

**New Hampshire Department of Education  
Bureau of Special Education  
Special Education Program Approval and  
Improvement Process**

**SAU #31**

**Newmarket School District**

**Summary Report**

James J. Hayes, Superintendent of Schools  
Jean Parsons, Director of Student Services

Robert Andrews, SERESC Educational Consultant  
Jen Dolloff, SERESC Educational Consultant

Report Date: June 29, 2012

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>P. 3</b>
<b>NEWMARKET SCHOOL DISTRICT.....</b>	<b>P. 5</b>
<b>FOCUSED MONITORING ACTIVITIES.....</b>	<b>P. 7</b>
<b>IEP REVIEW SUMMARY.....</b>	<b>P. 16</b>
<b>NEXT STEPS.....</b>	<b>P. 23</b>
<b>ACTION PLAN.....</b>	<b>P. 26</b>
<b>ADDENDA.....</b>	<b>P. 31</b>

## **INTRODUCTION**

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

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

**Essential Question:** What are the contributing factors to the achievement gap between students performing in the proficient range and students performing in the non-proficient range and how can this gap be narrowed? “

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

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

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

The summary report for the Focused Monitoring districts is intended to serve as a record of the work of the Achievement Team during the 2009-2010 school year, and more importantly will contain a limited number of well defined goals that will help focus the district's work by setting a target for student achievement or addressing the factors that impact student achievement. The document is intended to be a synthesis of what the Achievement Team has accomplished, which supports an improvement plan with clear goals, research-based interventions and action steps to achieve the goal of narrowing the achievement gap between students with and without disabilities. Monitoring visits and corrective actions focus on the specific processes related to the Key Performance Indicator that put districts on the "visit" list and are aimed at helping districts improve their performance on that indicator. A statewide group of stakeholders identified the key focus area for New Hampshire school districts.

### **New Hampshire Department of Education Technical Assistants:**

Robert Andrews	SERESC Consultant
Jen Dolloff	SERESC Consultant

### **Leadership Team Members:**

Jim Hayes	Superintendent
Patricia Ballantyne	Director of Curriculum and Instruction

Jean Parsons	Director of Student Services
Christopher Andriski	Principal, Newmarket Junior/Senior High School
Scott Thompson	Principal Newmarket Elementary School
Christopher O'Callahan	Special Education Coordinator, Newmarket Junior/Senior High
Jocelyn Robinson	Special Education Coordinator, Newmarket Elementary School

**Achievement Team Members:**

Jean Parsons	Director of Student Services
David Williams	Asst. Principal, Newmarket Junior/Senior High School
Debbie Roffo	Asst. Principal, Newmarket Elementary School
Jocelyn Robinson	Special Education Coordinator, Newmarket Elementary School
Christopher O'Callahan	Special Education Coordinator, Newmarket Junior/Senior High
Karen Folger	Special Education Teacher
Mary McIver	Classroom Teacher
Steve Johnson	Classroom Teacher
Ralph Longa	Parent
Lori Carmichael	Speech Language Pathologist
Ann Kost	Associate School Psychologist

**IEP Review Team Members:**

Robert Andrews	Education Consultant
Jennifer Dolloff	Education Consultant
Nash Reddy	Director of Student Services
Paula Wensley	Director of Student Services
Elementary School Staff:	
Julie Cooper	SPED PK Teacher
Ann Cocci	SPED PK Teacher
Lori Carmichael	Speech Pathologist
Diane Hughes	RegEd Teacher
Kim Garrant	SPED Teacher
Anne Tufts	Occupational Therapist
June Williamson	RegEd Teacher
Pam Allen	SPED Teacher
Junior High Staff:	
Chris O'Callahan	SPED Building Coordinator
Ann-Marie Pullar	SPED Teacher
Elizabeth Beaulieu	RegED Teacher
Melanie Paradis	RegED Teacher
Janice Murray	RegED Teacher
Sarah Denham	SPED Teacher
Jen Boston	RegED Teacher
Ann Kost	Associate School Psychologist
Mark Leavitt	RegED Teacher
Greg Thayer	RegED Teacher
Michelle Silvia	RegEd Teacher
Senior High Staff:	
Chris O'Callahan	SPED Building Coordinator

Sue Parshley  
Sara Cross  
Abigail Lewis  
Kristina Cochran  
Ann Kost

RegEd Teacher  
RegEd Teacher  
RegEd Teacher  
SPED Teacher  
Associate School Psychologist

## **Newmarket School District**

### **Mission Statement**

The Newmarket School District is committed to the highest standards of quality education by creating a safe and successful learning community that embraces diversity and responds to the social, emotional, intellectual and physical needs of every child. We are dedicated to fostering links to the broader community to ensure that students develop lifelong skills enabling them to be contributing and productive members of society.

### **About the Newmarket School District**

The Newmarket School District continues with their mission to provide to the students the highest standards of quality education. In working to achieve this goal there have been a number of successful initiatives implemented in the school system.

Four major themes have been entwined into the work in the district. Throughout the district, the use and interpretation of data is assisting to drive change in instruction and learning. Assessment tools are being utilized to measure student learning and effectiveness of the curriculum. This year data has been gleaned from a number of sources including the Aims Web based reading inventory and the New Hampshire Assessment Test. In addition, the district will be utilizing the Northwest Educational Assessment, a standardized test to provide additional information in the core subject areas. Classroom teachers are using data to assist with the decisions around instruction. The result of the 2011 state assessment test at grades three through eight and ten indicate that Newmarket is one of three school districts in the state to be removed from the state DINI (District In Need of Improvement) List, a significant accomplishment representing improved test scores. Newmarket Elementary School made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in Mathematics, and Newmarket Junior/Senior High School made AYP in Reading. However, the elementary school remains a School In Need of Improvement (SINI) for Reading and the Junior/Senior High School remains a SINI for Mathematics.

In addition to the goals for data driven change, the district is immersed in an evaluation of the educational facilities in the community. The Newmarket School Board has charged a community based facilities committee to investigate, gather input and evaluate the needs of the district in terms of appropriate learning environments. To date, the community has participated in a survey and educational space requirements have been evaluated. During the year, recommendations will be presented by the facilities committee for further analysis by the community.

The final goal for the year will be to continue to link the schools to the broader community, ensuring that students have an opportunity to provide service to the community as well as the citizens having opportunities to participate in school events. During the last year a collaborative effort was developed with parents, the Newmarket Recreation Department and school district to establish a support program to assist students in their integration into the community. Through the support of several grants, a Friendship Facilitator was hired to assist

students. The community connections are very important in Newmarket and the business partnerships that have been established are another means of creating a positive learning environment for the students.

This year several changes are underway to support the students. At the elementary school all classrooms are using the Everyday Math Series from Kindergarten through grade five. The school district continues to be proud of the strong support given by the volunteer program as well as the PTA in the elementary school and high school.

## **Newmarket Commencement Goals**

The graduates of the Newmarket School District will master the basic skills of:

*Reading*

*Writing*

*Mathematics*

*Science*

*Social Studies*

In order to:

**N**urture life-long learning

**E**xercise behaviors that promote mental and physical

**W**ell-being and health awareness, work cooperatively and exhibit teamwork skills

**M**ake informed career choices

**A**ppreciate the fine and performing arts

**R**espect oneself and others and display good citizenship

**K**now about, and be responsible for the environment

**E**xhibit technological competence

**T**hink creatively and critically to identify and solve problems

**C**ommunicate effectively through reading, writing, speaking and listening

**A**pply responsible economic principles

**R**ecognize personal, local, national, and global heritages

**E**xplore world languages and appreciate cultural diversity

**S**ucceed through achievement!

## **Focused Monitoring Activities**

Using the "5 Step Inquiry Process", our Focus Monitoring team broke our task in to the following steps:

- 1. Get ready for inquiry**
- 2. Organize and analyze data**

3. Investigate factors impacting student achievement
4. Determine effective practice and write a plan
5. Implement, monitor and evaluate

## Step 1: Getty Ready for Inquiry

### May 11, 2011

In concert with the Focus Monitoring program approval team, administration from the Newmarket School District identified an essential question to guide all of us through the yearlong Focus Monitoring process.

“What are the contributing factors to the achievement gap between students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers, and how will the gap be narrowed?”

While the performance gap exists in multiple levels across the district, we chose to focus on the junior senior high school (NJSHS) as the elementary school (NES) is currently involved in a restructuring process. We also chose to focus primarily on math since this was an area we have seen greater inconsistency in approach and intervention and NJSHS is a SINI in mathematics. The district has been previously engaged, since 2007 in advancing a literacy model founded on an RTI tiered approach and supported by a daily literacy class teaching strategies for reading for meaning across content areas. We have found this to be a very successful model for students with disabilities to improve overall reading skills.

### August 3, 2011

#### Leadership Symposium Series

The administrative team gathered at SERESC with the goal of determining the role of district leadership in defining and ensuring access for all identified students.

Team members participated in an initial exercise to help define how we operate with a goal of determining causes for methods to close the achievement gap. In assessing evidence of current practices, we drilled down to four questions:

- Is core instruction provided to all students in the general curriculum?
- Are there separate curricula in the junior/senior high school?
- What formative assessments are used to measure progress?
- Are our IEP goals connected to the GLE's/GSE's?

### Chalk Talk

Team members list and discuss available data relative to the questions.

### August 16, 2011

#### SAU Summer Leadership Institute

The administrative team shared with the larger group an overview of the Focus Monitoring process. Central to the discussion was an explanation of the **Cycle of Inquiry** which would be our guiding roadmap through the year.

- Newmarket readiness survey completed.

- Membership for leadership and achievement teams determined.
- Schedule of meetings for each team developed.

## Step 2: Organize and Analyze Data

**September 14, 2011**

### Leadership Team – Initial Meeting

Initial data had been provided to the team by the SERESC Consultants as a starting point for our inquiry. The team began by reviewing:

- District professional development plan
- District strategies plan
- Current SINI – DINI plan

### Data Study: Predictions, Observations, Inferences

Insights noted; Math gap between IEP and all other disaggregate group is significant. There is a pattern of steady decline in math scores from elementary to high school for the entire population.

### Data Study: Newmarket Readiness Survey

The leadership team first participated in the survey and then engaged in a data study analyzing and comparing their outcomes versus the administrative team results. Insights noted; senior administration viewed the districts professional development strategy, communication across the district, use of data and collaboration among general and special education staff as areas of strength. Outcomes from the leadership team indicated a less than enthusiastic endorsement.

### Action

- Initiate micro view of students in grades 6 through grade 11 who did not make growth.
- Readiness survey to be given to entire district staff.

### Homework

- Schools Moving Up by H.M. Almazan.

**September 21, 2011**

### Achievement Team – Initial Meeting

**Seven Norms of Collaboration** - reviewed and accepted

**Five Step Inquiry Process** – reviewed

NECAP Data for 2010 had been made available to the team, using a **Data Driven Dialogue**, the group came up with some initial observations:

- Juniors seem to have little investment in the NECAP.
- Whole school did not meet growth targets.
- Drop off in math scores from grade 8 to grade 11.

### Actions

- Achievement team participates in School Readiness Survey.

## Homework

- School Moving Up by H.M. Almazan

## October 12, 2011

### Leadership Team

The team used a **data driven dialogue** (DDD) to review outcomes for the school readiness survey that had been taken by all district staff. First impressions indicate scores across the board were generally homogenous, but lower for communication across district, decision making and parent/community participation. This task was followed up with a **DDD** to discuss 2010 NECAP results.

The group used **The Final Word** format to discuss their shared reading "Schools Moving Up."

### Activity: School access and participation factors leading to student learning and achievement.

Team members prioritized school and participation indicators that they felt have the greatest overall impact on the gap. Factors such as power standards, core curriculum, time in regular classrooms and number of math levels offered were choices to consider.

As a secondary activity, members were asked to prioritize five items the district might consider to implement first, the level of access to those resources prioritized and finally, the level of control the district has regarding percent of students identified versus number of math levels available.

## October 19, 2011

### Achievement Team

Review:

Seven Norms of collaboration

Roles and responsibilities of administrative team members

**Activities: the Final Word** protocol was reviewed and used as the format to discuss the article, Schools Moving Up.

- **VENN Diagram** – Listed individual and multi-site initiatives to improve student outcomes across the district
- **School access and participation factor work sheet** members prioritized factors most critical to closing the gap:
  1. **Power standards:** creating non-negotiable lists (standards) regarding what students must know at each level.
  2. **NECAP administration and accommodations**

## Communicating to the Field

Members Mary McIver and Chris O'Callahan offered to present to the junior/senior high school staff an overview of NECAP data, school readiness survey and efforts to date in the Focus Monitoring process.

## **Homework**

Accelerating Mathematics Achievement Using Heterogeneous Groupings by Burns, Heubert and Levin

## **November 10, 2011**

### **Leadership Team**

#### **Review**

- Venn Diagram of initiatives
- Access and participation indicators
- Power standards
- Vertical alignment of curriculum
- Number of levels and minutes for math instruction

## **The Final Word**

Curriculum Now by Mike Schmoker

Team members unanimously agreed on two points from the article relative to closing the gap:

- Research argues for a coherent, content rich curriculum that affords opportunities for reading, writing and discussion in every content area.
- Ensure that students have opportunities to closely read, discuss and write about these texts in direct response to high quality questions.

## **November 14, 2011**

### **IEP Compliance Review**

Twelve IEP's from Grades 6, 7, 8, and 11 were randomly picked and reviewed by NHDOE Review Team.

## **November 16, 2011**

### **Achievement Team**

#### **The Final Word**

Accelerating Mathematics Achievement Using Heterogeneous Grouping by C. Burris, J. Heubert and H. Levin

## **What's Next?**

The Team engaged in a **Chalk Talk** to inventory and prioritized factors that will define the year long process.

- Vertical core standards and curriculum
- Nonnegotiable power standards
- IEP goals aligning with NECAP outcomes

Review: VENN Diagram of district initiatives

- Are we replicating interventions that are not effective?
- District initiatives that have had positive impact on closing the gap:

- Mahesh Sharma – Teacher training
- Math Lab – ALEKS
- Key 3 Literacy and Literacy Across Content Area
- Would fall NWEA Assessments be helpful in determining intervention requirements?

**Action**

The group feels more longitudinal data regarding student progress/NECAP would be beneficial. A subgroup will review IEP’s, assessment scores and profile of 30 students.

**Homework**

Read article, “Improving High Schools Through Rigor, Relevance and Relationships” Education Trust Publishers.

**December 2, 2011**

**Report Out**

Team members Mary McIver and Chris O’Callahan communicate to NJSHS faculty status of Focus Monitoring Team.

- Review essential question
- Exercise using data based decision making
- Discussion of targeted growth
- Power standards

**Step 3: Investigate Factors Impacting Student Achievement**

**December 7, 2011**

**Leadership Team**

**NECAP Actions**

- Incentives to increase student investment
- Appropriate implementation of accommodations

Improving Performance: Target low performers for added math lab time

Professional Development: Mandate all district math instructors participate in professional development with Mahesh Sharma

- Vertical alignment and spiraling of math curricula

**Homework**

Identifying Power Standards That Matter the Most by P. Reeves

**December 14, 2011**

**Achievement Team**

**The Final Word:** Improving high schools through rigor, relevance and relationships.

Noted in the article: Longitudinal research demonstrates that the rigor of high school course work is more important than parent education level, family income or race/ethnicity, in predicting whether a student will earn a post-secondary credential.

### **Activity: Narrowing Our Focus**

Power standards:

- Identify non-negotiable
- Identify ten most important standards

NECAP Administration:

- Accommodations
- Schedule
- Increasing student investment

### **Data Analysis**

2011-2012 Student Progress:

- **ALEKS Math outcomes**
- **Tier II added minutes of direct instruction**

### **Action**

Gather data on identified students that score proficient in NECAP. What are the characteristics?

### **January 12, 2012**

#### **Leadership Team**

**The final Word:** Identifying the power standards that matter the most.

### **Reporting Out**

- The team reported that power standards for math had been completed for kindergarten through five.
- District curriculum coordinated administration and math instructors continue work with Mahesh Sharma to identify power standards for grades six through 12.

### **Action\***

Student profile subcommittee to gather more student specific data to further analyze trends related to NECAP performance.

\*See File Review in the addendum

### **January 18, 2012**

#### **Achievement Team**

**The last Word:** Identifying the power standards that matter the most.

Interesting insights:

- Kids don't retain the information when given too much information. Depth not breadth.
- There is a seemingly randomness of the standards that students are tested on in jr/sr high school.
- Power standards for math may be more easily determined as math is so linear.

### **Chalk Talk**

The team participated in an exercise that related an analogy of mastering physical techniques on football to mastering learning in a classroom.

### **Drill Down – NECAP Administration**

- Scheduling factors
- Personnel
- Trainings
- Incentives
- Test prep
- Fidelity of accommodations

## **Step 4: Determine Effective Practice and Write a Plan**

**February 8, 2012**

### **Leadership Team**

Feedback on longitudinal student review

- Process was more time consuming than expected
- Few disability based IEP goals at the high school. Most goals are primarily functional and metacognitive
- Not all students with disabilities who scored “substantially below proficient”(SBP) or “partially proficient” (PP) in math had math goals on their IEPs.
- Most eleventh graders did not have assessment accommodations built into the IEP.

### **Data Analysis: NECAP Proficiency Scores**

- Overall math scores are very poor
- More students have moved into level four in grades six to eight
- Dramatic fall off in scores from grade eight to grade eleven
- Math proficiency for students with disabilities at grade eleven is 0%
- During 2010 – 2011 40% of student with IEP's reached their growth target
- Math index for all identified students was 36.9

**February 15, 2012**

### **Achievement Team**

### **Data Analysis: Multi-Tier Support Reading and Math**

- Lowest 25% in *reading* receive 550 minutes of direct instruction per week.
- Lowest 10% in *reading* receive 700 minutes of direct instruction per week.
- Maximum minutes for lowest 25% in *math* is 300 minutes of direct instruction per week
- Analysis of ALEKS data indicates additional math lab time is improving student outcomes

- Reading is addressed better and more longitudinally than math throughout the system
- More multi-tiered support required for math

## **The Final Word**

“What research says about the value of homework”

### **Subcommittee Work**

#### **NECAP Administration**

- Accommodations
- Fidelity of administration
- Scheduling
- Test taking strategies
- Student investment

### **Closing the Gap**

Target goal – students with IEP’s will achieve a math index score of 50

- IEP goals to reflect NECAP outcome
- Increase number of minutes for math instruction
- Math lab support to align with specific skill deficiency

### **Homework**

Ensuring Content Area Learning By Secondary Students With Learning Disabilities by Deschler

## **March 14, 2012**

### **Leadership Team**

#### **Action**

- Timeline for completing improvement plan
- Review accommodations and power standards
- IEP case study

#### **Activity**

- Subcommittee priority area work
- Hypothesis development “understanding Gaps in Student Performance”
- Root cause analysis

## **March 21, 2012**

### **Achievement Team**

Action plan and initial goal statements

- IEP goals will reflect areas of academic weakness as demonstrated by NECAP outcomes
- Develop a system to ensure areas of weakness are being addressed and progress is monitored
- Link math lab and ALEKS work to IEP goals
- All students who require accommodations in assessments will have those embedded in to the IEP
- Accommodations in IEP’s will be implemented in daily work, not just state and district assessments

- Review NECAP administration
- Professional development: Metacognition, test taking strategies, test administration

**April 11, 2012**

**Leadership Team**

**The Final Word**

Ensuring Content Area Learning By Secondary Students With Learning Disabilities by D. Deshler

Review

Achievement team action plan, initial goals

**April 18, 2012**

**Achievement Team**

**Finalize Goals**

- In 2012 students with IEP's at NJSHS achieved a math index score of 36.9; by the end of 2013 students with IEP's will achieve a math index score of 50.
- By June of 2013, NJSHS will standardize, develop, deliver and manage NECAP administration to include all accommodations that students with IEP's need to demonstrate their knowledge.

**Actions**

Summary report writing assignments first draft summary report due May 9, 2012. Plan to communicate final report and action plan to all constituents.

## **IEP REVIEW SUMMARY**

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

**Focused Monitoring Process**

**NEWMARKET SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**November 14-15, November 16, and December 16, 2011**

**Introduction:**

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

The town of Newmarket, NH is located in Rockingham county and has a population of 9460 (2009). Since the year 2000, Newmarket population has changed + 14.7 %. In 2010-11, the total public school enrollment pre-school through grade 12 was 1127 students and approximately 180 students are identified as having a disability. At the time of the program visit, the Newmarket School District had 9 students placed in out of district settings. In 2005, 18.08% of the students in the Newmarket School District were eligible for Free or Reduced Lunch, compared to approximately 20.13% of students in 2010.

## **Data Collection Activities:**

As part of the NHDOE Focused Monitoring Process a Special Education compliance review was conducted in the NEWMARKET SCHOOL DISTRICT on November 14-15, November 16, and December 16, 2011. Listed below is the data that was reviewed as part of the compliance review, all of which are summarized in this report.

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

## **SUMMARY OF FINDINGS:**

**IEP Review Process: Conducted on November 14-15, 2011. Additional reviews conducted on November 16, 2011 and December 16, 2011.**

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

**As required by the IEP review process, general and special educators in the NEWMARKET SCHOOL DISTRICT were provided with a collaborative opportunity to review 15 in district and out of district IEPs in order to determine if the documents included the following information:**

- Student's present level of performance
- Measurable annual goals related to specific student needs
- Instructional strategies, interventions, and supports identified and implemented to support progress toward measurable goals
- Assessment (formative and summative) information gathered to develop annual goals and to measure progress toward annual goals
- Accommodations and/or modifications determined to support student access to the general curriculum instruction and assessment
- Evidence of progress toward key IEP goals and the documented evidence of student gains over a 3 year period
- Transition plans that have measurable postsecondary goals ( for youth aged 16 and above as required by Indicator 13)
- Evidence of required documentation for preschool programming (for children ages 3-5)

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

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

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

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

**Include Preschool and Secondary Transitions**

- Was it possible to assess the degree to which IEPs were designed to provide educational benefit (access to, participation and progress in the general curriculum)?
  1. Yes. All students who were randomly selected for an IEP review, were placed in learning environments that constituted Regular class 80% or more of the day and all IEPs provided an explanation of the extent, if any, to which the student was NOT participating with nondisabled peers in the regular class and other educational settings, including nonacademic settings.
  2. All IEPs were developed by Teams, which included parents and regular education staff as well as special education teachers and related service personnel.
  
- How has this process informed future plans for improving the writing of student IEPs and ensuring the student's participation in the general education curriculum?
  1. All IEPs will contain measureable academic and functional goals that include objectives or benchmarks, baseline data, and expected proficiency levels.
  2. IEPs will be developed to reflect all currently available data, including NECAP data and district level evaluation results.
  3. A variety of data sources will be included in the Present Levels of Academic Performance and Functional Performance portion of all IEPs.
  4. Multiple data sources will all be included during IEP development.
  5. Transition planning will occur, beginning with students turning 14 years of age.
  6. Accommodations and Modifications will be reviewed and updated annually.
  7. Functional goals will be included in all IEPs when appropriate.
  8. Students will be involved in IEP development and attend IEP meetings as early as is possible.
  9. Students at the Newmarket High School will be invited to the IEP meetings and have input to transition planning.
  
- Describe how individual student performance information is conveyed from grade to grade/school to school:
  1. Since the Newmarket School District is a small district with only two buildings, teachers and para-educators often have students for multiple years.
  2. The school psychologist who conducts all of the formal testing in the district works in both buildings.
  3. There are weekly staff meetings across grades in the elementary school and the Junior High/High School is beginning to discuss students, review NECAP and NWEA data.

4. Each spring at the elementary school, the grade six case manager meet with the Junior High School special education staff. The junior high school case managers conduct observations on the in-coming students.
  5. There are specific discussions with regard to the next grade placement.
  6. There is frequent communication and conversation between sending teacher/receiving teachers.
  7. IEPs are distributed to all staff.
  8. The communication between buildings continues throughout the year as needed, and includes frequent meetings with parents
- How will the district further explore the factors that have impacted poor scores for individual students on state assessments and in the general education curriculum?
    1. Results of the IEP review visits were included and examined during the 2010-2011 year long Focused Monitoring Process.
    2. Junior and Senior High Schools will develop a comprehensive plan for NECAP administration to include staff training in consistent administration, optimal scheduling, providing accommodations to all students, and incentives for student participation.
    3. All students will be provided with access to the general education curriculum and will be taught by staff certified in appropriate subject areas.
    4. Develop IEP goals to address areas on the NECAP which are below proficient.
  - Strengths and suggestions identified related to IEP development/progress monitoring and services:

*Strengths:*

1. Staff members who were involved in the IEP Review Process demonstrated a strong understanding of each student and were committed to provide needed supports and services to each student.
2. Parent to teacher and teacher to parent communication and rapport appear strong and effective. Staff members frequently talk and correspond with parents especially at the elementary school.
3. The Collaboration between and among teaching staff and the administration is commendable.
4. At the elementary school, parents are involved in the development of the IEP with the case manager from early draft stages until it is presented and agreed upon at the Team Meeting.
5. The district preschool program appears to be very effective. The preschool staff members have structured time to collaborate and partner effectively with parents.

*Suggestions:*

1. At the preschool level growth from previous IEPs should be included in the present level of the new IEP.
2. The Preschool staff should determine if it is possible to use more specific tools to measure student progress and they should share PALM results with related service providers.
3. The Speech Language Pathologist should review her role in the development of functional needs on the pre-school IEP front pages.
4. At Newmarket Elementary School, the administration should determine how to maintain the integrity and fidelity of related services and RtI in the event of future budget cuts.

5. The Newmarket Junior High School should determine how teachers can meet on a regular basis with para-educators.
6. Develop a better schedule for the administration of NECAP and insure that all students receive the accommodations that they require.
7. At the Newmarket High School IEP teams should develop more descriptive profiles based on data from multiple measures. Provide staff with training in Transition planning including measurable post-secondary goals and objectives.

#### **District Wide Commendations:**

- An Rtl model is well established at the elementary school and includes a comprehensive assessment system of formative and summative assessments and collaborative data teams that meet weekly.
- At the Junior High School there is initial Rtl implementation with Reading offered 50 minutes every day and 100 minutes two days a week as Tier I. Tier II utilizes the double block of Language Arts for more intensive remediation.
- At the Junior High School, the students are offered a Student Advisory period in their homeroom for 25 minutes daily and this includes a Food Pantry for students who need breakfast.
- The Newmarket School District has developed a comprehensive Staff Development Program.
- Given the limitations and frustrations that arise from the current Technology in the school district, teachers should be commended for their hard work and determination to meet the needs of all students.

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

As part of the Focused Monitoring data collection activities, the LEA Plan, which includes Special Education procedures, was reviewed. In addition, personnel rosters were submitted to verify that staff providing services outlined in IEPs are qualified for the positions they hold. Also, program descriptions were reviewed and verified, along with follow up and review of any newly developed programs or changes to existing approved Special Education programs.

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

A random review of one (1) student file for children with disabilities placed out of district was conducted and the annual goals were not measureable.

#### **Indicator 13 Transition Plan Review:**

A random review of an additional six (6) student Transition Plans for students with disabilities who are over sixteen (16) years of age was conducted. None of the Transition Plans met requirements for Indicator 13 and one student over the age of 16 did not have a Transition Plan contained in the IEP.

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

One (1) student file for children with disabilities attending a Charter School was reviewed. The IEP goal was not measureable since there was no baseline or indication of how the goal would be measured. There was no evidence to indicate that the student had been included in the transition planning and there was no evidence that the student had been invited to attend the IEP meeting.

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

As part to the Focused Monitoring Compliance Component, the NHDOE reviews all requests for new programs in the district, and/or requests for changes to existing programs. As such, the NHDOE worked with the NEWMARKET SCHOOL DISTRICT in the review of the following changes to existing approved programs:

There are no New Programs or Changes to Existing Programs in the Newmarket School District.

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

Preschool	1
Elementary School	2
Middle School	2
High School, Age below 16	1
High School, Age 16 or above	1
Indicator 13 Age 16 or over	6
Out of District Grade 7	1
Charter School Student- Grade 10	1
Total Number of IEPs Reviewed	15

**Findings of Noncompliance Identified as a Result of the  
NHDOE Compliance and IEP Review Visit:**

As a result of the fifteen (15) IEPs that were selected for the IEP Reviews on November 14 -15, November 16, and December 16, 2011 the following Systemic Findings of Noncompliance were identified:

**Child Specific Findings of Noncompliance**

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

**Ed 1109**

**34 CFR 300.306 Determination of Eligibility**

One (1) of the fifteen IEPs reviewed did not utilize multiple measures for decision-making when developing the IEP.

**Ed 1109**

**CFR 300.320 Goals and Objectives/Benchmarks**

One (1) of the fifteen (15) IEPs reviewed did not clearly describe the relationship between the goals and the student’s needs, resulting from the disability, as described in the present levels of performance.

Six (6) of the fifteen (15) IEPs reviewed did not include annual, measurable goals, including baseline data indicating the student’s academic and functional performance levels from which the goal will be measured.

Three (3) of the fifteen (15) IEPs did not state the student’s expected proficiency levels/targets.

One (1) of the fifteen (15) IEPs did not include a benchmark or short-term objective used to measure the student’s progress toward the annual goals.

One (1) of the fifteen (15) IEPs did not include goals, benchmarks or objectives that met the needs of the student in order to participate and make progress in the general education curriculum.

Two (2) of the fifteen (15) IEPs reviewed were not written in a manner useful to the general education teacher.

One (1) of the fifteen (15) IEPs reviewed did not include a statement of the transition services needed for a student who will turn age 14 during the IEP service period.

**Ed 1109.01 (a) (1)**

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

**CFR 300.320 Transition**

One (1) student over the age of 16 did not have a transition plan in the IEP.

Eight (8) of the fifteen (15) IEPs reviewed did not meet the requirements of Indicator 13, including no appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that cover education or training, employment, and, as needed, independent living.

Three (3) of the fifteen (15) IEPs reviewed did not update the postsecondary goals annually.

Seven (7) of the fifteen (15) IEPs reviewed did not include goals based on age appropriate transition assessments.

One (1) of the fifteen (15) IEPs reviewed did not include annual IEP goals related to the student's transitional services needs.

Five (5) of the fifteen (15) IEPs reviewed did not present services that would reasonably enable the student to meet his/her postsecondary goal.

Six (6) of the fifteen (15) IEPs did not present evidence that the student was invited to the IEP meeting where transitional services were discussed.

**Ed 1109**

**34 CFR 300.320 Measuring Progress**

One of the fifteen (15) IEPs reviewed did not indicate how the progress toward meeting the annual goals would be measured

**Systemic Findings of Noncompliance**

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

**Ed 1109**

**CFR 300.320 Goals and Objectives/Benchmarks**

Six (6) of the fifteen (15) IEPs reviewed did not include annual, measurable goals, including baseline data indicating the student's academic and functional performance levels from which the goal will be measured.

Three (3) of the fifteen (15) IEPs did not state the student's expected proficiency levels/targets.

**Ed 1109.01 (a) (1)**

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

**CFR 300.320 Transition**

Eight (8) of the fifteen (15) IEPs reviewed did not meet the requirements of Indicator 13, including lack of appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that cover education or training, employment, and, as needed, independent living.

Seven (7) of the fifteen (15) IEPs reviewed did not include goals based on age appropriate transition assessments.

Five (5) of the fifteen (15) IEPs reviewed did not present services that would reasonably enable the student to meet his/her postsecondary goal.

Six (6) of the fifteen (15) IEPs did not present evidence that the student was invited to the IEP meeting where transitional services were discussed.

**Conclusions:**

The IEP review process conducted in the Newmarket School District was fully supported by faculty and administration. The visiting team was welcomed and staff actively participated in the IEP review process. Preparation for the review process was thorough and it was clear that staff and administration were interested in participating in a dialogue about the process of IEP development and monitoring of student progress. The collaboration of regular and special education staff was evident in the IEP documents presented and was further supported by staff willingness to actively participate in the Focused Monitoring Process. This was most evident with IEPs review for the pre-school and elementary students. The results of this review were an accurate representation of what occurs on a consistent basis for all students with disabilities at the school.

**NEXT STEPS**

The Newmarket School District is committed to improving student performance for all students, including students who are identified as having an educational disability. Through careful analysis and reflection, the Focus Monitoring Team, with the support of Administration, has agreed to implement the action plan included in this report with an eye towards sustainability and continued improvement. Our next steps include various trainings for all staff, improvement in student IEP writing for specific academic skill improvement at the upper grades, and preparation for NECAP administration with skilled proctors and students who understand what accommodations they need in order to demonstrate their learning and why. Our math programs and available levels of math instruction will be addressed and revised. We look forward to block scheduling a new initiative for the Junior/Senior High School, which will open many doors to innovative ways of meeting individual student needs.

The Leadership and Achievement teams would like to thank everyone involved in this effort, especially fellow team members who served on these teams. This reflection, study and ultimate plan to improve student achievement could not have been developed without the assistance of each and every one of you.

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

SAU#: <b>SAU #31</b>	NAME OF SAU: <b>Newmarket School District</b>	SUPERINTENDENT: <b>Dr. James Hayes, Ed.D.</b>						
SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTOR: <b>Jean Parsons</b>					DATE OF PLAN: <b>4/20/12</b>			
<b>SYSTEMIC FINDINGS OF NON-COMPLIANCE:</b> Systemic Findings of Non-compliance are defined as systemic deficiencies that have been identified through the IEP Review Process, which are in violation of state and federal special education rules and regulations.								
The NHDOE, Bureau of Special Education, requires that all <u>Systemic</u> Findings of Non-compliance be corrected as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the final report date – <b>February 16, 2013</b> <b>PLEASE NOTE:</b> If applicable, <u>Child Specific</u> Findings of Non-compliance identified through the IEP Review Process and noted separately on the Assurance Form, are required to be resolved within 45 days.							For Use By Technical Assistant At Follow Up Visit	
SYSTEMIC FINDINGS OF NON-COMPLIANCE	CORRECTIVE ACTION	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	EVIDENCE OF COMPLIANCE AND EVIDENCE OF IMPACT ON STUDENTS, AS APPROPRIATE	TIMELINE (Check appropriate columns below to indicate expected completion time for each activity.)				Date of follow up visit (or date of acceptance of evidence submitted to indicate correction):
				5/12	8/12	11/12	2/13	<b>Note as Met, In Process or Not Met</b>
<b>Ed 1109 CFR 300.320 Goals and Objectives/Benchmarks</b>	<b>All IEPs have been corrected either by writing new IEPs or amending the old IEP with the needed corrections/additions. All have been approved and signed by parents.</b>	<b>NJSHS Special Education Coordinator and student case managers</b>	<b>IEPs in student special education files reflect needed improvements.</b>		<b>X</b>			
<b>Ed 1109.01 (a) (1) 20 U.S.C. 1416 (a) (3) (B); CFR 300.320 Transition</b>	<b>All IEPs have been corrected either by writing a new IEP or amending an old IEP with the needed corrections/additions. All IEPs have parent signatures, indicating approval.</b>	<b>NJSHS Special Education Coordinator and student case managers.</b>	<b>IEPs in student special education files. Reflect needed improvements.</b>		<b>X</b>			

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

SAU#: <b>SAU # 31</b>		NAME OF SAU: <b>Newmarket School District</b>		SUPERINTENDENT: <b>Dr. James Hayes Ed.D.</b>	
SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTOR: <b>Jean Parsons</b>				DATE OF PLAN: <b>4/20/2012</b>	
<p><b>SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:</b> Suggestions for improvement, simply stated, are recommendations provided by the visiting team that are intended to strengthen and enhance programs, services, instruction and professional development. While the school or district is not held accountable for follow up on suggestions for improvement, the NHDOE strongly encourages the school or district to seriously consider the suggestions, determine which are most appropriate, and address those in the corrective action plan.</p>					<p>For Use By Technical Assistant At <b>Follow Up Visit</b></p>
SUGGESTIONS	IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITY	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	EVIDENCE OF COMPLIANCE AND EVIDENCE OF IMPACT ON STUDENTS, AS APPROPRIATE	TIMELINE	Date of follow up visit (or date of acceptance of evidence submitted to indicate correction):
					<b>Note as Met, In Process or Not Met</b>
1. At the preschool level growth from previous IEPs should be included in the present level of the new IEP.	IEPs are written with previous growth included in new IEP.	Preschool Teachers, Related Service Providers, Sped. Coord & Sped. Dir.	Preschool IEPs with growth from previous IEP included in current IEP.	6/1/12	
2. The Preschool staff should determine if it is possible to use more specific tools to measure student progress and they should share PALM results with related service providers.	POM results are shared with related service providers	Preschool Teachers	Student record reflects sharing of test results with related service providers.	6/1/12	
3. The Speech Language Pathologist should review her role in the development of functional needs on the pre-school IEP front pages	SLP contributes to development of functional needs on preschool IEP student profile page	SLP and preschool team, sped. coordinator, sped director.	IEPs contain more speech/language details on functional needs when they exist for the specific student	6/15/12	
4. At Newmarket Elementary School, the administration should determine how to maintain the integrity and fidelity of related	All related services are provided with new schedule. All RTI	Building Principal, Director of Student Services	All Programs are delivered, all student services are provided.	4/20/2012	

services and Rtl in the event of future budget cuts.	is delivered by appropriate service providers.	Related Service Providers, Reading and Math Teachers			
5. The Newmarket Junior High School should determine how teachers can meet on a regular basis with para-educators.	NJSHS is changing to Block Schedule in FY 2013. The new schedule will accommodate this.	Jr. High School Principal, Guidance Director (scheduler) Director Student Services	New Block Schedule is completed.	6/30/12	
6. Develop a better schedule for the administration of NECAP and insure that all students receive the accommodations that they require.	Meet with Principal to gain his agreement. Modify NECAP schedule.	NJSHS Principal, Building Sped. Coordinator	NECAP schedule with accommodation needs reflected in schedule and location of test administration	9/30/2012	
7. At the Newmarket High School IEP teams should develop more descriptive profiles based on data from multiple measures. Provide staff with training in Transition planning including measurable post-secondary goals and objectives.	Transition Planning and goal writing was provided to all sped teachers grade 8-12 on 1/25/2012. Review of IEPs is on-going.	Director of Student Services	Student IEPs containing compliant transition goals	6/15/12	

## **ACTION PLAN**

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

## **NEWMARKET SCHOOL DISTRICT ACTION PLAN**

**MEASURABLE STUDENT LEARNING GOAL:** In 2012 students with IEPs at NHS achieved a math index score of 36.9, and NJHS students achieved a math index score of 52.5; by the end of 2012 students with IEPs at NHS will achieve a math index score of 50, and NJHS students with IEPs will achieve a math index score of 62.

**OBJECTIVE #1 :** To refine IEP focus on Student skill weakness and provision of targeted research-based programming that addresses individual student needs.

STRATEGIES/ ACTIVITIES	ESTIMATED RESOURCES Budget, Human Resources, Materials	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE Leader and Participants	TIMELINE Begin/End	MONITORING OF IMPLEMENTATION Evidence		EVALUATING RESULTS Evidence of Effectiveness	
				What & by whom	When	What & by whom	When
1. Student IEP goals will address all identified areas of academic and functional goals.	In-house personnel	Director of Sp. Ed. and Building Special Ed. Coordinator, Special education team members	4/20/2012 On-going	What & by whom	When	What & by whom	When
				IEPs will be reviewed by Building Sp. Ed. Coordinator	8/30/12	Each student IEP at JSHS contain appropriate goals.	Before IEP is offered to parent.
2. A comprehensive system will be in place to ensure that all IEP goals are being addressed.	In-house personnel	JSHS Sp. Ed. Coordinator, Special education case managers	8/30/12 On-going	Building Sp. Ed. coordinator and Sp. Ed. Director will meet monthly with Sp. Ed. Teachers to monitor.	8/30/12	Monthly meetings will occur with agendas including addressing all IEP goals.	Monthly
3. Additional levels of support in math will be available to students with identified math needs.	Budget: purchase additional student computers, add additional minutes to weekly math instruction.	Sp. Ed. and Reg. Ed. Administration	6/30/12 End 6/30/13	Additional computers will be purchased and math class schedule will show additional time each week.	8/30/12	Student achievement will improve: ALEKS bi-weekly assessments	Bi-weekly.
4. Continued refinement of math lab support to ensure alignment with specific skill deficiencies.	In-house personnel	Math teachers, Special Education Teachers	4/30/12 On-going	Math lab design will be modified to assess bi-weekly to measure student skill attainment and direct instruction will re-evaluate results of the assessments.	8/30/12	Bi-weekly assessment results will be collected.	Bi-weekly

OBJECTIVE #2: By June of 2013 NJSHS will standardize, develop, deliver and manage NECAP administration to include all accommodations that students with IEPs need to demonstrate their knowledge.

STRATEGIES/ ACTIVITIES	ESTIMATED RESOURCES Budget, Human Resources, Materials	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE Leader and Participants	TIMELINE Begin/End	MONITORING OF IMPLEMENTATION Evidence		EVALUATING RESULTS Evidence of Effectiveness
				What & by whom	When	What & by whom
1. Prior to District and State assessments accommodations will be reviewed and revised.	In –house personnel	Dir. Sp. Ed. and Building Sp. Ed. Coordinator Special Ed. Case managers	8/30/12 Through 9/30/12	Accommodations will be reviewed/ during Teacher workshop days prior to school’s opening, and will be revised during Sept.	8/30/2012 Through 9/30/12	Students will use accommodations they are entitled to. Observation by Administration
2. Students will review accommodations with their case manager prior to NECAP administration.	In –house personnel	Special Education Case managers and students	8/30/12 Through 9/30/12	Reviews will happen during Study skills lab or time arranged between case manager and student	8/30/12 Through 9/30/12	Students will know what and why accommodations are needed. Test scores will improve as a result of using accommodations.
3. Building-wide training on NECAP administration to ensure standardized implementation.	Training during Teacher workshop days prior to school’s opening in August	Guidance Director and Administration	8/27/12 through 8/30/12	Training will occur, opening meeting agenda will include training time for all staff.	8/27/12 Through 8/30/12	Training will occur. Administration will attend training.
4. Specific training for Proctors to ensure appropriate accommodations are provided.	Training during the week prior to NECAP administration in the fall and spring.	Guidance Director and Administration	Fall 2012, Spring 2013	Training will occur. Sign-In sheets for trainees. Outline of training topic will be provided.	Fall 2012 And Spring 2013	Appropriate student accommodations will be provided in each proctoring site. Administration and Guidance will review.

STRATEGIES/ ACTIVITIES	ESTIMATED RESOURCES Budget, Human Resources, Materials	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE Leader and Participants	TIMELINE Begin/End	MONITORING OF IMPLEMENTATION Evidence		EVALUATING RESULTS Evidence of Effectiveness
				What & by whom	When	
5. A comprehensive testing schedule will be developed and distributed to the entire staff.	In house personnel.	Guidance Director and Guidance Department and all staff	Prior to testing Fall 2012 & Prior to Spring testing 2013	What & by whom	When	What & by whom
				Schedules will be provided to all staff in staff mailboxes	Prior to Fall and Spring NECAP testing	All staff will know when and where NECAP testing will occur and why. Questions to the office will greatly decrease!
6. Student involvement in creating incentives for meeting individual growth targets or proficiency standards.	Budget to fund incentives, and in-house personnel	Administration and Students	Prior to testing fall 2012 & Spring 2013	Surveys will be collected from students for additional ideas. Ideas to be used will be announced at Class meetings and over morning announcements the week prior to testings.	Early fall 2012. & Spring 2013 prior to NECAP testing	Incentives will be announced and test scores will improve as a result of incentives with student buy-in.
7. Provide Professional development to teach test-taking strategies	In-house personnel	Administration and all professional and paraprofessional staff.	During opening teacher workshop days &/or prior to initial assessments fall 2012	Staff Development training will be provided by Administration.	During opening teacher workshop days &/or Prior to testing.	Test taking strategies will be taught in LA classes to ensure all students receive the instruction.  Student test scores will improve.

<p>8.Ensure that all students are learning test-taking strategies.</p>	<p>In-house personnel</p>	<p>Administration, teachers and students</p>	<p>Prior to fall 2012 NECAP test administration</p>	<p>LA department chair at high school and team leaders in each Jr. High team will ascertain that students are learning test taking strategies by reviewing teacher plans.</p>	<p>Prior to fall NECAP administration</p>	
--	---------------------------	--	---	---	---	--

## Addenda

File Review Summary Chart

Newmarket Elementary Restructuring Plan Summary

Newmarket Student Specific Data Chart - NECAP

### FILE REVIEW SUMMARY

Gender	Male 19	Female 9					
Identification	OHI-1 SLD - 18	OHI/SLD - 2 SP&L - 3	OHI/SP&L 1 SLD/SP&L 1				
Grade	6-3	7-7	8-12	9-1	10- 1	11-3	unknown 1
Date of determination	2000-2 2001-1 2002-2 2003-2 2004-2	2005-2 2006-4 2007-3 2008-2 2009-1	2010- 2 2011-1 unknown-3				
Years in district	1-1 2-2 4-3 6-1 7-4	8-1 9-2 10-2 11-4 12- 1	unknown 7				
# of different School Districts	1-15 2-1	3-4 4-2	unknown - 6				
Attended Preschool	Yes -12	no- 2	unknown - 14				
Time in Regular Ed	43% -1 71%-1 73%-1 75%-1	85%-1 86%-4 87% -7 100%-9	unknown 3				
% of Curriculum Modified	0%- 11 13% -1 50% 1 Unknown-15						
Reading Minutes/week	250- 5	750-2					

	500- 19	unknown-1		
Math Minutes/week	250 -13 300-12	500-1 750-1	unknown-1	
Math Modifications	Yes - 3	No -12	Unknown - 13	
Reading Modifications	Yes-3	No 12	Unknown-13	
Teacher Certification	Yes-22	No-1	Unknown - 4	
ESY	Yes -15	No-10	Unknown -3	
Regular Diploma	Yes- 23		Unknown -5	
Attendance	79%-2 80%-1 82%-1 87%-1 88%-3	90%-3 93%-3 94%-2 95%-2 96%-1	98%-2 99%-5 100%-1	
Goal Aligned with NECAP	Reading: Yes- 19 Math: Yes-14 Writing: Yes-15	No-1 No- 3 No-0		
Vocational Goal	Yes-2	no-5	n/a-8	unknown - 13
Related Services	Counseling SP, OT, PT, Counseling Speech, Counseling speech OT, Counseling Speech, OT, PT none unknown	3 1 9 3 1 2 3 7		
Para Professional minutes/day	30 1 60 2 120 2	168 1 180 3 240 5	300 9 unknown 5	
Extra Curricular	Yes 7	No 4	Unknown 17	
NECAP Accommodations				
NECAP Modifications				
Student Invited to IEP Meeting	Yes 12	n/a 5	no 2	unknown 9

Student Attended IEP Meeting	Yes-1 no-13 n/a- 8 unknown-6
Intellectual Range	70-80 1 70-90 2 89-90 - 2 90-100 4 100-110 2 80-110 4 90-115 2 100-120 1 80-100 3 70-105 2 65-115 1 unknown 4
Achievement	Reading 60 1 70 3 80 10 90 3 100 2 unknown  Math 70 3 80 11 90 1 100 1 unknown 4
To be added NECAP and NWEA Performance from 2005-2011	In progress

## RESTRUCTURING AT NEWMARKET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

While the bulk of the work of the Focused Monitoring Team has been at the junior/senior high school level, Newmarket Elementary School (NES) has been involved in the development of a Restructuring Plan. NES entered its 4<sup>th</sup> year as a School in Need of Improvement in the area of reading and as such was required to develop a Restructuring Plan during the school year with implementation planned for the 2012-2013 school year. As in many districts, the sub-group failing to meet proficiency on state assessments is that of students with educational disabilities.

During this year, staff spent many hours meeting under the direction of the Success Team providing input to address identified areas in need of improvement. The Success Team began its work in the spring of 2011. Members of the Team included classroom teachers, special educators, reading and other specialists, and administration (building and SAU). This Team worked throughout the 2011-2012 school year with groups of certified staff (with all certified staff participating) providing input as they prioritized 82 Indicators for Success. The result was a comprehensive and detailed 'voice' that was used to develop a Restructuring Plan. The Plan includes goals and objectives as well as a specific action items which when implemented will lead to improved student achievement. The Plan addresses three priority areas – team structure, effective teaching, and aligned standards, curriculum, instruction and assessment. All three goals will contribute to the overall aim: making the school experience as consistent and as integrated as it can be for all students, but especially those with educational disabilities.

Below is the draft of what the plan will look like when fully implemented (A DRAFT copy of the full plan may be found in the Appendix):

- A) Student achievement and organizational effectiveness will be improved by creating consistent Leadership Teams (administrators, leadership teams, staff, students, parents) across the school community. A broader leadership model will encourage the exchange of ideas about effective instructional practices among teachers, administrators, and parents.

The principal will manage the Leadership Team which will consist of the principal, assistant principal, teachers (1 from each grade level) and 2 teachers from Special Education/Related Services who will remain on the team for at least one year. The team will meet twice per month either before or after school up to one hour each meeting. The Leadership Team will discuss and advise on matters of curriculum, building climate, instruction, and professional development. They will coordinate communication between the Leadership Team and constituent groups. They will send out the agendas for meetings ahead of time and will share the leadership team minutes with the staff. A Leadership Team member will attend monthly paraprofessional meetings when necessary.

In addition every grade level and Special Education/Related Services will have a team that meets on a weekly basis. We will have cross grade level instructional teams to create a new curriculum guide and units for instruction based on Common Core Curriculum. We will continue with Data Teams to help guide instructional goals. (Included in this Objective are the following indicators: ID05, ID07, ID08, ID11, ID13)

- B) We will improve student achievement and teacher effectiveness by engaging teachers in ongoing professional development related to the adopted Danielson model. As part of their annual goal-setting, teachers will self-identify and work with peers to identify practices they need to improve, learn how to improve them, practice new strategies, and assess their effectiveness through reviewing student learning. Goals will also be reviewed and approved by the Principal. Since we made AYP in both reading and math

in 2012, we will continue providing PD in the strategies that contributed to this success - Key Three literacy strategies and Professor Sharma's strategies in mathematics instruction. (This also includes indicators: IF04, IF10.)

- C) All teachers will be guided by a document that aligns curriculum, instruction and assessment to Common Core Standards by 6/14/13. The document will be universally available - to teachers, administrators, and parents. Lessons will be designed with reference to Common Core Standards instead of GLEs. Multiple student assessments will help students, parents and teachers know the level of development of each student. We currently use multiple assessments (DIBELS, AIMSweb, NWEA, NECAP, Scott Foresman Reading, Everyday Math and teacher-created assessments) and it is anticipated that those that are curriculum based measures will be aligned with the Common Core as it becomes the national norm. New report cards will be developed in the school by 6/30/14. (Included in this Objective are the following indicators: IIA01, IIA02, IIC01, IID09, IIIA07.)

With the release of the 2012 AYP results, NES needed to make a decision. Since the school achieved AYP in both reading and mathematics it will not be required by the NHDOE to implement the Restructuring Plan. Instead, next year becomes a holding year awaiting 2013 AYP results to see if NES remains a School in Need of Improvement. Following a discussion with both the staff as a whole, it is the recommendation of the Success Team that the district proceed with implementation of the Plan pending its approval. Much of the work within the Plan is designed to improve student achievement and it makes sense to implement that work regardless of AYP status. The Restructuring Plan is currently being reviewed at the district SAU office before being submitted to the DOE for approval.

## STUDENT SPECIFIC DATA - NECAP

Name		DC	CS	EL	CH	JB	AM	AP	MD
DOB		4.3.1996	10.6.1996	9.26.1999	11.9.1998	5.11.1998	11.26.1998	8.22.1997	10.7.1994
Gender		M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
Grade		10	9	7	6	8	7	8	11
SASID									
Identification		OHI	SLD	SLD/SL	SLD	SLD	SLD	SLD	SLD
Date of Determination		5.3.2006	2.16.2005	2002	2008	2009	?	2006	2006
Years in School District		7	?	10	1	2.5	4	9	11
# of school districts attended		1	1	2	3		4	?	2
Attended preschool	?	yes	Yes	yes	no		?	Yes	no
Time in Reg Ed		87%	86%	87%	87%	71%	43%	100%	86%
% curriculum modified		0	0	13% reading			50% reading	0	0
Reading Minutes		250	250	500	750	500	500	500	250
Math Minutes		250	750	250	250	250	250	250	250
Math Modification		0	0	?	?	0%	100%	0	0
Reading Modification		0	0	?	?	0%	50%	0	0
Teacher Certification		yes	Yes	Yes	?	yes	no	yes	yes
ESY		No	Yes-R	Yes	Yes	yes	yes	yes	no

Regular Diploma		yes	Yes	Yes	?	yes	yes	yes	yes
Name		DC	CS	EL	CH	JB	AM	AP	MD
Attendance		93%	94%	99%	82%	79%	?	98%	94%
Goal aligned with Necap		Writing	Reading Writing	R,M, W	R, M, W	M, R	M, R	R-no m-yes	M-no
Vocational Goal		no	No	No	No	n/a			no
Necap accommodations		A2, A3, A8 B2, B3, T1	A7, B2, B3, C4, C7, T3, S1, P2						
Necap modifications		none	none	none					
Necap ALP		no	no	no	no	no	no		
Related Services		counseling	none	SP, OT, PT, Coun			Sp, C	Sp	C
Para Professional		60 min/day	300 min/day	300 min/day	2hr/day-I		2.8 Hr/day-G	3 hr/day G	5 hr/day G
Extra Curricular						no	no	yes	no
Student invited to IEP meeting		yes	Yes	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	yes
Student attended IEP meeting		no	no	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	no
Intellectual		88-102	95-100	100-109	97-113	80-86	82-85 mem 68		104-108
Achievement		R 97 M99	R 83 M	LA-A	R 80	R 109	R 69 m 74		Av

			86		M 84	M83	w 71		
NECAP 2011 M/R		none	none	SBP/SBP			SBP/SBP		SBP/PP
NECAP 2010 M/R	NECAP 2011 M/R	none	none	SBP/SBP	SBP/SBP	SBP/PP	SBP/	SBP/PP	
Name		DC	CS	EL	CH	JB	AM	AP	MD
NECAP 2009 M/R	NECAP 2011 M/R	P/P	PP/pp	SBP/PP		SBP/PP		SBP/PP	
NECAP 2008 M/R	NECAP 2011 M/R	P/PP	PP/PP	PP/PP		PP/PP	alt/alt	SBP/PP	PP/PP
NECAP 2007 M/R	NECAP 2011 M/R	PP/PP	P/PP	PP/PP		SBP/SBP		PP/PP	PP/PP
NECAP 2006 M/R	NECAP 2011 M/R	PP/PP	PP/SBP	PP/SBP		SBP/PP		PP/SBP	PP/PP
NECAP 2005 M/R	NECAP 2011 M/R	P/SBP	PP/SBP	PP/SBP					PP/P
NEWEA 2011 M/R	NECAP 2011 M/R	A/A (p/p)	A (p)	SBP/SBP					SBP/PP
NEWEA 2010 M/R	NECAP	HA/A	LA/L	SBP/SBP	SBP/SBP	SBP/PP	SBP/SBP	SBP/PP	PP

	2011	(p/p)	(pp/sbp)						
NEWEA 2009 M/R		A/A (p/p)	A/LA (p/pp)	SBP/PP		SBP/PP	SBP/	SBP/PP	
NEWEA 2008 M/R		A/HA (p/p)	A/LA (p/pp)	PP/PP		PP/PP	Alt-P/ALT-P	SBP/PP	PP/PP
NEWEA 2007 M/R		LA/LA (bp/bp)	A/LA (p/pp)	PP/PP		SBP/SBP		PP/PP	P/P
NEWEA 2006 M/R		LA/A (bp/p)	BA/LA (P/PP)	PP/PP		SBP/SBP		PP/SBP	P/P

Name		CR	JD	JL.	EB	HW	HH	TB	AS
DOB		9.27.1998	6.4.1998	6.29.1995	4.20.1995	6.12.2000	12.10.1999	5.29.1999	4.25.1999
Gender		F	F	M	M	F	F	M	M
Grade		8	8	11	11	6	6	7	7
SASID									
Identification		SLD	Sp & L	SLD	SLD	SLD	SLD	SLD	Sp & L
Date of Determination		2004	2001	2003	2000	2007	2007	2007	2004
Years in School District		11	9	11	11	7	7	6	8
# of schools		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

attended									
Attended preschool ?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes		
Time in Reg Ed	86%	100%	86%	100%	85%	100%	100%	87%	
% curriculum modified	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Reading Minutes	250	500	250	250	500	500	500	500	500
Math Minutes	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	300	300
Math Modification	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	MATH
Reading Modification	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	SEP CLASS
Teacher Certification	yes	yes	yes	yes	No	yes	yes	yes	yes
Name	CR	JD	JL	EB	HW	HH	TB	AS	
ESY	Yes (did not attend)	yes	no	no	Yes	yes	No	yes	
Regular Diploma	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Attendance	98%	100%	90%	90%	88%	90%	93%	96%	
Goal aligned with Necap	?	R yes, M no	R yes W yes M no	W yes M yes	M Yes	M Yes R Yes	R	R M W	
Vocational Goal	n/a	n/a	yes	yes	n/a	n/a	n/a		
Necap accommodations									

Necap modifications			none						
Necap ALP		no	no	no	no	no	no	no	
Related Services		Sp, C, ST Skill	Sp, C			Sp, C	none	Sp, C	Sp, C
Para Professional		4 hr day/G	15 hr/week	4 hr/day G	5hr/day G	2 hr/day G	1 hr/day G	4 hr/day G	5 hr/day G
Extra Curricular		yes	yes	no	yes				
Student invited to IEP meeting		n/a	?	yes	yes	n/a	n/a	yes	yes
Student attended IEP meeting		n/a	?	yes	no	n/a	n/a	no	no
Intellectual		89-109	74-84	94-99	98-100	72 NV 104 V	94-96	101-113	73-76
Name		CR	JD	JL.	EB	HW	HH	TB	AS
Achievement		R80 M88	R 76 M ? W?	M 89 W 80 R?	R 91 W 86 M	R 87 M 77 W	R 85 W 89 M	R 85 M 104	R 80 M 78
NECAP 2011 M/R			SBP/SBP	SBP/PP	SBP/PP			SBP/SBP	
NECAP 2010 M/R	NECAP 2011 M/R	PP/PP	SBP/SBP			P/P	SBP/PP		SBP/SBP
NECAP 2009 M/R	NECAP 2011	SBP	SBP/SBP	SBP /PP		SBP/P	PP/PP	PP	

	M/R								
NECAP 2008 M/R	NECAP 2011 M/R	SBP/PP	SBP/SBP	SBP/PP	SBP/P	PP/P	PP/PP		
NECAP 2007 M/R	NECAP 2011 M/R	PP/PP	SBP/SBP	PP/PP	SBP/P		SBP/	PP/SBP	
NECAP 2006 M/R	NECAP 2011 M/R	SBP/SBP	SBP/SBP		PP/P			PP/SBP	
NECAP 2005 M/R	NECAP 2011 M/R			PP/SBP	PP/P				
NEWEA 2011 M/R	NECAP 2011 M/R		SBP/SBP	SBP/PP	SBP/P				
NEWEA 2010 M/R	NECAP 2011	PP/PP	SBP/SBP			P/P	SBP/PP	LAV/LAV	
NEWEA 2009 M/R		SBP	SBP/SBP	SBP/PP		SBP/P	PP/PP		
NEWEA 2008 M/R		SBP/PP	SBP/SBP	SBP/PP	SBP/P	PP/P	PP/SBP	LAV/LAV	
NEWEA 2007 M/R		PP/PP	SBP/SBP	PP/PP	SBP/P			LAV/LAV	
NEWEA 2006 M/R		PP/SBP	SBP/SBP		PP/P				

Name	PV	SR	AS	BB	JW	SG	PL	SM
DOB	8.11.1998	11.19.1997	7.25.1998	6.6.1998	2.26.1998	3.17.1997	2.20.1998	
Gender	M	F	F	M	M	M	M	M
Grade	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	
SASID								
Identification	SLD	SLD/OHI	SLD	SLD	OHI/SLD	OHI/SP&L		
Date of Determination	2005	2002	2011	2008		2000		
Years in School District		10	2	4		12		
# of schools attended	2	2	4+	3+		2		
Attended preschool ?					yes	yes		
Time in Reg Ed	73%	87%	74%		87%	100%	100%	
% curriculum modified								
Reading Minutes	750	500	500	500	500	500	500	
Math Minutes	300	300	300	500	300	300	300	
Math Modification	yes							

Reading Modification		yes							
Name		PV	SR	AS	BB	JW	SG	PL	SM
Teacher Certification			yes		yes			Yes	yes
ESY			No	Yes	No			Yes	no
Regular Diploma			yes		yes			Yes	yes
Attendance		99%	95%	79%	93%	95%	99%	997%	87%
Goal aligned with Necap		R	R W	M W	M R W	M R W	R W		
Vocational Goal									
Necap accommodations									
Necap modifications									
Necap ALP									
Related Services		OT, C	SP, C	C		SP, C	SP, OT, PT		
Para Professional		2.5 hr/wk	4 hr/day G	3 hr/day G	4 hr/day	5 hrs/day G	5 hrs/day G		
Extra Curricular		yes							
Student invited to IEP meeting		yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		no		
Student attended		No	No	No	No		no		

IEP meeting									
Intellectual		110-120	79-105	80-102	89-105		85-98		
Achievement		R 82 M 106 W	R BAV	R Av M Low	R 91 M 89		R 78 M 85 W		
Name		PV	SR	AS	BB	JW	SG	P L	SM
NECAP 2011 M/R		PP/PP	PP/SBP	SBP/P	BP/PP	PP/SBP	PP/SBP	P/PP	PP/PP
NECAP 2010 M/R	NECAP 2011 M/R		PP/PP						
NECAP 2009 M/R	NECAP 2011 M/R	PP/SBP	SBP/PP			PP/		P	P
NECAP 2008 M/R	NECAP 2011 M/R	P/SBP	P/PP			P/PP	SBP/PP	P/PP	P/P
NECAP 2007 M/R	NECAP 2011 M/R	P/SBP				PP/SBP	SBP/PP	P/PP	P/P
NECAP 2006 M/R	NECAP 2011 M/R	P				PP/PP	SBP/PP	P/SBP	PP/PP
NECAP 2005 M/R	NECAP 2011 M/R								

NEWEA 2011 M/R	NECAP 2011 M/R								
NEWEA 2010 M/R	NECAP 2011								
NEWEA 2009 M/R									
NEWEA 2008 M/R									
NEWEA 2007 M/R									
NEWEA 2006 M/R									

Name		EP	BP	OL	TH				
DOB		5.24.1999	11.29.1998	7.2.1997	4.6.1999				
Gender		F	M	F	F				
Grade		7	7	8	7				
SASID									
Identification		SLD	SLD	SLD	SP & L				
Date of Determination		2010	2010	2003	2006				
Years in School District				7	4				
# of schools attended				3	3				

Attended preschool	?								
Time in Reg Ed		100%	100%	100%	87%				
% curriculum modified									
Reading Minutes		500	500	500	500				
Math Minutes		300	300	300	300				
Name		EP	BP	OL	TH				
Math Modification									
Reading Modification									
Teacher Certification		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes				
ESY		No	Yes	No	Yes				
Regular Diploma		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes				
Attendance		99%		80%	88%				
Goal aligned with Necap		M	M R W	R W	R W				
Vocational Goal									
Necap accommodations									
Necap modifications									
Necap ALP									
Related Services			SP	SP	SP, C				

Para Professional			5 hr day G		5 hrs/day G				
Extra Curricular				yes					
Student invited to IEP meeting				yes	yes				
Student attended IEP meeting				no	no				
Name		EP	BP	OL	TH				
Intellectual		83-98	83-97	65-115 M	76-85				
Achievement		M low Av	R 71 M 81 W	R 81 M 86 W	R 83 M 83				
NECAP 2011 M/R		SBP/P	BP/PP	SBP/PP	PP/PP				
NECAP 2010 M/R	NECAP 2011 M/R								
NECAP 2009 M/R	NECAP 2011 M/R	SBP	P	SBP	P				
NECAP 2008 M/R	NECAP 2011 M/R	SBP/P	P/PP	SBP/PP	SBP/SBP				
NECAP 2007 M/R	NECAP 2011	SBP/P	P/PP	PP/PP	SBP/SBP				

	M/R								
NECAP 2006 M/R	NECAP 2011 M/R	P/SBP	PP/PP		PP/PP				
NECAP 2005 M/R	NECAP 2011 M/R								
NEWEA 2011 M/R	NECAP 2011 M/R								
NEWEA 2010 M/R	NECAP 2011								
NEWEA 2009 M/R									
NEWEA 2008 M/R									
NEWEA 2007 M/R									
NEWEA 2006 M/R									