	0	0	2526
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	NECAP	1929	284	86	4	0	0	0	0	0	2303

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT: 3

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6

PAGE 6 OF 18

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

STATE: NEW HAMPSHIRE

2007-2008

SECTION C. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT BASED ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (10B)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Achievement Level	10B ROW TOTAL ¹								
3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 11		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT:

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 7 OF 18

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

STATE: NEW HAMPSHIRE

2007-2008

SECTION C. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT BASED ON MODIFIED ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (10C)												
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Achievement Level	10C ROW TOTAL ¹	Number of students included Within the NCLB 2% Cap ^{2,3}								
3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 11		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

PAGE 8 OF 18

TABLE 6

OMB NO. 1820-0659

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

2007-2008

STATE: NEW HAMPSHIRE

SECTION C. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT BASED ON ALTERNATE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (10D)										
1	2	3	4							Number of Students Included Within the NCLB 1% Cap ¹
Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	10D ROW TOTAL ²	
19	20	75	37	0	0	0	0	0	151	0
13	29	69	31	0	0	0	0	0	142	0
18	37	73	44	0	0	0	0	0	172	0
19	33	83	33	0	0	0	0	0	168	0
26	31	53	30	0	0	0	0	0	140	0
20	39	63	21	0	0	0	0	0	143	0
20	45	39	7	0	0	0	0	0	111	0

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 9 OF 18

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

STATE: NEW HAMPSHIRE

2007-2008

SECTION C. SUMMARY OF THE PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10A (FROM PAGE 5) ¹	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10B (FROM PAGE 6) ¹	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10C (FROM PAGE 7) ¹	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10D (FROM PAGE 8) ¹	NO VALID SCORE ^{1,2} (11)	TOTAL ^{1,3} (12)
3	1867	0	0	151	27	2045
4	2142	0	0	142	25	2309
5	2399	0	0	172	38	2609
6	2474	0	0	168	20	2662
7	2577	0	0	140	30	2747
8	2526	0	0	143	58	2727
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	2303	0	0	111	226	2640

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6
REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 10 OF 18

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

2007-2008

STATE: NEW HAMPSHIRE

SECTION D. ENROLLMENT DATA FOR THE READING ASSESSMENT¹

DATE OF ENROLLMENT COUNT: OCTOBER

GRADE LEVEL		STUDENTS WITH IEPs (1)	ALL STUDENTS (2)
3		2043	14686
4		2309	15089
5		2609	15295
6		2662	15439
7		2747	15922
8		2727	16371
HIGH SCHOOL (SPECIFY GRADE:)	11	2640	16467

¹At a date as close as possible to the testing date.

New Hampshire Department of Education
 Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
 OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
 AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
 OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
 PROGRAMS

TABLE 6

PORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STA
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 11 OF 18

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

2007-2008

NEW HAMPSHIRE

SECTION E. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK REGULAR ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS		
	TOTAL (3)	SUBSET (OF 3) WHO TOOK THE ASSESSMENT WITH ACCOMODATIONS (3A)	LEP STUDENTS IN US < 12 MONTHS WHOSE ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY (ELP) TEST REPLACED REGULAR READING ASSESSMENT (3B)
3	1867	1525	0
4	2144	1777	0
5	2401	1907	0
6	2480	1966	0
7	2581	1977	0
8	2531	1836	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	2317	1337	0

New Hampshire Department of Education
 Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
 OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
 AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
 OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
 PROGRAMS

TABLE 6

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 12 OF 18

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

2007-2008

STATE: NEW HAMPSHIRE

SECTION E. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT			
	TOTAL (4)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT WAS BASED ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (4A)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT WAS BASED ON MODIFIED ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (4B)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT WAS BASED ON ALTERNATE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (4C)
3	151	0	0	151
4	142	0	0	142
5	172	0	0	172
6	168	0	0	168
7	140	0	0	140
8	143	0	0	143
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	111	0	0	111

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 13 OF 18

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

2007-2008

STATE: NEW HAMPSHIRE

SECTION E. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS COUNTED AS NONPARTICIPANTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH NCLB				
	STUDENTS WHOSE ASSESSMENT RESULTS WERE INVALID ¹ (5)	STUDENTS WHO TOOK AN OUT OF LEVEL TEST (6)	STUDENTS WHO DID NOT TAKE ANY ASSESSMENT		
			PARENTAL EXEMPTION (7)	ABSENT (8)	DID NOT TAKE FOR OTHER REASONS ² (9)
3	0	0	0	16	9
4	0	0	0	23	0
5	0	0	0	22	14
6	0	0	0	14	0
7	0	0	0	25	1
8	0	0	0	51	2
HIGH SCHOOL :	11	0	0	169	43

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 14 OF 18

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

STATE: NEW HAMPSHIRE

2007-2008

SECTION F. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT

REGULAR ASSESSMENT BASED ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (10A)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	1	2	3	4						10A ROW TOTAL ¹
		Achievement Level									
3	NECAP	681	496	647	43	0	0	0	0	0	1867
4	NECAP	799	649	642	54	0	0	0	0	0	2144
5	NECAP	752	902	680	67	0	0	0	0	0	2401
6	NECAP	787	904	757	32	0	0	0	0	0	2480
7	NECAP	809	929	812	31	0	0	0	0	0	2581
8	NECAP	962	968	571	30	0	0	0	0	0	2531
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	NECAP	855	869	560	33	0	0	0	0	0	2317

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6

PAGE 15 OF 18

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

STATE: NEW HAMPSHIRE

2007-2008

SECTION F. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT BASED ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (10B)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Achievement Level	10B ROW TOTAL ¹								
3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 11		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 16 OF 18

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

STATE: NEW HAMPSHIRE

2007-2008

SECTION F. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT BASED ON MODIFIED ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (10C)												
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	1	2	3	4						10C ROW TOTAL ¹	Number of students included Within the NCLB 2% Cap ^{2,3}
		Achievement Level										
3	NECAP ALT	17	22	68	44	0	0	0	0	0	151	0
4	NECAP ALT	14	31	59	38	0	0	0	0	0	142	0
5	NECAP ALT	10	39	85	38	0	0	0	0	0	172	0
6	NECAP ALT	12	31	89	36	0	0	0	0	0	168	0
7	NECAP ALT	24	36	52	28	0	0	0	0	0	140	0
8	NECAP ALT	14	37	69	23	0	0	0	0	0	143	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	NECAP ALT	17	40	45	9	0	0	0	0	0	111	0

New Hampshire Department of Education
 Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
 OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
 AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
 OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
 PROGRAMS

TABLE 6

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 17 OF 18

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

2007-2008

STATE: NEW HAMPSHIRE

SECTION F. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT BASED ON ALTERNATE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (10D)												
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Achievement Level	10D ROW TOTAL ²	Number of Students Included Within the NCLB 1% Cap ¹								
3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 11		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

New Hampshire Department of Education
 Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
 OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
 AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
 OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
 PROGRAMS

TABLE 6
 REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 18 OF 18
 OMB NO. 1820-0659
 FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

STATE: NEW HAMPSHIRE

2007-2008

SECTION F. SUMMARY OF THE PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10A (FROM PAGE 14) ¹	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10B (FROM PAGE 15) ¹	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10C (FROM PAGE 16) ¹	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10D (FROM PAGE 17) ¹	NO VALID SCORE ^{1,2} (11)	TOTAL ^{1,3} (12)
3	1867	0	151	0	25	2043
4	2144	0	142	0	23	2309
5	2401	0	172	0	36	2609
6	2480	0	168	0	14	2662
7	2581	0	140	0	26	2747
8	2531	0	143	0	53	2727
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	2317	0	111	0	212	2640

New Hampshire Department of Education
Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 7
REPORT OF DISPUTE RESOLUTION UNDER PART B, OF THE
INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT
2007-08

PAGE 1 OF 1
OMB NO.: 1820-0677
FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

STATE:

NH-New Hampshire

SECTION A: WRITTEN, SIGNED COMPLAINTS	
(1) Written, signed complaints total	62
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	35
(a) Reports with findings	20
(b) Reports within timeline	14
(c) Reports within extended timelines	21
(1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	20
(1.3) Complaints pending	7
(a) Complaints pending a due process hearing	0

SECTION B: MEDIATION REQUESTS	
(2) Mediation requests total	13
(2.1) Mediations held	13
(a) Mediations held related to due process complaints	13
(i) Mediation agreements	13
(b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints	0
(i) Mediation agreements	0
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	0

SECTION C: DUE PROCESS COMPLAINTS	
(3) Due process complaints total	84
(3.1) Resolution meetings	19
(a) Written Settlement agreements	19
(3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated)	16
(a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited)	12
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	4
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing	19

SECTION D: EXPEDITED DUE PROCESS COMPLAINTS (RELATED TO DISCIPLINARY DECISION)	
(4) Expedited due process complaints total	0
(4.1) Resolution meetings	0
(a) Writen settlement agreements	0
(4.2) Expedited hearings (fully adjudicated)	0
(a) Change of placement ordered	0