

# NH Part B

# FFY2014 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

**General Supervision System:**

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

New Hampshire has a responsibility, under federal law, to have a system of general supervision that monitors the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) by school districts. The general supervision system is accountable for identifying and correcting noncompliance with IDEA and the New Hampshire Rules for the Education of Children with Disabilities, as well as for promoting continuous improvement. As stated in section 616 of 2004 amendments to the IDEA, "The primary focus of Federal and State monitoring activities described in paragraph (1) shall be on -

(A) Improving educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities; and

(B) Ensuring that States meet the program requirements under this part, with a particular emphasis on those requirements that are most closely related to improving educational results for children with disabilities."

There are eight components that comprise NH's general supervision system. It is important to note that although the components are presented separately here, they each connect, interact and articulate requirements to form a comprehensive system. The general supervision system for NH has the following components.

- State Performance Plan (SPP)
- Integrated Monitoring Activities
- Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation
- Data on Processes and Results
- Targeted Technical Assistance and Professional Development
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives and Sanctions
- Effective Dispute Resolution
- Fiscal Management

*State Performance Plan:* The State Performance Plan (SPP) is a blueprint for systems change for special education in New Hampshire. It is a six year plan and annual report submitted to the USDOE Office of Special Education in February of each year. The plan spans FFY 2013-FFY 2018. It is comprised of 17 indicators and is developed with broad, ongoing stakeholder input. Baseline data and targets for performance are established for each indicator and performance is reported in each year. It incorporates a variety of methods including the use of desk audits, on-site monitoring and data collection to determine performance and compliance. Throughout the plan, the Bureau of Special Education seeks to align across the NH Department of Education and across other agencies and organizations to maximize results. The new Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), is part of OSEP's Results Driven Accountability (RDA). All the components of the general supervision system are woven together in

the SPP. For example, *Targeted technical assistance* is provided to districts when the review of *Data on Processes and Results* indicates that there are concerns with local *Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation*. This can result in *Improvement, Correction, Incentives and Sanctions*, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 and as laid out in IDEA and NH laws.

*Integrated Monitoring Activities: Compliance & Improvement Monitoring Review:* The special education compliance & improvement monitoring process integrates monitoring activities across several key components of the NH general supervision system. Key components that are integrated in this monitoring approach include:

- Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation
- Data on Processes and Results
- Targeted Technical Assistance and Professional Development
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives and Sanctions

The intent of the special education compliance improvement monitoring review is to improve student outcomes for students with IEPs by:

1. Ensuring districts understand and are implementing special education requirements in accordance with the *New Hampshire Rules for Education of Children with Disabilities* and the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*
2. Improving special education policies, procedures and practices
3. Identifying and supporting correction of noncompliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02

The Bureau of Special Education followed a standard process to select districts to participate in the special education compliance monitoring review. Each district was sorted into a cohort group based on the current October 1<sup>st</sup> fall enrollment. The Bureau of Special Education in conjunction with the Bureau of Data Management reviewed the previous year state assessment data for grades 4 and 8 for Reading and Math to determine the district in each cohort group that had the widest achievement gap for students without disabilities compared to students with disabilities.

Once a district was selected, the Bureau of Special Education contacted the district to discuss the special education compliance monitoring review with the school administration. A summary of the district makeup was developed (number of schools, fall enrollment and child count data, and grade span).

The Bureau of Special Education also provided targeted technical assistance regarding the special education compliance review process and completion of the self-assessment data collection form. The district was provided with a list of students with disabilities representative of the school based on grade level, disability, gender, and case manager. Students residing in the district who attended a charter school were also included in the representative sample. During the on-site visit, the monitoring team selected a subset of the student files to review.

The monitoring visit consisted of NHDOE team members and special education administrator(s) from other districts. The NHDOE team verified district identified evidence on the self-assessment data collection form. While the district completes the entire self-assessment, each file is reviewed using half of the self-assessment items. The self-assessment is divided into two sections, and on the day(s) of the monitoring visit, each of the files that were selected was assigned a section to be reviewed by the monitoring team. Half of the files are reviewed for one part of the self-assessment, and the other half are reviewed using the second part of the self-assessment.

The districts were encouraged to invite their special education staff as well as related service providers to attend the review which provided another targeted professional development opportunity. Staff members were provided the opportunity to learn about implementing IDEA and the *New Hampshire Rules for the Education of Children with Disabilities* and to engage in a professional discussion of best practices for ensuring improved outcomes for students with disabilities.

Each district must have policies, procedures, and effective implementation of practices that are aligned and support the implementation of IDEA and the *New Hampshire Rules for the Education of Children with Disabilities*. As part of the special education compliance monitoring review, the monitoring team reviewed the district's policies and procedures manual for compliance. In addition, the Bureau of Special Education cross checked the Annual Request for Federal Special Education Funds FY 2014, IDEA Part B Section 611 Assurances, and District Policies to Support Assurance Standards with the district's policy and procedures manual to ensure that document name, date adopted, and pages were valid. Districts are required to submit assurance statements with their local application for IDEA funds.

Based on the review of the district's policies and procedures manual, the monitoring team, as necessary, makes written findings of noncompliance. The findings must be corrected as soon as possible, but no later than 6 months from the date of the report. This allows the district to convene stakeholders and work with local school boards to create meaningful policy changes.

As part of the review of district's forms implementing the special education process, the Bureau of Special Education also looked for evidence that the policies and procedures were effectively being implemented. The NHDOE notifies the district in writing of any findings of noncompliance regarding the effective implementation of practices that must be corrected as soon as possible but no later than 3 months from the date of the report.

During the monitoring visit, the NHDOE identifies practices that have the potential to become problematic and potential remedies to these practices. Whereas these practices do not rise to the standard of noncompliance, and therefore require no corrective actions, the NHDOE believes that the practices are noteworthy to be addressed.

The Bureau of Special Education has reviewed the District special education staff certifications using the New Hampshire Educator Information System. The review process was for special education staff employed during current school year.

The data were generated and reviewed prior to the visit for each school being monitored. Each special education staff member's endorsement was compared to the subject/assignment. This process was used for special educators who hold Education Intern License 4 (INT4), Beginning Educator Certification (BEC) and Experienced Educator Certification (EEC). If the endorsement was appropriate to the subject/assignment then the renewal date of the endorsement was verified to ensure that the endorsement was current.

If there was a discrepancy between endorsement and the subject/assignment, the district was given an opportunity to verify the data. If the discrepancy could not be resolved, a finding of noncompliance was made based on Personnel Standards pursuant to Ed 1113.12, 34 CFR 300.18, and 34 CFR 300.156.

Districts are responsible for implementing the special education process in accordance with IDEA and the *New Hampshire Rules for the Education of Children with Disabilities*. The self-assessment data collection form highlights the district's understanding of the requirements of IDEA and the *New Hampshire Rules for the Education of Children with Disabilities* and was reviewed during the monitoring visit. Each area of compliance on the self-assessment data collection form clearly outlines whether the compliance is either a requirement of both IDEA and the *New Hampshire Rules for the Education of Children with Disabilities* or a requirement of solely the *New Hampshire Rules for the Education of Children with Disabilities*. During the monitoring visit, the monitoring team verified the evidence of compliance based on review of the student file, using the district's self-assessment as a resource.

Based on this review, the Bureau of Special Education identified findings of noncompliance with IDEA and the *New Hampshire Rules for the Education of Children with Disabilities*. The findings include the compliance citation, the area of compliance, the specific component of the regulation, and the required corrective actions, which include timelines for demonstrating correction of noncompliance. Student specific information was not included in the report but was provided to the district's Special Education Director.

There are two main components to the corrective actions entitled, "*Corrective Action of Individual Instance of Noncompliance*" and "*Corrective Action Regarding the Implementation of the Regulations*". The NHDOE timelines and process are designed to ensure verification of correction of noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case more than one year from the written finding. The first component, "corrective action of individual instance of noncompliance", is for any noncompliance concerning a child-specific requirement. There must be evidence that the district has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district. These areas must be corrected as soon as possible, with state timelines given in the report for each area. The NHDOE will return to the district, typically within 3 months from the date of the report, to verify compliance for each individual instance identified in the report. The second component, "corrective action regarding the implementation of the regulations" would typically involve the district providing professional development training to appropriate staff with regards to areas found to be in noncompliance. The NHDOE reviews updated data, collected after the identification of noncompliance, to demonstrate that the district is correctly implementing the specific requirement. This involves a follow-up on-site review of new files selected to ensure verification of correction of noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case more than one year from the written finding.

#### *Policies, Procedures and Effective Implementation*

In addition to monitoring policies, procedures and effective implementation through the SPP and the Compliance Monitoring Review, the Bureau has authority under RSA 186-C:5 III as follows: (d) On-site monitoring to further evaluate noncompliance, verify accuracy of data, assess the adequacy of the corrective action plans and their implementation, or other purposes as the department may determine, which may include: (1) Regular or periodic monitoring. (2) Special on-site monitoring required as part of the resolution or remediation of a complaint under 34 C.F.R. sections 300.151-152, or based on reliable information received indicating that there is reason to believe that there is noncompliance with standards. (3) Random or targeted visits which may be unannounced when the department determines that an unannounced visit is needed.

#### *Data on Processes and Results*

Data on processes and results are intricately woven into all areas of general supervision. The Bureau coordinates with the ED Facts stewards and other bureaus in the department to ensure fidelity of data and results. As part of the SPP process, the Bureau annually reports to the public on district performance compared to the state and established targets.

As required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), 34 CFR §300.600, the Bureau makes determinations annually on the performance of each public school district regarding the implementation of IDEA. These determinations are made in consideration of information obtained through the State's general supervision system (such as on-site monitoring visits, desk audits and other public information made available) including any audit findings and whether the data submitted by the local educational agency (LEA) is valid, reliable, and timely. The Bureau considers compliance and may consider other performance indicators in relation to the State's targets for improvement for these indicators. Based upon this information, this State must determine whether the district:

- meets the requirements and purposes of the IDEA;
- needs assistance in implementing the requirements of the IDEA;
- needs intervention in implementing the requirements of the IDEA; or
- needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of the IDEA. (300.603)

#### *Technical Assistance (TA) and Professional Development*

The New Hampshire Department of Education, Bureau of Special Education provides a tiered approach to technical assistance (TA) to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence based technical assistance and support to districts. The TA is closely paired with professional development (PD) to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities. In alignment with OSEP's TA & D Conceptual Framework, NH defines TA activities and the levels as follows:

#### *Technical Assistance Activities*

TA activities provide expertise in response to a client's defined problem or need in order to increase their capacity. Clients typically include local school district personnel and parents of children with disabilities but may also include other people interested in special education. New Hampshire has specified three categories of technical assistance—Universal, General; Targeted, Specialized and Intensive, Sustained. Each category is important and should be employed strategically to achieve the desired outcomes. The description below references NHDOE Bureau of Special Education (Bureau) staff however this model also applies to key initiatives funded with IDEA funds. Each of the levels of technical assistance includes a variety of professional development activities. These are designed to promote evidence-based practices, utilize the Participatory Adult Learning Strategies (PALS) model and take into consideration implementation science for scale-up and sustainability.

#### *Universal, General TA*

Passive technical assistance (TA) and information provided to independent users through their own initiative resulting in minimal interaction with NHDOE Bureau of Special Education (Bureau) staff. This includes one-time, invited or offered professional development presentations by Bureau staff such as trainings regarding: NHSEIS; application for reimbursement under the state fund of Catastrophic Aid; IDEA Federal Funds Application; and presentations at the NH Special Education Administrators Association. This category of TA also includes information or products, such as numbered Memorandums, guidebooks and manuals, and other resources downloaded from the Bureau's website by independent users. Brief communications by Bureau staff with recipients, either by telephone or email are considered Universal, General TA.

In addition, dissemination activities are considered Universal, General TA. This includes the distribution of information and resources to specific audiences with or without a direct request for this information. The intent is to collect, package and spread knowledge and the associated evidence-base in a way that can be accessed by audiences on their own schedules and without the direct intervention of the Bureau staff.

#### *Targeted, Specialized TA*

Targeted or specialized technical assistance (TA) are services developed based on needs common to multiple recipients and not extensively individualized. In this TA, a relationship is established between the TA recipient and one or more Bureau staff or the Bureau's designee. This category of TA can be one-time, labor-intensive events, such as on-site training to selected districts regarding the completion of the self-assessment data collection form prior to the compliance monitoring review. They can also be episodic, less labor-intensive events that extend over a period of time, such as facilitating a series of meetings with new Special Education Administrators or Special Education Coordinators or the Measurable Annual Goals trainings with a coaching component. Facilitating communities of practice can also be considered Targeted, Specialized TA.

Targeted TA is also provided to districts with findings of noncompliance relative to indicators in the State Performance Plan. Bureau staff offers TA and PD to district administrators and practitioners, as appropriate. This can include a review of data, identification root causes of noncompliance and support for district personnel with understanding the intricacies of the area being addressed. This TA may be mandated as part of the correction of noncompliance.

#### *Intensive, Sustained TA*

The Intensive or Sustained technical assistance (TA) services are often provided on-site and require a stable, ongoing relationship between the Bureau staff and the TA recipient. This category of TA should result in changes to policy, program, practice, or operations that support increased recipient capacity and/or improved outcomes at one or more systems levels. Frequently these TA services are defined as negotiated series of activities designed to reach a valued outcome. Many of the Bureau's initiatives provide intensive TA to districts that demonstrate readiness and a desire to engage in significant work. A non-exhaustive list of current intensive TA includes the UDL Academy, NH Next Steps, SEE Change, SWIFT, NH Safe Schools and Healthy Students State Planning grant, and NH Connections. These generally have an application process or some other selection criteria. Recipients' of these types of intensive TA commit to a multi-year process that includes data collection and evaluation of implementation.

Mandatory intensive TA may be provided to districts that are determined to need substantial intervention with the implementation of IDEA. Bureau staff and district leadership work closely to identify root causes that impact the determination and to develop and implement a long-term plan to remedy areas of concern.

#### *Improvement, Correction, Incentives and Sanctions*

By virtue of State Law and Regulation, the Bureau applies enforcement procedures subsequent to the issuance of corrective actions specified in the orders resulting from a complaint investigated, a due process hearing, or a monitoring activity. The Bureau monitors the execution of the corrective actions. At the conclusion of the time limit specified, the Bureau generates a written report indicating whether the issues have been resolved, and if not the extent to which the agency had taken corrective action to achieve compliance with the IDEA and the NH Rules for the Education of Children with Disabilities. In the event the written report shows that the agency has not complied with orders issued by the department, the Commissioner of Education gives written notice of the further enforcement action to be taken. When taking enforcement action, the Commissioner considers:

- (1) Severity, length and/or the repetitive nature of the same or other noncompliance;
- (2) Whether good faith effort was made to correct the problem;
- (3) The impact on children who are entitled to FAPE; and
- (4) Whether the nature of the noncompliance is individual or systemic.

Enforcement actions include but are not be limited to:

- (1) Corrective action plan development, implementation, and monitoring;
- (2) Voluntary and mandatory technical assistance as determined by the department;
- (3) Mandatory, targeted professional development as determined by the department;
- (4) Directives ordering specific corrective or remedial actions, including but not limited to withdrawing program approval, pending an appeal;
- (5) Targeting or redirecting the use of federal special education funds in the areas of concern;
- (6) Formal referral to the bureau of credentialing for review;
- (7) Order the cessation of operations of discrete programs operated by a school district, collaborative program, private provider of special education, public academy, or state institution for the benefit of children with disabilities;
- (8) Require redirection of federal funds to remediate noncompliance of more than one year;
- (9) Making no further payments of state or federal funds to the LEA or other public agency until the department determines that there is no longer any failure to comply with the orders;
- (10) Order, in accordance with a final state audit resolution determination, the repayment of misspent or misapplied state and/or federal funds;
- (11) In the case of an LEA or other public agency, refer the matter to the department of justice for further action; and
- (12) In the case of a private provider of special education or other non-LEA program, order all school districts with students placed in the private provider of special education to relocate the students for whom each district is responsible to other programs or facilities that are in compliance with the IDEA and Ed 1100.

#### *Effective Dispute Resolution*

*Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR)* may take the form of a *neutral conference* as described in RSA 186-C:23-b and Ed 215.02, and *mediation* as described in RSA 186-C:24 and Ed 215.03. For over 20 years the New Hampshire State Department of Education has actively promoted Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) as a timely, cost-effective and confidential method of helping people to resolve disputes before going to an administrative hearing. Even before the enactment of the RSA 186-C:23 in 1990, which established Neutral Conferences in New Hampshire, the Department of Education had ADR in place and was offering Mediation to parties. In recent years both parties and their advocates have increasingly chosen this alternative route toward resolving disputes.

In New Hampshire ADR involves an independent third person, called a "neutral evaluator" or "mediator," depending on the ADR process chosen, whose role is to assist the parties in either resolving the dispute or lessening the areas of conflict. By using ADR early in a dispute, parties are empowered to reduce potentially protracted and repetitive legal proceedings and make decisions that affect not only the issue(s) in dispute but also their future relationship.

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) is available to any person aggrieved by a final decision at their school district prior to filing an appeal at the state level. ADR is not mandatory for any party nor does entering into ADR impair either party's right to an appeal. If an alternative dispute resolution option is selected by a party and resolution is not achieved, the individual selected as a neutral or mediator will not be the same individual who is subsequently appointed as a hearing officer to preside at an administrative due process hearing.

*Due Process Hearing Complaints:* Either a parent a child or the school district may file a due process hearing complaint on any matter relating to a proposal or a refusal to initiate or change the identification, evaluation, or educational placement of a child, or the provision of a free appropriate public education (FAPE) to the child. The time period for the hearing procedures is 45 calendar days not including a 30 day resolution period. A school district must offer a resolution meeting if a parent has requested the due process hearing. The due process complaint must allege a violation that happened not more than two years before you or the school district knew or should have known about the alleged action that forms the basis of the due process complaint. If a parent are requests a due process hearing to recover the

cost of a unilateral placement, the parent must file the request within 90 days of the unilateral placement. The above timeline does not apply to the parent if they could not file a due process complaint within the timeline because the school district:

- specifically misrepresented that it had resolved the issues identified in the complaint; or
- withheld information from you that it was required to provide you under IDEA 2004.

The school district must inform the parent of any free or low-cost legal and other relevant services available in the area if the parent request the information, or if the parent or the school district file a due process complaint.

For more information on Special Education Due Process Hearings and Alternative Dispute Resolutions, go to:

[http://www.education.nh.gov/legislation/special\\_ed\\_due\\_process.htm](http://www.education.nh.gov/legislation/special_ed_due_process.htm)

*Special Education Complaint Procedures:* The "Complaint Process" is one method parents or others have to resolve an issue if they believe a public agency (LEA or SEA) has not complied with a special education law. Because most differences are successfully resolved at the local level, parents may wish to notify their school district to give them the opportunity to resolve the issue at the local level before filing a complaint. The "Complaint Process" is one of the Procedural Safeguards afforded to parents under Federal and State laws. The New Hampshire Department of Education is required to make available to parents and other individuals the ability to file formal complaints against a school district if they believe the school district violated a federal or state special education law.

Any person, including students, or organization can file a complaint. The person filing the complaint does not need to live in New Hampshire, but there are specific requirements that need to be met for filing. The person or organization filing the complaint will be referred to as the "complainant."

The complaint process is one of the rights parents, other individuals and organizations have if they believe the school district has violated federal or state special education laws. The complaint is a formal request to the state agency (New Hampshire Department of Education) to investigate the allegation(s) of noncompliance with the federal or state laws. For more information about the NH Special Education Complaint Process, go to:

[http://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/special\\_ed/complaint.htm](http://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/special_ed/complaint.htm)

#### *Fiscal Management*

The ANNUAL REQUEST FOR FEDERAL FUNDS allows a local education agency (LEA) to apply for IDEA Part B Section 611 & Preschool Section 619 funds in one application. The application is a web based online process, which requires activities, assurances and when appropriate, a consolidated application option. Funds are distributed based on a reimbursement process after an extensive review by the Bureau to ensure activities are allowable costs under IDEA. This application process walks districts through a process to ensure that required proportional share of funds are spent on children with disabilities who are enrolled by their parents in private schools. Districts also specify if they are using IDEA funds for CEIS, which allows the Bureau to monitor the appropriate use of CEIS dollars.

The NH Department of Education Agency Audit Manager reviews audits of districts' use of Title I, Food Service and Special Education funds. The State Director of Special Education receives a copy of the letter to the district when there is an audit with findings which concern Special Education. The district is required to complete corrective action within 30 days of the request for correction. The NHDOE Audit Manager verifies that the findings are timely corrected. In the past, findings have concerned timesheets for employees paid with federal funds, inventory paid for with federal funds was not being properly tagged and the presence of rules/regulations surrounding equipment and services purchased with federal funds.

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**Technical Assistance System:**

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

The NH Department of Education, Bureau of Special Education General Supervision System (described above) includes the description of the mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**Professional Development System:**

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

The NH Department of Education, Bureau of Special Education General Supervision System (described above) includes the description of the mechanisms the State has in place to ensure service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**Stakeholder Involvement:**  apply this to all Part B results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

The NHDOE Bureau of Special Education engages a broad range of stakeholders who have interest and expertise in the various issues relative to improving outcomes for children with disabilities. Stakeholders are seen as allies for change and are intentionally engaged in on-going, meaningful ways. The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP/APR and the development and implementation of Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) are described in detail in each indicator of the SPP. The State Director of Special Education participates in the meetings of the NH State Advisory Panel (the NH State Advisory Committee on the Education of Students/Children with Disabilities or SAC), listening to the concerns of the council directly and providing updates at each meeting on special education. Members of SAC are invited to participate in stakeholder meetings that support the development of the SPP. The Bureau of Special Education Preschool Special Education Coordinator is an active member of the NH Part C Interagency Coordinating Council, which has a birth-age five focus. She also serves as the Vice-Chair of Spark-NH, the NH Early Childhood Advisory Council. The Bureau also has a seat on the NH Developmental Disability Council.

The Bureau has a strong partnership with the NH Parent Information Center (PIC). PIC is New Hampshire's Parent Technical Assistance Center, funded by OSEP. The Executive Director of PIC meets monthly with the State Director for the Bureau of Special Education. Representatives from PIC participate in stakeholder meetings. PIC and Bureau staff work closely together to promote key initiatives across the state. Examples include NH Connections (supporting parent-school partnerships) and RACE2K with a focus on maximizing results for preschool children with disabilities.

The Bureau seeks diverse representation from the field throughout the year to provide insights into what is working well and what can be improved. The Bureau has involved both practitioners and administrators from across the state in discussions about a variety of topics that expand beyond the SPP. The State Director attends the NH Association of Special Education Administrators meetings. When invited, she attends regional meetings of local administrators. She has also been appointed to the State Rehabilitation Council. The Bureau hosts a bi-monthly meeting of special education administrators to address improvements to the state special education data system (NHSEIS). The NHSEIS stakeholder group focuses on recommendations for guidance documents and trainings as well as enhancements to the data system. A series of three meetings are held each year for both new special education coordinators and new special education administrators. The Bureau also helps coordinate and participates in the Secondary Transition Community of Practice. These are a few of the ways in which the Bureau and stakeholders work together to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**Reporting to the Public:**

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2013 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2013 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b) (1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2013 APR in 2015, is available.

The NH Department of Education reported to the public on the FFY 2013 performance of each LEA (district) located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2013 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b) (1)(i)(A). These reports (District Data Profiles) are available on the NH Department of Education website at [http://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/special\\_ed/data\\_profiles.htm](http://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/special_ed/data_profiles.htm). A complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2013 APR in 2015, is available at [http://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/special\\_ed/spp.htm](http://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/special_ed/spp.htm).

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2010

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			83.00%	87.00%	87.00%	89.00%	75.00%	80.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Data		72.00%	75.00%	71.00%	71.00%	91.11%	71.56%	69.46%	70.20%	71.03%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Key:

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Aligning Graduation Rate Targets with Title I of ESEA: As required by OSEP, the NHDOE has aligned targets for SPP Indicator 1: Graduation Rates for Youth with IEPs with the graduation rate targets for all students under Title I of the ESEA. As identified in the NH Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility waiver the graduation rate target for all students is 85% in in FFY 2013 and 95% in subsequent years. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility Waiver Renewal was approved August 6, 2015.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma</a>	1,941	
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate</a>	2,713	null
SY 2013-14 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	12/2/2015	<a href="#">2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table</a>	71.54%	Calculate <span style="background-color: #cccccc; border: 1px solid black; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 15px;"></span>

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current	Number of youth with IEPs in the	FFY 2013	FFY 2014	FFY 2014

year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	Data	Target	Data
1,941	2,713	71.03%	95.00%	71.54%

**Graduation Conditions Field**

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

Explanation of Calculation

Consistent with the OSEP instructions, the NHDOE has described the results of the examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2014 APR, use data from 2013-2014), and compared the results to the target reported in the FFY 2014 State Performance Plan that aligns with the graduation rate target under Title I of the ESEA.

When reporting graduation rates for the SPP/APR, OSEP permits states to use the same data as used for reporting to the US Department of Education under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). These data are reported in the CSPR for all students. In order to calculate this for students with IEPs, the Bureau of Information Services identified youth with IEPs in the overall data and performed the same calculation for this subgroup as the calculation used for all youth. Beginning with 2009-2010, the Department reports the NH Annual Graduate Rate based on a cohort model using US Department of Education established parameters. This report identifies the number of students who graduated in four years with a regular high school diploma or an adult high school diploma and the graduation rate by school and district.

For the FFY 2013 SPP, NH calculated a five-year cohort graduation rate in addition to the four-year cohort graduation rate. Students from the original incoming freshman class who were counted in the FFY 2012 four-year cohort group, but who needed a fifth year to complete graduation requirements and who did so successfully are captured in the five-year cohort graduation rate that was calculated for FFY 2013. The FFY 2013 five-year cohort graduation rate was 2,256 of 2,959 or 76.24%.

For the FFY 2014 APR, NH calculated a five-year cohort graduation rate in addition to the four-year cohort graduation rate. Students from the original incoming freshman class who were counted in the FFY 2013 four-year cohort group, but who needed a fifth year to complete graduation requirements and who did so successfully are captured in the five-year cohort graduation rate that was calculated for FFY 2014. The FFY 2014 five-year cohort graduation rate was 2,112 of 2,724 or 77.53%, an increase of 1.29 percentage points.

Definition and Requirements for Graduation with a Regular Diploma

*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. Additional information on the graduation rate is provided in the Technical Advisory – Graduation Rate Calculation: [http://www.education.nh.gov/standards/tech\\_advisories.htm](http://www.education.nh.gov/standards/tech_advisories.htm)

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**Indicator 2: Drop Out**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2008

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			3.60%	3.50%	3.50%	3.40%	3.30%	3.20%	2.50%	0.76%
Data		3.90%	3.00%	3.90%	4.53%	2.30%	0.67%	0.85%	1.43%	0.76%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	0.76%	0.76%	0.76%	0.76%	0.65%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Prior to the submission of the FFY 2013 SPP, the NHDOE Bureau of Special Education staff conducted a Go-to Meeting with a variety of stakeholders including representatives from the NH Parent Information Center (PIC), the NH School Administrators Association, and Special Education Administrators from diverse regions of the state. This meeting focused on Indicators 2 (dropout), 4 (suspensions and expulsions) and 14 (Post School Outcomes). This format allowed participants from across the state to engage in the discussion, regardless of weather conditions, travel constraints and busy schedules. These indicators were clustered together because of the interconnected nature of suspensions/expulsions, dropouts and post school outcomes. The meeting included an overview of the SPP/APR and these three indicators. Historical data and targets were shared with participants for the three indicators. FFY 2013 data was also presented. The two key questions posed for each indicator were: should we re-establish baseline year for this indicator and why; and what does the group think about the NHDOE proposed targets for the new SPP?

For Indicator 2, the group felt that there was no compelling reason to change the baseline data year established in FFY 2008. Regarding the targets, the group reflected on the fact that the current FFY 2013 data represents 72 out of 9,434 students with IEPs who dropped out of school. While one student dropping out is too many, this is a remarkably low number which may be due in part to the NH State Law that prohibits students from dropping out until they are at least 18 years old, which became effective in the summer of 2009. The data for all students is higher (1.29% or 782 out of 60,284) than the drop out rate for students with IEPs for the same time period. Stakeholders felt that the targets should remain stable at the FFY 2013 actual data level until the final year of the SPP. They agreed to the final target being set at 0.65%, which represents a decrease from 72 to 62 students with IEPs who drop out. The discussion centered around the struggles districts have with the most challenging students. The NHDOE has a number of initiatives and priorities that focus on reducing the dropout rate for all children. In addition, the goal of Next Steps NH (the NH SPDG) is to increase the number of students with disabilities and/or at risk of dropping out of school that are college and career ready in NH through the implementation of evidenced based transition practices. The need to focus on strategies that support students staying in school by increasing family, student and school partnerships was also highlighted.

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs who met the NH definition of drop out	Number of NH youth with IEPs enrolled in high schools that met the criteria	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
50	9,451	0.76%	0.76%	0.53%

**Use a different calculation methodology**

- Change numerator description in data table
- Change denominator description in data table

**Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.**

As permitted by OSEP, the NHDOE used the same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012. The NHDOE exercised Option 2 from the Instructions: "Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data. Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2013 APR, use data from 2012-2013), and compare the results to the target. Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain why."

Consistent with the OSEP Part B Indicator Measurement Table, the NHDOE has described the results of the examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2014 APR, use data from 2013-2014). The results are compared to the target set for FFY 2014 in the State Performance Plan.

Dropout numbers and rates for all students, including students with IEPs, are reported by districts operating high schools and for the two public academies. Beginning with 2009-2010, the Department has reported the NH Annual Dropout rate using the cohort rate defined by the New England Secondary School Consortium (NESSC) in parallel with national definitions. The cohort model includes all students during the past four years who were expected to graduate at the end of the reported school year. This analysis results in a more accurate picture of students who were in NH schools during the past four years. The calculation for the dropout rate for students with IEPs was the same calculation that the NHDOE Bureau of Data Management used to determine dropout rates for all students.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

### Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

#### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2012

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥										92.59%
Data									92.59%	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

#### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	92.59%	92.59%	92.59%	92.59%	93.00%

Key:

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

NHDOE Bureau of Special Education staff conducted a Go-to Meeting with a variety of stakeholders including representatives from the NH Parent Information Center (PIC), Special Education Administrators, the NHDOE Title III ESOL State Director and the Bureau of Accountability and Assessment data person (invited). This format allowed participants from across the state to engage in the discussion, regardless of weather conditions, travel constraints and busy schedules. The focus of the meeting was to determine if baseline year should be re-set and to establish targets for the life of the SPP for Indicator 3A, 3B and 3C. The NHDOE provided an overview of the SPP and the measurement for this indicator. The group reviewed historical data, past targets and FFY 2013 data; looking at trends and comparisons of various data points. There was a rich discussion about factors that impact this indicator such as declining enrollment and minimum "n" size and the upcoming changes in statewide assessment. The group stressed the need to re-visit this once we have fully transitioned to the new assessments. There was also conversation about the impact of students moving on the data (enrolled for full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year) and questions about why the denominator for 3B was different for reading than for math. For 3C, the group considered what it means to be proficient and recognized the importance of understanding how far off from proficient students are.

#### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Does your State have an ESEA Flexibility Waiver of determining AYP?

Yes  No

Are you reporting AYP or AMO?

AYP  AMO

Number of districts in	Number of districts that	Number of districts that	FFY 2013	FFY 2014	FFY 2014

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

the State	met the minimum "n" size	meet the minimum "n" size AND met AMO	Data*	Target*	Data
175	null	null	100%	92.59%	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**From:** Stein, Charlotte on behalf of Ryder, Ruth **Sent:** Tuesday, December 22, 2015 2:07:21 PM **To:** [amy.maisterra@dc.gov](mailto:amy.maisterra@dc.gov); [angela.denning@azed.gov](mailto:angela.denning@azed.gov); [aalbert@dss.edu.fm](mailto:aalbert@dss.edu.fm); [barbara.guy@iowa.gov](mailto:barbara.guy@iowa.gov); [barbara.troolin@state.mn.us](mailto:barbara.troolin@state.mn.us); [barbara.vanharen@dpi.wi.gov](mailto:barbara.vanharen@dpi.wi.gov); [Bill.Hussey@dpi.nc.gov](mailto:Bill.Hussey@dpi.nc.gov); [rodriguezbcj@de.pr.gov](mailto:rodriguezbcj@de.pr.gov); [csilva@sde.idaho.gov](mailto:csilva@sde.idaho.gov); [CDrouin@cde.ca.gov](mailto:CDrouin@cde.ca.gov); [Cindy.Moran@state.vt.us](mailto:Cindy.Moran@state.vt.us); [criley@ksde.org](mailto:criley@ksde.org); [crystalr@alsde.edu](mailto:crystalr@alsde.edu); [dandel@isbe.net](mailto:dandel@isbe.net); [dqay@doe.k12.ga.us](mailto:dqay@doe.k12.ga.us); [denise.koscielniak@state.nm.us](mailto:denise.koscielniak@state.nm.us); [donald.enoch@alaska.gov](mailto:donald.enoch@alaska.gov); [doug.gill@k12.wa.us](mailto:doug.gill@k12.wa.us); [isabelina.rodriguez@ct.gov](mailto:isabelina.rodriguez@ct.gov); [Eugene.Lenz@tea.state.tx.us](mailto:Eugene.Lenz@tea.state.tx.us); [fahoriuchi@yahoo.com](mailto:fahoriuchi@yahoo.com); [fpodobnik@mt.gov](mailto:fpodobnik@mt.gov); [gary.sherman@nebraska.gov](mailto:gary.sherman@nebraska.gov); [gteevens@nd.gov](mailto:gteevens@nd.gov); [glenna.gallo@schools.utah.gov](mailto:glenna.gallo@schools.utah.gov); [gloria.yepa@bie.edu](mailto:gloria.yepa@bie.edu); [gcagle@mdek12.org](mailto:gcagle@mdek12.org); [gretta.hylton@education.ky.gov](mailto:gretta.hylton@education.ky.gov); [spedcor@palaunet.com](mailto:spedcor@palaunet.com); [David.Sienko@ride.ri.gov](mailto:David.Sienko@ride.ri.gov); [jacqueline.denton@state.nm.us](mailto:jacqueline.denton@state.nm.us); [ideloren@mail.nysed.gov](mailto:ideloren@mail.nysed.gov); [jamie.wong@la.gov](mailto:jamie.wong@la.gov); [Janice.Breton@maine.gov](mailto:Janice.Breton@maine.gov); [joey.hassell@tn.gov](mailto:joey.hassell@tn.gov); [John.Eisenberg@doe.virginia.gov](mailto:John.Eisenberg@doe.virginia.gov); [JRPayne@ed.sc.gov](mailto:JRPayne@ed.sc.gov); [linda.turner@state.sd.us](mailto:linda.turner@state.sd.us); [Lisa.haley@arkansas.gov](mailto:Lisa.haley@arkansas.gov); [lisa.weiigel@wvo.gov](mailto:lisa.weiigel@wvo.gov); [mfranczkowski@msde.state.md.us](mailto:mfranczkowski@msde.state.md.us); [mmmittnacht@doe.mass.edu](mailto:mmmittnacht@doe.mass.edu); [mcleven@doe.nv.gov](mailto:mcleven@doe.nv.gov); [maryann.mieczkowski@doe.k12.de.us](mailto:maryann.mieczkowski@doe.k12.de.us); [michael.lovato@state.nm.us](mailto:michael.lovato@state.nm.us); [Michael.Lovato@state.nm.us](mailto:Michael.Lovato@state.nm.us); [monica.verra-tirado@fldoe.org](mailto:monica.verra-tirado@fldoe.org); [Pwright@doe.in.gov](mailto:Pwright@doe.in.gov); [phomberg@k12.wv.us](mailto:phomberg@k12.wv.us); [Pat.Geary@nysed.gov](mailto:Pat.Geary@nysed.gov); [pathozella@pa.gov](mailto:pathozella@pa.gov); [salaveap@yahoo.com](mailto:salaveap@yahoo.com); [salaveap@yahoo.com](mailto:salaveap@yahoo.com); [peggy.mcdonald@doe.state.nj.us](mailto:peggy.mcdonald@doe.state.nj.us); [Boyer\\_R@cde.state.co.us](mailto:Boyer_R@cde.state.co.us); [Rene.Axtell@sde.ok.gov](mailto:Rene.Axtell@sde.ok.gov); [rcharleswell@stti.k12.vi](mailto:rcharleswell@stti.k12.vi); [renee.eckleshardy@k12.wv.us](mailto:renee.eckleshardy@k12.wv.us); [robyn.widley@state.mn.us](mailto:robyn.widley@state.mn.us); [sammie.lambert@education.ky.gov](mailto:sammie.lambert@education.ky.gov); [Thibedeau, Santina](mailto:Thibedeau, Santina); [sarah.drinkwater@state.or.us](mailto:sarah.drinkwater@state.or.us); [shari\\_dela\\_cuadra@notes.k12.hi.us](mailto:shari_dela_cuadra@notes.k12.hi.us); [stephen.barr@dese.mo.gov](mailto:stephen.barr@dese.mo.gov); [sue.zake@education.ohio.gov](mailto:sue.zake@education.ohio.gov); [susan.campbell@state.de.us](mailto:susan.campbell@state.de.us); [lizamasuzanne@gmail.com](mailto:lizamasuzanne@gmail.com); [ChapmanT2@michigan.gov](mailto:ChapmanT2@michigan.gov); [ysgabriel@gdoe.net](mailto:ysgabriel@gdoe.net)

**Subject:** ESSA and Implications for Indicator B3A SPP/APR Reporting

Dear State Directors –

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) was signed into law by President Obama on December 10, 2015. The ESSA reauthorized the 50-year-old Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), the nation’s longstanding commitment to equal opportunity for all students. As you think through what this transition means for the work happening in your State, we encourage you to visit the Department’s newly created website ( <http://www.ed.gov/essa> ), which shares a number of resources to support the transition.

The Department is currently reviewing the ESSA to better understand the impact of the provisions on all programs, including IDEA, and will be providing comprehensive guidance on the transition to the new requirements. The purpose of this e-mail message is to call your attention to an impact on how States will report on Statewide assessments in Part B SPP/APRs that are due in 2016 and 2017.

One of the resources available on the [ESSA website](http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/transition-dcl.pdf) is a Dear Colleague Letter on the Transition to ESSA ( <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/transition-dcl.pdf> ). The letter contains many important details about the transition. We want to highlight that the letter addresses annual measurable objectives (AMOs), which are included in the data you report for Indicator B3A for the SPP/APR. On page two, the letter includes:

*AMOs and Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)*

In accordance with a February 27, 2015, letter from the Director of ED’s Office of State Support, many States that implemented new assessments in the 2014–2015 school year are preparing to submit new AMOs for ED’s review and approval in January 2016. However, the ESSA requires States to “establish ambitious State-designed long-term goals...for all students and separately for each subgroup of students” instead of AMOs. ED wants to support State efforts to prepare for this transition; therefore, in accordance with ED’s authority to ensure an orderly transition to the ESSA, ED will not require States to submit AMOs (for school years 2014–2015 or 2015–2016) in January 2016 for ED’s review and approval, nor will ED require States to report performance against AMOs for the 2014–2015 or 2015–2016 school years. Additionally, ED will not require States to hold districts accountable for their performance against AMAOs 1, 2, and 3 under Title III of the ESEA for the 2014–2015 or 2015–2016 school years.

Please note, however, that all States and districts must continue to publish report cards, including report cards for the 2014–2015 school year (if those report cards have not yet been published), for the 2015–2016 school year, and beyond. Report cards must continue to include information that shows how a district’s student achievement on the State assessments compares to students and subgroups of students in the State as a whole. At the school level, the district must include information that shows how a school’s student achievement on the State assessments compares to students and subgroups of students in the district and in the State as a whole. However, consistent with ED’s authority to ensure an orderly transition to the ESSA, report cards need not include the information required under ESEA section 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii).

**As a result, because the Department is not requiring States to submit AMOs for school years 2014–2015 or 2015–2016 or to report performance against AMOs for the 2014–2015 or 2015–2016 school years, States will not be required to report on Indicator B3A for purposes of the FFY 2014 Part B SPP/APR (due in February 2016) and the FFY 2015 Part B SPP/APR (due in February 2017).** States will be required to continue to report on Indicators B3B and B3C in the FFY 2014 and FFY 2015 Part B SPPs/APRs. We are working to put together additional information to share with you, including the logistics for how this will impact the data included in GRADS. In the meantime, please contact your OSEP State Lead with any questions related to this change.

Likewise, we encourage you to share your more general ESSA questions with us by sending an email to the Department’s dedicated email box for ESSA questions: [essa.questions@ed.gov](mailto:essa.questions@ed.gov).

Happy Holidays to you and your families!

Ruth

Ruth E. Ryder

Deputy Director

[Office of Special Education Programs](#)

## FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

U.S. Department of Education

Email: [ruth.ryder@ed.gov](mailto:ruth.ryder@ed.gov)

[www.ed.gov/osers](http://www.ed.gov/osers) | [Subscribe](#)

### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

### OSEP Response

Indicator 3A is not applicable for FFY 2014.

### Required Actions

### Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

#### Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Overall	2014	Target ≥			96.18%	96.18%	96.18%	97.00%	97.00%	97.25%	97.35%	97.65%
			Data		97.24%	98.80%	97.80%	98.21%	97.71%	99.00%	98.00%	98.00%	97.65%
Math	A Overall	2014	Target ≥			96.18%	96.18%	96.18%	97.00%	97.00%	97.25%	97.35%	97.54%
			Data		96.64%	98.60%	97.60%	97.94%	97.81%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	97.54%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

#### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	91.10%	91.10%	91.10%	91.10%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	91.14%	91.14%	91.14%	91.14%	95.00%

Key:

#### Explanation of Changes

The baseline and targets were reset due to a change in the statewide assessment, moving from NECAP to Smarter Balanced.

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Prior to the submission of the FFY 2013 SPP, NHDOE Bureau of Special Education staff conducted a Go-to Meeting with a variety of stakeholders including representatives from the NH Parent Information Center (PIC), Special Education Administrators, the NHDOE Title III ESOL State Director and the Bureau of Accountability and Assessment data person (invited). This format allowed participants from across the state to engage in the discussion, regardless of weather conditions, travel constraints and busy schedules. The focus of the meeting was to determine if baseline year should be re-set and to establish targets for the life of the SPP for Indicator 3A, 3B and 3C. The NHDOE provided an overview of the SPP and the measurement for this indicator. The group reviewed historical data, past targets and FFY 2013 data; looking at trends and comparisons of various data points. There was a rich discussion about factors that impact this indicator such as declining enrollment and minimum "n" size and the upcoming changes in statewide assessment. The group stressed the need to re-visit this once we have fully transitioned to the new assessments. There was also conversation about the impact of students moving on the data (enrolled for full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year) and questions about why the denominator for 3B was different for reading than for math. For 3C, the group considered what it means to be proficient and recognized the importance of understanding how far off from proficient students are.

Prior to the submission of the FFY 2014 APR, the NHDOE Bureau of Special Education staff conducted a Go-to Meeting with a variety of stakeholders including representatives from the NH Parent Information Center (PIC), Special Education Administrators, the NH Association of School Administrators and the Bureau of Accountability and Assessment data person

## FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

(invited). This format allowed participants from across the state to engage in the discussion, regardless of weather conditions, travel constraints and busy schedules. The focus of the meeting was to determine if baseline year should be re-set and to establish targets for the life of the SPP for Indicator 3B and 3C. The NHDOE provided an overview of the SPP and the measurement for this indicator. The group reviewed historical data, past targets and FFY 2014 data; looking at trends and comparisons of various data points. There was a rich discussion about the changes to the assessment and the steep learning curve for districts and students, especially regarding the use of accommodations and the online assessment. The group stressed the need to re-visit this after the SAT has been included in the process next year. The group also discussed factors related to participation such as a misconception that there was an option to opt-out. This was addressed in one voice by the NHDOE and the Parent Information Center. The NHDOE released a Technical Assistance Memo for further guidance. The NHDOE has trainings available that support district personnel understanding of DLM and Smarter Balanced accommodations. The group understands that new baseline and target will need to be established in FFY 2015 once the SAT results are included. The group came to consensus that, given the FFY 2014 baseline, the targets should remain stable until the final year and then be more in line with results for all students.

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	14,745	13,433	97.65%	91.10%	91.10%

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	14,746	13,439	97.54%	91.14%	91.14%

### Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

General information page for NH School & District Profiles. Click on test results for Smarter Balanced and DLM results:

<https://my.doe.nh.gov/profiles/profile.aspx?oid=&s=&d=&year=&tab=testresults#general>

SBAC subgroups including students with disabilities.

<https://my.doe.nh.gov/profiles/testresults/sbac.aspx?d=0&s=0&subject=Math&report=PatLevel>

PACE subgroup results:

<http://education.nh.gov/assessment-systems/pace.htm>

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2014, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State revised its targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Required Actions**

**Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

**Historical Data**

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Overall	2014	Target ≥			40.84%	48.23%	55.62%	63.01%	70.40%	71.00%	70.40%	35.70%
			Data		41.49%	29.12%	31.90%	35.18%	38.45%	37.00%	37.00%	38.00%	35.70%
Math	A Overall	2014	Target ≥			50.74%	56.89%	63.04%	69.13%	69.19%	70.00%	70.20%	25.94%
			Data		31.81%	28.36%	26.90%	29.23%	33.96%	31.00%	28.00%	28.00%	25.94%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	19.31%	19.31%	19.31%	19.31%	58.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	13.29%	13.29%	13.29%	13.29%	46.00%

Key:

**Explanation of Changes**

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Prior to the submission of the FFY 2013 SPP, NHDOE Bureau of Special Education staff conducted a Go-to Meeting with a variety of stakeholders including representatives from the NH Parent Information Center (PIC), Special Education Administrators, the NHDOE Title III ESOL State Director and the Bureau of Accountability and Assessment data person (invited). This format allowed participants from across the state to engage in the discussion, regardless of weather conditions, travel constraints and busy schedules. The focus of the meeting was to determine if baseline year should be re-set and to establish targets for the life of the SPP for Indicator 3A, 3B and 3C. The NHDOE provided an overview of the SPP and the measurement for this indicator. The group reviewed historical data, past targets and FFY 2013 data; looking at trends and comparisons of various data points. There was a rich discussion about factors that impact this indicator such as declining enrollment and minimum "n" size and the upcoming changes in statewide assessment. The group stressed the need to re-visit this once we have fully transitioned to the new assessments. There was also conversation about the impact of students moving on the data (enrolled for full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year) and questions about why the denominator for 3B was different for reading than for math. For 3C, the group considered what it means to be proficient and recognized the importance of understanding how far off from proficient students are.

Prior to the submission of the FFY 2014 APR, the NHDOE Bureau of Special Education staff conducted a Go-to Meeting with a variety of stakeholders including representatives from the NH Parent Information Center (PIC), Special Education Administrators, the NH Association of School Administrators and the Bureau of Accountability and Assessment data person

**FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

(invited). This format allowed participants from across the state to engage in the discussion, regardless of weather conditions, travel constraints and busy schedules. The focus of the meeting was to determine if baseline year should be re-set and to establish targets for the life of the SPP for Indicator 3B and 3C. The NHDOE provided an overview of the SPP and the measurement for this indicator. The group reviewed historical data, past targets and FFY 2014 data; looking at trends and comparisons of various data points. There was a rich discussion about the changes to the assessment and the steep learning curve for districts and students, especially regarding the use of accommodations and the online assessment. The group stressed the need to re-visit this after the SAT has been included in the process next year. The group also discussed factors related to participation such as a misconception that there was an option to opt-out. This was addressed in one voice by the NHDOE and the Parent Information Center. The NHDOE released a Technical Assistance Memo for further guidance. The NHDOE has trainings available that support district personnel understanding of DLM and Smarter Balanced accommodations. The group understands that new baseline and target will need to be established in FFY 2015 once the SAT results are included. The group came to consensus that, given the FFY 2014 baseline, the targets should remain stable until the final year and then be more in line with results for all students.

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	13,433	2,594	35.70%	19.31%	19.31%

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	13,439	1,786	25.94%	13.29%	13.29%

**Public Reporting Information**

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

General information page for NH School & District Profiles. Click on test results for Smarter Balanced and DLM results:

<https://my.doe.nh.gov/profiles/profile.aspx?oid=&s=&d=&year=&tab=testresults#general>

SBAC subgroups including students with disabilities.

<https://my.doe.nh.gov/profiles/testresults/sbac.aspx?d=0&s=0&subject=Math&report=PatLevel>

PACE subgroup results:

<http://education.nh.gov/assessment-systems/pace.htm>

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2014 and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State revised its targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			2.80%	2.20%	2.20%	2.87%	2.87%	2.75%	2.50%	1.15%
Data		2.26%	3.70%	4.32%	4.32%	2.87%	3.45%	1.15%	0%	1.15%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	1.15%	1.15%	1.15%	1.15%	1.15%

Key:

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Prior to the submission of the FFY 2013 SPP, the NHDOE Bureau of Special Education staff conducted a Go-to Meeting with a variety of stakeholders including representatives from the NH Parent Information Center (PIC), the NH School Administrators Association, and Special Education Administrators from diverse regions of the state. This meeting focused on Indicators 2 (dropout), 4 (suspensions and expulsions) and 14 (Post School Outcomes). This format allowed participants from across the state to engage in the discussion, regardless of weather conditions, travel constraints and busy schedules. These indicators were clustered together because of the interconnected nature of suspensions/expulsions, dropouts and post school outcomes. The meeting included an overview of the SPP/APR and these three indicators. Historical data and targets were shared with participants for the three indicators. FFY 2013 data was also presented. The two key questions posed for each indicator were: should we re-establish baseline year for this indicator and why; and what does the group think about the NHDOE proposed targets for the new SPP?

There was no compelling reason to change the baseline year for this indicator. The stakeholder group discussed the fact the numbers of overall suspensions/expulsions that exceed the threshold is low and stable year to year. There was much discussion of ongoing activities to support this trend of low suspensions/expulsions. There was a desire among participants to see more technical assistance and support with positive behavioral supports and promoting preventive actions within districts. Because the current data are lower than baseline, the group felt strongly that the targets should remain stable throughout the life of the SPP.

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

**FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Please indicate the type of denominator provided



Number of districts in the State



Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
3	175	1.15%	1.15%	1.71%

**Explanation of Slippage**

While OSEP considers it slippage when the percentage is less than 10% if the worsening is more than 0.1%, the NHDOE does not consider one additional district (3 out of 175 vs. 2 out of 174) to be statistically significant. It is important to note that in the FFY 2013 SPP, prior to any consideration of minimum cell size, there were 8 districts that had greater than 3% suspension/expulsion of students with IEPs for more than 10 days in a school year. In the FFY 2014 APR there were only 4 districts that had greater than 3% suspension/expulsion of students with IEPs for more than 10 days in a school year prior to the application of the cell size requirements. This gave NH a 50% decrease in the total number of districts that exceeded the threshold when the cell size requirements were not applied. The NHDOE continues to work with districts to ensure that policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, are in place and implemented to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

**Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a)):**



Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State



The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

**State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology**

**Definition of Significant Discrepancy**

The NHDOE defines a "significant discrepancy" as any district with a rate of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs that is greater than 3% of students with IEPs enrolled in the district.

For any district that had greater than 3% students with IEPs suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days in a school year, districts that did not meet the following minimum "n" size requirements were removed from the count:

- A minimum of 11 children with IEPs in the district, consistent with the state assessment, NECAP.
- At least 4 students with IEPs suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days.

**Identification of Comparison Methodology**

Discrepancies were computed by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the state. The results of the NHDOE examination of the data are for the year before the reporting year (e.g. for the FFY 2013 APR, data are from 2012-2013), including data disaggregated to determine if significant discrepancies occurred in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs. If the NHDOE determined that there were significant discrepancies in the suspension and expulsion rates, the NHDOE reviewed, and if appropriate, revised (or required the district to revise) the district's policies, practices, and procedures relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of behavioral interventions, and procedural safeguards to ensure that the policies, procedures and practices complied with Part B.

**Minimum "n" size requirements**

Report on the number of districts that did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement in the FFY 2014 APR (using the 2013-2014 data).

Step 1: Of the 175 districts, the NHDOE determined that there were 4 districts that had greater than 3% suspension/expulsion of students with IEPs for more than 10 days in a school year.

Step 2: Of the 4 districts identified in Step 1, four (4) had more than 11 students with IEPs and so were considered for the next

step. None were removed because all met the minimum "n" size.

Step 3: Of the 4 districts identified in Step 1 & 2, three (3) had four or more students with IEPs suspended or expelled for more than 10 days in the school year.

Therefore, one district did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement in the FFY 2014 APR.

### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

### FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

#### Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

In FFY 2014, using the 2013-2014 data, the NHDOE completed a review of policies, procedures and practices for the 3 districts identified in this indicator. The NHDOE reviewed and, when appropriate, revised (or required the affected district to revise) the district's policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA.

The NHDOE review included the completion of a self-assessment by each identified district which was verified by the NHDOE. The district's self-assessment specifically covered a review of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. This process included a review of files for students impacted by this indicator in order to determine if there were individual instances of noncompliance. Targeted technical assistance will be provided to assist with addressing and correcting the root causes.

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:
  - The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Pursuant to the OSEP FAQ dated 9/3/08, the NHDOE group's individual instances of noncompliance in a district related to this Indicator as one finding of noncompliance. In FFY 2014 there were 3 written findings of noncompliance relative to this indicator from 3 districts. As a result of the process described above, and within one year of the noncompliance being identified, the state will verify that, in the identified districts, they are (1) correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) have corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2015 APR, the State will describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. Targeted technical assistance will be provided to assist with addressing and correcting the root causes of problematic practices and noncompliance.

- The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	2	0	0

**FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

*Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

In the FFY 2013 APR, using the 2012-2013 data, there were 2 districts identified with significant discrepancy for this indicator. The NHDOE reviewed and, when appropriate, revised (or required the affected district to revise) the district’s policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA.

The NHDOE review included the completion of a self- assessment by each identified district which was verified by the NHDOE. The district’s self-assessment specifically covered a review of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. This process included a review of files for students impacted by this indicator in order to determine if there were individual instances of noncompliance. Any individual instances were verified as corrected as soon as possible, but in no case greater than one year from identification. This process included a review of files for students impacted by this indicator in order to determine if there were individual instances of noncompliance. Root causes of problematic practices and noncompliance were identified in the review process. Targeted technical assistance was provided to assist with addressing and correcting the root causes.

As a result of the process described above, and within one year of the noncompliance being identified, the state verified that, in the identified districts, they are (1) correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) have corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

*Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected*

In the FFY 2013 APR, using the 2012-2013 data, there were 2 districts identified with significant discrepancy for this indicator. The NHDOE reviewed and, when appropriate, revised (or required the affected district to revise) the district’s policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA.

The NHDOE review included the completion of a self- assessment by each identified district which was verified by the NHDOE. The district’s self-assessment specifically covered a review of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. This process included a review of files for students impacted by this indicator in order to determine if there were individual instances of noncompliance. Any individual instances were verified as corrected as soon as possible, but in no case greater than one year from identification. This process included a review of files for students impacted by this indicator in order to determine if there were individual instances of noncompliance. Root causes of problematic practices and noncompliance were identified in the review process. Targeted technical assistance was provided to assist with addressing and correcting the root causes.

As a result of the process described above, and within one year of the noncompliance being identified, the state verified that, in the identified districts, they are (1) correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) have corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						0%	0%	1.15%	0%	0.57%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
2	0	175	0.57%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

### State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

#### Definition of Significant Discrepancy

The NHDOE defines a "significant discrepancy" as any district with a rate of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs that is greater than 3% of students with IEPs enrolled in the district.

For any district that had greater than 3% students with IEPs suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days in a school year, districts that did not meet the following minimum "n" size requirements are

removed from the count:

- A minimum of 11 children with IEPs in the district, consistent with the state assessment, NECAP.
- At least 4 students with IEPs suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days.

For Indicator 4B, these minimum cell sizes are applied to the population of students with IEPs in each race and ethnicity category.

#### Identification of Comparison Methodology

Discrepancies were computed by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs (districts) within the state. The results of the NHDOE examination of the data are for the year before the reporting year (e.g. for the FFY 2013 APR, data are from 2012-2013 ), including data disaggregated to determine if significant discrepancies by race or ethnicity, occurred in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs. If the NHDOE determined that there were significant discrepancies by race or ethnicity in the suspension and expulsion rates, the NHDOE reviewed, and if appropriate, revised (or required the district to revise) the district's policies, practices, and procedures relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of behavioral interventions, and procedural safeguards to ensure that the policies, procedures and practices comply with Part B.

#### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

#### FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

#### Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

In the FFY 2014 APR, using the 2013-2014 data, there were two districts identified with significant discrepancy for this indicator. The NHDOE reviewed and, when appropriate, revised (or required the affected district to revise) the district's policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA.

The NHDOE review included the completion of a self-assessment by the identified district. The district's self-assessment specifically covered a review of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. The NHDOE then verified the results of the district's self-assessment. Based on this review, it was determined that there were no individual instances of noncompliance and no findings of noncompliance with the implementation of regulations of IDEA relative to this indicator.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

The NHDOE conducted an on-site visit to review the district's policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA. Furthermore, file reviews of all students potentially impacted by the noncompliance were completed and in all cases it was determined that there was no individual case of noncompliance or

the child was no longer in the jurisdiction of the district. Based on the self-assessment and the subsequent on-site review, the NHDOE determined that there were no (0) districts that had noncompliance regarding this indicator.

If there had been any districts identified with significant discrepancy for this indicator, the NHDOE would have verified within one year of the noncompliance being identified that, in the districts with identified noncompliance, the districts were (1) correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) would have corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	null	0

**FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

*Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

In the FFY 2013 APR, using the 2012-2013 data, there was 1 district identified with significant discrepancy for this indicator. The NHDOE reviewed and, when appropriate, revised (or required the affected district to revise) the district’s policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA.

The NHDOE review included the completion of a self-assessment by the identified district. The district’s self-assessment specifically covered a review of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. The NHDOE then verified the results of the district's self-assessment.

*Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected*

The NHDOE conducted an on-site visit to review the district’s policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA. Furthermore, file reviews of all students potentially impacted by the noncompliance were completed and in all cases it was determined that there was no individual case of noncompliance or the child was no longer in the jurisdiction of the district. Based on the self-assessment and the subsequent on-site review, the NHDOE determined that there was one district that had noncompliance regarding this indicator.

As a result of the process described above, and within one year of the noncompliance being identified, the state verified that, in the district with identified noncompliance, the district is (1) correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

--

**Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2013	Target ≥			76.00%	76.50%	77.00%	48.71%	49.00%	51.00%	53.00%	72.85%
		Data		76.30%	65.03%	51.70%	45.02%	48.71%	72.62%	73.73%	73.23%	72.85%
B	2013	Target ≤			3.30%	3.30%	3.30%	19.18%	18.00%	16.00%	15.00%	7.97%
		Data		3.20%	13.34%	22.62%	26.98%	19.18%	8.56%	8.32%	8.01%	7.97%
C	2013	Target ≤			4.30%	9.50%	4.30%	2.82%	2.82%	2.75%	2.50%	2.61%
		Data		4.30%	4.00%	3.20%	3.20%	2.82%	2.67%	2.60%	2.48%	2.61%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	72.85%	72.85%	72.85%	72.85%	74.00%
Target B ≤	7.97%	7.97%	7.97%	7.97%	7.00%
Target C ≤	2.61%	2.61%	2.61%	2.61%	2.05%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Prior to the submission of the FFY 2013 SPP, the NHDOE utilized the NHSEIS stakeholder group to review the historical data and targets and the FFY 13 data for Indicator 5 and 6. This group was comprised of representatives from the NH Parent Information Center (PIC), special education administrators and the NH School Administrators Association. There was discussion regarding LRE and the continuum of settings that the IEP team must consider when determining the location of the provision of services. Because of upgrades to the data system, the release of guidance memos in 2013 and 2014 and ongoing training in the field regarding data entry, the group felt that baseline should be re-set for FFY 2013.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	6/4/2015	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21</a>	25,646	null

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</a>	18,552	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</a>	2,172	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools</a>	545	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities</a>	125	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements</a>	14	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	18,552	25,646	72.85%	72.85%	72.34%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,172	25,646	7.97%	7.97%	8.47%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	684	25,646	2.61%	2.61%	2.67%

Explanation of B Slippage

In order to explain the slippage of 0.5% for 5B, the NHDOE conducted additional analysis of data related to school age LRE. Based on that analysis, the NHDOE determined that there has been an increase in the number of students with IEPs who were unilaterally placed in private schools as well as an overall decrease in the total number of identified students that may have impacted these results. Students with IEPs who are parentally-placed in private schools are included in the total number of students with IEPs identified in the state. In FFY 2014, 220 out of 25,646 or 0.86% students with IEPs were parentally placed in private schools. In FFY 2013, 173 out of 25,838 or 0.67% students with IEPs were parentally placed in private schools. This represents an increase of 0.19% or 47 students with IEPs unilaterally placed by their parents in private schools. In addition, there was a decrease of 192 students in the total population of students with IEPs from 25,838 to 25,646, representing a 0.7% decrease in the total number of students identified. This decreasing trend is consistent with the 1.2% decrease in the overall population of all students enrolled in public schools.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Results indicator: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

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

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2013	Target ≥									51.00%	50.36%
		Data								50.03%	47.88%	50.36%
B	2013	Target ≤									10.00%	18.22%
		Data								10.26%	17.51%	18.22%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	50.36%	51.00%	53.00%	56.00%	60.00%
Target B ≤	18.22%	17.50%	16.00%	14.50%	12.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Prior to the submission of the FFY 2013 SPP, the NHDOE Bureau of Special Education staff conducted a Go-to Meeting with a variety of stakeholders including representatives from the NH Parent Information Center (PIC), Preschool Special Education Coordinators, TA providers and Special Education Administrators from diverse regions of the state to consider this indicator. This format allowed participants from across the state to engage in the discussion, regardless of weather conditions, travel constraints and busy schedules. The meeting included an overview of the SPP/APR and the indicator. Historical data and targets were shared with participants for the indicator. FFY 2013 data was also presented. The two key questions posed for the indicator were: should we re-establish baseline year for this indicator and why; and what does the group recommend for targets for the new SPP for this indicator?

Stakeholders wrestled with setting targets that were both ambitious yet achievable. There was considerable conversation about what the ultimate desired percentages would be in each category compared to how much movement we thought we could achieve in the next few years. Strategies to address potential root causes of challenges were explored. One area of recommended focus was to continue to improve data reported by district personnel. There was a recognition that this year saw an unprecedented turn-over in local preschool special education coordinators and special education administrators so getting the message out about how and what to report is more critical than ever. Strategies also included more routinized processes at the local level to ensure parents are asked about the amount of time the child is in regular early childhood settings and developing a process to validate the data are reflecting actuality. The second key area that was discussed was around continuing to provide the timely delivery of high quality, evidence based technical assistance and support to districts around the continuum of LRE and program development.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5</a>	3,332	null

**FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
C089; Data group 613)				
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program</a>	1,882	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">b1. Number of children attending separate special education class</a>	518	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">b2. Number of children attending separate school</a>	n	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">b3. Number of children attending residential facility</a>	n	null

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	1,882	3,332	50.36%	50.36%	56.48%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	521	3,332	18.22%	18.22%	15.64%

**Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.**

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 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))

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A1	2012	Target ≥						66.30%	66.30%	67.00%	68.00%	79.50%
		Data					63.80%	66.30%	69.60%	70.00%	79.50%	80.94%
A2	2012	Target ≥						71.30%	71.30%	71.50%	72.00%	61.60%
		Data					82.10%	71.30%	68.40%	67.20%	61.60%	61.82%
B1	2012	Target ≥						67.10%	67.10%	68.00%	69.00%	78.90%
		Data					65.70%	67.10%	73.00%	73.70%	78.90%	79.96%
B2	2012	Target ≥						53.40%	53.40%	53.70%	54.00%	60.90%
		Data					75.80%	53.40%	50.70%	55.90%	60.90%	61.74%
C1	2012	Target ≥						68.50%	68.50%	69.00%	70.00%	76.80%
		Data					74.40%	68.50%	68.00%	73.90%	76.80%	77.85%
C2	2012	Target ≥						63.10%	63.10%	63.50%	64.00%	63.20%
		Data					78.70%	63.10%	55.20%	58.80%	63.20%	66.03%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	79.50%	79.50%	79.50%	80.00%	80.00%
Target A2 ≥	61.60%	61.60%	61.60%	62.00%	62.00%
Target B1 ≥	78.90%	79.00%	79.00%	80.00%	80.00%
Target B2 ≥	60.90%	61.00%	61.00%	61.50%	61.50%
Target C1 ≥	76.80%	77.00%	77.00%	77.50%	77.50%
Target C2 ≥	63.20%	63.20%	63.20%	63.50%	63.50%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Prior to the submission of the FFY 2013 SPP, the NH Department of Education Preschool Special Education consultant and the Preschool Outcome Measurement System (POMS) TA consultant met with a variety of stakeholders from diverse regions of the state. Participants included representatives of the NH Parent Information Center (PIC), State TA providers, Special Education Administrators, Preschool Special Education Coordinators and practitioners.

The group reviewed the 3 outcomes, progress categories and summary statements as well as historical data and past targets. Discussion included the impact of NH small cell size, confidence bands, expected

percentages in each category and the stability of the state level data.

Baseline year: The Stakeholder Input group recommended that baseline should be re-set to FFY 2012. This was because in FFY 2011, after an extensive review of data and stakeholder input, the state removed one of the 3 possible tools that the field can use, resulting in more valid and reliable data in FFY 2012.

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	1175.00
--	---------

**Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)**

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	28.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	141.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	276.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	515.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	215.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	791.00	960.00	80.94%	79.50%	82.40%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	730.00	1175.00	61.82%	61.60%	62.13%

**Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)**

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	28.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	154.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	280.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	523.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	190.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	803.00	985.00	79.96%	78.90%	81.52%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	713.00	1175.00	61.74%	60.90%	60.68%

**Explanation of B2 Slippage**

The NHDOE does not consider the difference of 0.22 percentage points from the target of 60.90% to the actual data of 60.68% to be significant. Also, there was a decrease in the overall denominator from the past year, which appears to be consistent with demographic changes in the state. This decrease may have had an impact on the calculation as well.

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	46.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	127.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	224.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	509.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	269.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	733.00	906.00	77.85%	76.80%	80.91%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	778.00	1175.00	66.03%	63.20%	66.21%

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? No

Provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” and list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

Criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers”: New Hampshire calculates “comparable to same-age peers” using the Child Outcome Summary (COS) process devised by the Early Childhood Child Outcome (ECO) Center. This is done through an online calculation by each of the 2 publishers of the tools used in the state. The criteria for defining “comparable to same-age peers” has been defined as a child who has been scored as a 6 or a 7 on the COS process.

List the instruments used: The two instruments used to gather the data are the online systems for Teaching Strategies Gold by Teaching Strategies and AEPSi by Brookes Publishing.

Procedures used to gather data for this indicator: § Who is included in the measurement, i.e. what population of children?

Effective November 1, 2006, all NH districts were required to begin assessing the entry level and exit data on each of the three outcomes for all preschool children who began receiving special education from that date on. Only children who are receiving preschool special education in NH for at least 6 months are

included in the measure.

*Who conducted the assessments?*

District personnel are responsible for ensuring the assessments are conducted with fidelity. They are encouraged to work closely with the child's family members, Child Care /Head Start provider(s), and others who may have knowledge of a child when conducting an assessment. Some districts have hired/contracted with additional individuals to oversee the assessment process while others have designated this responsibility to specific personnel already on staff.

*When did measurement occur?*

The child's status at entry is measured within 6 weeks of the child beginning to receive special education or related services. Assessments on child status on the outcomes are measured at least annually. The child's status on exit is measured near exit.

*What data was reported to the state, and how was that data transmitted?*

Districts subscribe to the web-based data management systems with the publisher of the tool(s) they opt to use. The district enters assessment data into the web-based data management system as assessments are completed. The NHDOE runs aggregate reports directly from the publisher's web-based data systems. This data can be disaggregated at both a state and district level for monitoring of implementation of the system and for federal reporting.

*What data analysis methods were used to determine the progress categories?*

The publishers, with direction from the NHDOE and ECO, have created systems to analyze the data at a state and district level based on the federal reporting requirements. This analysis converts the raw data from the assessment items to the ECO COSF scores and calculates progress as required by OSEP.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**Indicator 8: Parent involvement**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			72.00%		32.00%	34.00%	35.00%	36.00%	37.00%	36.00%
Data			72.00%	32.00%	45.00%	47.00%	50.00%	51.00%	52.00%	36.93%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	36.00%	36.00%	37.00%	37.00%	38.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Prior to the submission of the FFY 2013 SPP, the NH Department of Education utilized the Indicator 8 Input Group (which meets at least three times per year) to provide multi-stakeholder input into the development of targets for Indicator 8. The Input Group includes Special Education Directors from urban, rural and cooperative school districts and parent leaders from local family-school partnership groups (parents of children with disabilities). The group consisted of a representative from each of the following: NH Superintendent’s and Special Education Administrator’s Associations, the NH Parent Information Center (PIC), and the NH State Advisory Committee (SAC), as well as staff from Gibson Consulting Group (the survey vendor) and the NH Connections project (TA Project funded by the NHDOE to support the development and improvement of family-school partnerships in special education) and the national consultant Dr. Batya Elbaum (formerly from federally-funded Data Accountability Center). The Input Group reviewed the 2013-2014 statewide Parent Survey in Special Education results, state historical and trend data, previous target setting information, and information on national trends presented by Dr. Elbaum to provide recommendations for FFY 2013-2018 targets for Indicator 8.

The Indicator 8 Input Group recommended that, because starting next year the Parent Involvement Survey will be administered as a census survey over a two year period, the target should remain the same for the first three years of the State Performance Plan so as to afford each block an equal opportunity to reach the target. (With the premise that the 2013 gave us a “new baseline” to understand where we were as a state). The fourth year of the SPP the target will increase by one percent, the same target would be applied to fifth year to allow both blocks equal opportunity to reach the target. The 6<sup>th</sup> year of the SPP would increase by one percent over the target set for year four.

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
835.00	2359.00	36.93%	36.00%	35.40%

**Explanation of Slippage**

For the FFY 14 APR, New Hampshire saw a decrease of 1.5 percentage points in the number of families that responded that the school facilitated parent involvement as a means to improve services and outcomes for children with disabilities.

As noted in the Description of Stakeholder Input in the FFY 2013 SPP, the Indicator 8 Input Group recommended that, starting in FFY 2014 the Parent Involvement Survey will be administered as a census survey over a two year period. The intent of this shift was to 1) combat survey fatigue and 2) allow additional time for local districts and schools to implement improvement strategies based on their Indicator 8 data.

In FFY 2014, Districts in Block A completed the survey. This group had completed the survey the previous year as well and therefore both survey fatigue and the lack of time to implement strategies may have impacted the results. The department anticipates that once the remaining Districts in Block B complete the survey in 2015 -2016, the cycle will have be completed regarding the administration of a census survey over 2 years in New Hampshire. At that time the Department anticipates the need to reset baselines regarding the parent survey.

**Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.**

In order to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that was valid and reliable, Gibson Consulting Group (the contractor responsible for conducting the survey and analysis under the direction of the NHDOE) did a scaling of the two survey types. The scaling itself was done separately for the two survey types (preschool and school age). Once every respondent had a scale score, all of the scale scores were put back together (for example, if there were 100 school age respondents and 20 preschool respondents, now there would be 120 scale scores). The combined scale score was an average of all 120 scale scores, and the percentage met was the percentage of the 120 scale scores that exceeded the threshold of 600.

**Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.**

Beginning in January 2014, the New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE), Bureau of Special Education, contracted with Gibson Consulting Group to conduct a statewide parent involvement survey. The goal of the contract was to provide data for reporting requirements for the Department of Education's Special Education State Performance Plan.

Upon closure of the survey window, all paper survey responses were scanned and all online survey responses were exported from the online survey platform. All responses to the preschool survey (both paper and online) were merged into one analytic dataset and all responses to the school age survey (both paper and online) were merged into another analytic dataset.

Substantial data cleaning efforts were undertaken with data collected both via paper-based and online versions of the survey. Responses to two demographic items were checked for validity: if the students' reported age at referral was greater than their reported current age, the age at referral variable was recoded to "missing". Similarly, on the school age survey, if a parent reported that their student was in elementary school, but answered the last question about transition planning meetings, their response to the question about transition planning meetings was changed to "missing" as these meetings occur predominantly at the high school level.

Missing data and outlier response patterns were explored. Of the 2,365 surveys completed, six cases

(three school age and three preschool) were dropped due to missing data on all survey items. Among the remaining 2,359 cases, the evaluation team examined the “completeness” of survey responses; that is, cases with either complete or partially complete submissions. Nearly 90% of responses on both the preschool and school age surveys were completed in full, and patterns of missing data on the remaining 10% did not warrant additional diagnostics or cleaning. Thus, all 2,359 surveys were included in the final analytic dataset.

The research team also examined extreme responses (answering “very strongly disagree” or “very strongly agree”) to all survey items. Extreme disagreement was less common (less than one percent of preschool and school age responses) than extreme agreement (13% of preschool and 7% of school age), and given the overall low incidence of extreme values, no submissions were dropped from the analytic dataset for this reason.

Additional validation processes were possible using data collected online. First, time to survey completion was examined, with start and end times demonstrating that, on average, online surveys were completed in just over eight minutes (with a median response rate of six minutes). Responses of two minutes or less comprised less than 3% of the sample. Again, because this value was not unreasonable, and because time to completion could not be examined on data resulting from paper surveys, no submissions were dropped from the analytic dataset for this reason.

Finally, the research team examined internet protocol (IP) addresses in combination with time stamps to search for potential instances of attempts to “stuff the ballot box”. Once flagged, other criteria were used to examine the validity of duplicate responses (for example, a parent with three students receiving special education services could legitimately complete three entries from the same IP address with consecutive time stamps). Demographic questions and outlier responses to survey items were examined in combination with IP address and time stamps. Across both preschool and school age online survey submissions, there were no instances of identifiable ballot stuffing, thus no submission were dropped from the final analytic dataset.

Thus, the final analytic data set was comprised of 290 preschool responses and 2,069 school age responses, for a total of 2,359 responses.

*Rasch Scaling:* Once the analytic data files were cleaned, the Rasch scaling model was applied as prescribed by the NCSEAM technical manual. Responses to both the preschool and school age Parent Involvement Surveys were scaled separately using a polytomous Rasch model, where the rating scale was collapsed into three categories: Very Strongly Disagree, Strongly Disagree and Disagree comprise Category 1, Agree represents Category 2, and Strongly Agree and Very Strongly Agree are in Category 3. The specific scaling method used was the Andrich Rating Scale model, which was the method used for the initial validation and calibration of the Parent Involvement measure (Elbaum, personal communication, September 2014). Anchor values for some items, where available, were taken from those used in Florida, which represent the most recently re-scaled values.

The scaling method places each individual, conditional on their responses to the 25 items comprising the rating scale for the respective instrument, on a continuous scale, or ruler, ranging from 0 to 1,000. The standard for agreeing that their child’s school facilitated parental involvement was set at 600 (this threshold was defined by NCSEAM as part of the Parent Involvement Survey development process): respondents whose scaled score was below this threshold were identified as having not agreed that their child’s school facilitated parental involvement, while scaled scores at or above this level agreed.

#### *Representativeness of Responses:*

Parents answered questions about their students’ ethnicity, gender, and primary exceptionality/disability type. Analysis of these responses shed light on the extent to which the sample of students for whom parents answered questions is similar to, or dissimilar to, the population of students in the state who receive special education services. The more comparable the characteristics of the sample are to the population of students, the more generalizable the results are to the population of students in the state who receive special education services.

Statistics on the population of the state’s students receiving special education services were extracted from the state’s 2014 Statewide Census by Disability report, which is based on students enrolled as of October 1, 2014. Statistics were then compared for gender, ethnicity, and primary exceptionality/disability between the state’s population and the survey sample.

The group of students whose parents responded to the survey were comparable to the state population of students receiving special education services as defined by gender, with 66% of the state’s population

of students receiving special education services being male and 68% of parents responding that their student was male.

The responding parents described their children with ethnicity categories that less closely matched those of the state's population of students receiving special education services. Much of this difference was due to the percent of parents who self-reported their student as multiple races on the survey (7.6%) compared to the state average (0.6%). This difference is likely due to differences in how a student's race/ethnicity data was collected for the state versus how it was posed on the survey (with the option to "mark all that apply"). This over-representation of students identified as multiple races was offset by an under-representation in the survey sample of parents identifying their students as white (83% among the survey sample compared to 90% among the state's population). The percentage of students identified as Asian, Black (not Hispanic) and Native Hawaiian were within 2 percentage points of the state's population. American Indian or Alaska Native students were over-represented in the group by 3.3 percentage points compared to the state's population of those students, while Hispanic students were under-represented in the sample by 3.3 percentage points.

The percentage of the survey results varied in small ways from the state population as defined by the student's primary exceptionality/disability (Table 5). A greater percentage of the survey results reported their students' primary exceptionality was Autism (14.9% of the survey results compared to 8.8% of the student population in the state), Developmental Delay (12.8% in the survey results compared to 10.5% in the state population), or Multiple Disabilities (4.0% compared to 1.4%, respectively). Alternatively, the survey was comprised of fewer parents of students with Other Health Impairment as their primary exceptionality (11.5% in the survey compared to 18.1% in the population), Specific Learning Disability (29.6% compared to 33.4%), and Emotional Disturbance (6.0% in the survey compared to 7.4% in the population).

Despite these small differences, students with Specific Learning Disabilities comprised the largest proportion of special education student primary exceptionalities in the survey group and in the population, and the next largest proportions of students were comparable. As a whole, students whose primary exceptionality was identified as Specific Learning Disabilities, Speech or Language Impairment, Other Health Impairment, Developmental Delay and Autism comprised 87% of the state's special education student population and 86% of the surveys.

The responding parents were well distributed across children's age ranges. Almost all ages were represented by between 5% and 8% of the total responding sample. There was some tendency for parents of younger children to respond at a greater rate, but this difference was minimal. In short, parents of students across all age ranges were equally likely to respond to the survey.

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No

- Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State
- No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

The State revised the baseline for this indicator, using FFY 2013 data, and OSEP accepts that revision.

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

Compliance indicator: 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))

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	0	175	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

### Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

Definition of “Disproportionate Representation” and Methodology

#### Definition of Disproportionate Representation

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.

#### Methodology

All racial/ethnic groups were included in the analysis, as required by OSEP. A weighted risk ratio was used in analyzing the district data. In order to calculate the weighted risk ratio, there had to be at least two

racial/ethnic subgroups in the district that met the minimum “n” size. The minimum “n” size was defined as at least 40 students enrolled in the district in two or more racial/ethnic subgroups and within those subgroups, at least 10 students identified as receiving special education and related services. The cell size was selected to protect individually identifiable student information and to ensure that there were sufficient students in the subgroups to allow for appropriate identification of disproportionate representation. The cell size is consistent with the cell size NHDOE uses for determining AYP. The *OSEP/Westat technical guide: Methods for Assessing Racial/Ethnic Disproportionality in Special Education: A Technical Assistance Guide, July 2007* was used in developing this methodology. The NHDOE used the electronic spreadsheet developed by Westat that calculates both weighted and un-weighted risk ratios to determine state and district level data.

*Step One: States must provide the number of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.*

Using the criteria established above, the NHDOE determined that, out of 175 school districts, 20 school districts met the cell size requirement for data analysis. Of those 20 school districts, 0 were identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate representation of over representation.

In FFY 2009 the NHDOE, with support from NERRC and DAC, conducted an intensive review of our procedure for identification of LEAs with disproportionate representation. Based on this examination, the NHDOE determined that the process as explained in the SPP was sound. The small number of districts that met the cell size was a direct result of the homogeneous nature of New Hampshire’s population.

*Step Two: Determining if Disproportionate Representation is the Result of Inappropriate Identification States must report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2013 reporting period, i.e., after June 30, 2014.*

Through the process used for this indicator (described above), if any districts identified in Step One had been determined to have overrepresentation in the identification of students with disabilities, the NHDOE would have utilized the following monitoring process to determine whether the disproportionate representation (see above definition) was the result of inappropriate identification. The NHDOE would examine the districts’ child find, evaluation, eligibility and other related policies, procedures and practices to ensure an equitable consideration for special education and related services for all racial and ethnic groups and that those eligibility determinations were conducted appropriately. For each district that met the criteria in Step One, the State would have consulted with the local Director of Special Education regarding the data and reviewed local policies, procedures and practices related to this indicator. In addition, the NHDOE would have reviewed the data for complaints and due process hearings for any issues regarding inappropriate identification that may have been found in either of these dispute resolution mechanisms.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

Compliance indicator: 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))

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	0	175	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

### Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

Definition of “Disproportionate Representation” and Methodology

#### Definition of Disproportionate Representation

The NHDOE has defined disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification as a weighted risk ratio above 3.00.

#### Methodology

All racial/ethnic groups were included in the analysis, as required by OSEP. A weighted risk ratio was used in analyzing the district data. In order to calculate the weighted risk ratio, there had to be at least two racial/ethnic subgroups in the district that met the minimum “n” size. The minimum “n” size was defined as at least 40 students enrolled in the district in two or more racial/ethnic subgroups and within those

subgroups, at least 10 students identified in the specific disability category (specific learning disability, mental retardation (now referred to as intellectual disability), autism, other health impaired, speech language impaired, and emotional disturbance) for the racial/ethnic subgroup being compared. The cell size was selected to protect individually identifiable student information and to ensure that there were sufficient students in the subgroups to allow for appropriate identification of disproportionate representation. The cell size is consistent with the cell size used for determining AYP. The *OSEP/Westat technical guide: Methods for Assessing Racial/Ethnic Disproportionality in Special Education: A Technical Assistance Guide, July 2007* was used in developing this methodology. The NHDOE used the electronic spreadsheet developed by Westat that calculates both weighted and un-weighted risk ratios to determine state and district level data.

*Step One: States are to provide the number of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories*

Using the criteria established above, the NHDOE determined that, out of 175 school districts, 6 school districts met the cell size requirement for data analysis. While 169 districts were excluded from the calculation based on small cell sizes, the NHDOE chose to include all districts in the denominator for this indicator, as permitted. Of the 6 school districts that met the cell size requirements, zero (0) were identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate over-representation.

In FFY 2009 the NHDOE, with support from NERRC and DAC, conducted an intensive review of our procedure for identification of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. Based on this examination, the NHDOE determined that the process as explained in the SPP was sound. The small number of districts that met the cell size was a direct result of the homogeneous nature of New Hampshire's population.

*Step Two: Determining if Disproportionate Representation is the Result of Inappropriate Identification States must report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2013 reporting period, i.e., after June 30, 2014.*

Through the process used for this indicator (described above), if any districts identified in Step One had been determined to have overrepresentation in the identification of the specified disability areas, the NHDOE would have utilized the following monitoring process to determine whether the disproportionate representation (see above definition) was the result of inappropriate identification. The NHDOE would examine the districts' child find, evaluation, eligibility and other related policies, procedures and practices to ensure an equitable consideration for specific disability categories for all racial and ethnic groups and that those eligibility determinations were conducted appropriately.

For the district that met the criteria in Step One, the NHDOE would have consulted with the local Director of Special Education regarding the data and reviewed local policies, procedures and practices related to this indicator. In addition, the NHDOE would have reviewed the data for complaints and due process hearings for any issues regarding inappropriate identification that may have been found in either of these dispute resolution mechanisms.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
--------------------------------------	---	--	--

**FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
null	null	null	0

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 11: Child Find

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: 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.

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

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		81.00%	95.00%	77.00%	81.00%	95.00%	96.00%	95.00%	96.00%	95.61%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
1,902	1,828	95.61%	100%	96.11%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	74
---	----

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

Of the 1,903 children for whom parental consent for initial evaluation was received, 74 children did not have evaluations completed within the State established timelines (45 days or 60 days with signed extension). The 74 children were from 27 Districts. Pursuant to the OSEP FAQ dated 9/3/08, NHDOE groups individual instances of noncompliance in a district related to this Indicator as one finding of noncompliance. The review of FFY 2014 data resulted in 27 new findings of noncompliance; one per school district. The findings were made in FFY 2015 and NHDOE will report on correction of those findings in the FFY 2016 APR.

In analyzing the data, the majority of delays were reported within 1-15 days past the 45 day timeline. The reasons for delay include lack of understanding of the evaluation process and timelines, data entry errors and scheduling issues. The NHDOE has offered targeted technical assistance for those districts who continue to struggle in meeting the timelines.

Range of Days Beyond State Timeline                      1-15 Days                      16-30 Days                      31-45 Days                      46-60 Days                      +60 days

Initial Evaluations	41	17	3	2	11
---------------------	----	----	---	---	----

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used**

- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

The NHDOE monitored each district in the state for compliance with this indicator. The data for this indicator were only partially available through the State database, the New Hampshire Special Education Information System (NHSEIS). NHSEIS does not collect data on written consent for time extensions or allowable exceptions. Those additional data points for this indicator were collected through a desk audit monitoring process soliciting additional documentation from the districts to demonstrate compliance. Monitoring data for FFY 2014 were collected on all children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received for the time period of September 1 - November 30, 2014.

For the desk audit, districts were required to submit evidence of compliance including student information regarding date of referral, date of receipt of parental consent to evaluate and date of eligibility determination for special education. This information was entered by the district into NHSEIS. The NHDOE desk audit also required that districts with written consent for an extension submit written documentation of the extensions so that the NHDOE could determine if the parties had signed it by the 45<sup>th</sup> day. These data points were then analyzed to determine compliance at both the state and district level for completion of initial evaluations within the 45-day timeline or 60 days with a valid extension.

The desk audit also allowed districts to present evidence of allowable exceptions to the timeline when the timeframe set for initial evaluation did not apply to a public agency because: "1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for evaluation or 2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the relevant timeframe [for initial evaluations] has begun, and prior to a determination by the child’s previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability," as allowed by 34 CFR §300.301(d). As permitted by OSEP in the Measurement Table, the NHDOE did not report these exceptions in either the numerator or denominator.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
--------------------------------------	---	--	--

**FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
30	30	null	0

**FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

*Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

The NHDOE has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator has corrected the identified noncompliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, as follows: The NHDOE verified that each district was correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b), (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of data subsequently collected through a desk audit monitoring process. During the correction period, the NHDOE reviewed local policies and procedures and provided on-site technical assistance to districts to support the timely evaluation process, including accurate data collection and entry in order to ensure districts were providing timely evaluations.

These findings reflect all noncompliance identified with this indicator through monitoring and data collections. Written findings were made consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 that identified the LEAs where noncompliance occurred and their levels of noncompliance and included the regulatory citations. All noncompliant practices were addressed through root cause analyses and improvement activities. Policies and procedures were revised as necessary.

*Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected*

The NHDOE, through a data review of the desk audits submitted by districts and additional data as needed, verified that each district had completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. Therefore, the NHDOE has verified that, for each of these individual cases, the district had completed the required action, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, prior to the identification of findings, as reported in the FFY 2013 APR.

**OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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))

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2012

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		88.26%	66.00%	92.00%	95.00%	97.00%	98.00%	99.00%	97.00%	96.48%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	333
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	39
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	278
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	7
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
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. $[c/(a-b-d-e)] \times 100$	278	287	96.48%	100%	96.86%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	9
--	---

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

Of these 9 children, 3 were found not eligible for special education on or after the third birthday and 6 were found eligible and had IEPs fully developed and implemented after the third birthday. These 9 children were in 7 districts. Reasons for delays included changes in staff, IEP meetings held too close to the 3rd birthday, and challenges with implementation of the Interagency Agreement between Part C and

the district. For 3 of the children, there were data entry issues which prevented the NHDOE from being able to verify the implementation of the regulations. The RACE2K initiative, funded by the New Hampshire Department of Education, Bureau of Special Education, used information about the root causes of noncompliance to provide customized technical assistance to districts. Interagency agreements between early intervention and preschool special education are reviewed to promote timely referrals and coordinated efforts to ensure compliance and timely transitions.

Range of days beyond third birthday	1-15 Days	16-30 Days	31-45 Days	46-60 Days	>60 Days	Total
	5		1	1	2	9

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Data were collected for this indicator through a monitoring process, as the data required for this indicator were only partially available through the State database known as NHSEIS. This was the first year that NH Part C data transferred automatically into the Part B data system and the state was able to create a report of all children who were referred from Part C to Part B. Once the preliminary report was generated, the NHDOE, in conjunction with RACE2K (the NHDOE funded TA center), verified with districts additional data elements that were required to determine compliance. The New Hampshire Department of Education collected data from each district in the state to determine compliance with this indicator. Data were collected on all children who were served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination from the time period of July 1 – October 31, 2013. The data were collected from all geographic areas and accurately represent data for the full reporting period.

In order to ensure data quality the NHDOE verified available data points in NHSEIS. In addition, RACE2K and NHDOE staff conducted on-site reviews of files, policies and procedures as needed. This is the same process that was used to report in the FFY 2012 APR.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
5	5	null	0

**FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

*Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

The NHDOE has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator has corrected the identified noncompliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, as follows:

The NHDOE verified that each district was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements (34 CFR

## FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

§300.124(b) i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of data subsequently collected through a desk audit monitoring process. During the correction period, RACE2K, an initiative funded by the NHDOE Bureau of Special Education through the NH Parent Information Center (PIC) provided technical assistance and reviewed local policies and procedures to support districts with timely and quality transitions in compliance with the regulations.

*Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected*

Prior to issuing written findings of noncompliance, the NHDOE, through a data review, verified that each district had developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. Therefore, the NHDOE has verified that, for each of these individual cases, the district had completed the required action, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, prior to the identification of findings, as reported in the FFY 2013 APR based on FFY 2012 data.

### OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

### Required Actions

### Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

#### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						47.00%	50.90%	94.20%	100%	60.48%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

#### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

#### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
82	150	60.48%	100%	54.67%

#### Explanation of Slippage

The NHDOE through our monitoring processes continually looks at data and results to identify areas where additional training or further clarity is needed in the special education field. The NHDOE through compliance monitoring identified the need to provide further training to school district personnel in the writing of measurable annual goals. NHDOE staff researched and developed Measurable Annual Goals Trainings in collaboration with school district staff who were skilled in this area. Measurable Annual Goals Trainings were offered to each of the districts being monitored for Indicator 13 as well as to other districts. Some of the districts being monitored took advantage of this TA and others did not. In addition, through our Indicator 13 monitoring process, the NHDOE had become more concise about what constituted student invite and provided this as well as the annual goal criteria in our Indicator 13 trainings to districts selected for Indicator 13 monitoring in FFY 2014. In FFY 2014, the NHDOE Indicator 13 compliance monitoring team began reviewing district's annual goals in accordance with this more defined measurable annual goals criteria provided through the trainings, as well as being more concise about what constituted student invite to their IEP meeting where transition planning was discussed. This resulted in the FFY 2014 slippage of 5.81 percentage points from the FFY 2013 60.48% compliance to the FFY 2014 54.67% compliance. Each year, the cohort of districts being monitored changes so that all districts serving youth with IEPs aged 16 and above will be monitored at least once during the SPP cycle.

During the 2014-2015 school year, the NHDOE offered 3 statewide Indicator 13 trainings. The NHDOE also offered Indicator 13 trainings for each of the 13 districts being monitored. Only 2 districts took advantage of this opportunity. There was a direct correlation between compliance results and participation in the trainings. For the 2015-2016 period, the NHDOE offered additional local and regional trainings which

included a coaching component. As of December 2015, the NHDOE has conducted 2 statewide trainings, 4 regional trainings and 5 of the 16 districts being monitored participated in local Indicator 13 training.

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

Between FFY 2005–FFY 2010, all NH school districts had been monitored for Indicator 13, as mandated by OSEP. The NHDOE, with input and guidance from Data Accountability Center (DAC) and Northeast Regional Resource Center (NERRC), began a new process for Indicator 13 compliance review monitoring for FFY 2011 marking the beginning of a new five-year monitoring cycle for Indicator 13, in order to complete monitoring of all districts during the FFY 2005 SPP. For the SPP beginning in FFY 2013, the NHDOE began a new 6 year monitoring cycle. During this six-year monitoring cycle every public high school in NH will be monitored for this Indicator. The NHDOE randomly selects high schools to participate in Indicator 13 monitoring to ensure that all high schools will be monitored during the six-year cycle. Reporting for this Indicator is done only at the high school level, just as is done for Indicator 1 (graduation) and Indicator 2 (dropout), and no longer will be done at the district level. Once a NH high school is randomly selected, monitored, and meets 100% compliance for Indicator 13, they are removed from the selection process until the cycle is complete.

The New Hampshire Process: The NHDOE used an on-site file review process for monitoring for Indicator 13. NHDOE staff and/or qualified reviewers trained by the NHDOE conduct the file reviews.

Randomly selected high schools were notified in the summer months prior to the start of the school year in which they were monitored. Professional development opportunities were made available at no cost to the schools by the NHDOE in the areas of understanding the components of compliance, secondary transition, writing measurable post-secondary goals, etc. High schools were encouraged to take advantage of trainings offered by the NHDOE.

In preparation to meet the requirements for Indicator 13, it was recommended that high school special education staff (1) review the I-13 checklist found in the Indicator 13 Guidance Document; (2) review the NHDOE's I-13 past training PowerPoint presentation(s) on the components of compliance found at [http://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/special\\_ed/sec\\_trans.htm](http://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/special_ed/sec_trans.htm), and; (3) attend a NHDOE training on Indicator 13 compliance. Attachment C of the Indicator 13 Guidance Document is the checklist that the State will use for the compliance reviews to meet the requirements of I-13. High schools were responsible for ensuring that evidence of compliance with I-13 is in students' IEPs and/or their IEP files.

The New Hampshire Special Education System (NHSEIS) was used to generate student level information regarding this Indicator. The data was used to select student files to be reviewed that will be a representative sample considering gender, age, ethnicity, and disability. The number of files reviewed was based on district special education enrollment of students age 16 and up and is as follows:

District enrollment of more than 25 students age 16 and up – 10 files

District enrollment of less than 25 but more than 10 students age 16 and up – 5 files

District enrollment of 10 or less students age 16 and up – 2 files The NHDOE generated a list that had twice as many files for review, keeping in mind that unexpected changes may occur to a student's status, such as transferring to another school district. The NHDOE notified high schools in the early fall of the year they are scheduled to be monitored of the list of randomly selected student files. Prior to receiving the list of randomly selected student files, the NHDOE scheduled the I-13 on-site compliance monitoring visit with the high school to take place in the winter or spring of that school year.

The NHDOE then conducted on-site visits in the winter or spring to perform reviews of student IEP files. The NHDOE reviewers who complete the monitoring consisted of two team members who have been trained and have an understanding of the I-13 requirements (see I-13 Reviewer's Process). The high school shared the preselected IEP files for the current school year for review. The I-13 checklist was used.

In order to meet the compliance requirements, all 8 elements of the checklist must have (yes) in order to be in full compliance (See attachment A) or in some cases, (N/A) to be in compliance. The NHDOE calculated a high schools compliance percentage by dividing the total number of compliant files reviewed by the total number of reviewed files. (Example: Nine (9) files out of ten (10) files meet compliance =  $9/10 \times 100 = 90\%$  compliance) The NHDOE calculated the State compliance percentage by dividing the total number of NH compliant files reviewed by the number of total number of files reviewed. High schools were notified, in writing as soon as possible, but no later than 90 days from the date of the on-site file review visit, the findings of compliance or noncompliance.

The NHDOE entered data from completed Indicator 13 compliance checklist forms into the Indicator 13 Compliance database which collects the following information: District name, School Name, Student ID #, NHDOE team reviewer's names, date of finding(s), items of noncompliance, date of written notification to district of noncompliance, date of correction and date of closure letter noting the correction.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	4	2	0

**FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

*Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

Pursuant to the OSEP FAQ dated 9/3/08, the NHDOE groups individual instances of noncompliance in a district related to this Indicator as one finding of noncompliance. In FFY 2013, there were 6 written findings of noncompliance relative to this indicator from 6 districts.

After the written finding of noncompliance was made, the NHDOE and the district determined what, if any, additional technical assistance and/or coaching needed to be provided to the district by the NHDOE. Once the agreed upon technical assistance and/or coaching occurred, the NHDOE conducted a verification visit in each of the six districts at a mutually agreed upon date. At the verification visit, the NHDOE reviewed files for newly selected students to verify evidence the district was subsequently correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, as identified through the component check list. The NHDOE verified that four of the six LEAs were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for this indicator within one year of the written finding of noncompliance and that two of the six LEAs were subsequently correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for this indicator.

*Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected*

Each of the six districts with a finding of noncompliance were required to correct each individual instance of noncompliance within 60 days of the written finding of noncompliance. After the written finding of noncompliance was made, the NHDOE and the district determined what, if any, additional technical assistance and coaching needed to be provided to the district by the NHDOE. Once the agreed upon technical assistance and/or coaching occurred, the NHDOE conducted a verification visit in each of the six districts at a mutually agreed upon date. The NHDOE verified correction of each individual case of noncompliance through an on-site review of the updated file. If the NHDOE determined that the area of

noncompliance was not corrected within the initial timeline, additional support was provided and another verification visit was scheduled. For each of the six FFY 2013 findings of noncompliance, all individual cases of noncompliance were verified as corrected within 90 days of the written finding of noncompliance.

**OSEP Response**

The State revised the baseline for this indicator, using FFY 2013 data, and OSEP accepts that revision. Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

**Required Actions**

**Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

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

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2013	Target ≥							43.20%	45.20%	47.20%	39.56%
		Data						43.20%	54.40%	40.30%	47.40%	39.56%
B	2013	Target ≥							70.20%	72.20%	74.50%	63.11%
		Data						70.20%	75.70%	62.70%	69.90%	63.11%
C	2013	Target ≥							82.60%	84.60%	86.60%	77.78%
		Data						82.60%	87.90%	79.70%	82.80%	77.78%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	39.56%	39.56%	39.56%	39.56%	40.40%
Target B ≥	63.11%	63.11%	63.11%	63.11%	64.00%
Target C ≥	77.78%	77.78%	77.78%	77.78%	78.20%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Prior to the submission of the FFY 2013 SPP, the NHDOE Bureau of Special Education staff conducted a Go-to Meeting with a variety of stakeholders including representatives from the NH Parent Information Center (PIC), the NH School Administrators Association, and Special Education Administrators from diverse regions of the state. This meeting focused on Indicators 2 (dropout), 4 (suspensions and expulsions) and 14 (Post School Outcomes). This format allowed participants from across the state to engage in the discussion, regardless of weather conditions, travel constraints and busy schedules. These indicators were clustered together because of the interconnected nature of suspensions/expulsions, dropouts and post school outcomes. The meeting included an overview of the SPP/APR and these three indicators. Historical data and targets were shared with participants for the three indicators. FFY 2013 data was also presented. The two key questions posed for each indicator were: should we re-establish baseline year for this indicator and why; and what does the group think about the NHDOE proposed targets for the new SPP?

For Indicator 14, the group felt that there was a very compelling reason to change the baseline data year established in FFY 2009. The group reflected on the dropping response rate from FFY 2009 (13.64%) - FFY 2012 (9.82%) as well as the fact that the number of students responding to the survey dropped by 125 students between FFY 2009 (340 responders) and FFY 2013 (225 responders). The group felt these drops are due to the poor economy and the fact that families are more transient and change their addresses, emails and phone numbers more frequently making it difficult to get the survey to the student to complete. As well as the required timing for the post school outcomes survey administration occurring one year after the students have left high school which is when school staff are on summer break and not available to assist the NHDOE in

tracking down students who have not responded to the initial survey mailing at the student's most current location.

In reviewing Indicator 14 results over the last 4 years, stakeholders and the NHDOE agreed that a new baseline data year should be established using the FFY 13 actual data. In addition, the stakeholders felt the targets should remain stable at the FFY 2013 actual data level until the final year of the SPP. They agreed that the final target measurements would be increased to the following measurements: a) 40.4%, b) 64.0%, and c) 78.2% which would represent an increase in approximately 10 more survey responders across the various measurement areas. The NHDOE does have a five year federally funded SPDG grant (2012-2017) called Next Steps NH with the goal to increase the number of students with disabilities and/or at risk of dropping out of school that are college and career ready in NH through the implementation of evidenced based transition practices. This grant provides NH high schools with training in evidence based secondary transition strategies and practices that ensure students are aware of and prepared to participate in further education and career training for improved post school outcomes.

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	283.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	109.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	81.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	13.00
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	25.00

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	109.00	283.00	39.56%	39.56%	38.52%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	190.00	283.00	63.11%	63.11%	67.14%
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	228.00	283.00	77.78%	77.78%	80.57%

**Explanation of A Slippage**

The only area in which there was slippage was for A. Enrolled in Higher Education. The slippage is not considered to be statistically significant given that it was a decrease of approximately 1 percentage point. When comparing this year's data to last year, it is important to note that the overall response rate was increased by 1 percentage point and that there was an increase of 20 additional youth enrolled in higher education. The slight decrease in youth enrolled in higher education was offset by the increase in youth competitively employed and in some other employment.

**Was sampling used?** No

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: 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))

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2010

FFY	2005		2006			2007			2008		
Target	-			-		45.00%	-		60.00%	-	
Data			38.70%			100%			84.00%		

FFY	2009		2010			2011			2012			
Target	60.00%	-	75.00%	-		62.00%	-	72.00%	65.00%	-	75.00%	62.00%
Data	69.00%		71.00%			100%						

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014		2015		2016		2017		2018						
Target	62.00%	-	72.00%	62.00%	-	72.00%	62.00%	-	72.00%	63.00%	-	73.00%	63.00%	-	73.00%

Key:

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Based on new guidance provided by OSEP, when a state meets the threshold of at least 10 resolution sessions in a report period at any point in time, the baseline is established and targets are to be set for each succeeding year. Further, OSEP has stated that States are only held to the targets in a year when the threshold has been met. Given this new guidance, the NHDOE, after consulting with stakeholders, has established the baseline year for FFY 2010 and set targets from FFY 2013-FFY 2018. NH did not meet the threshold in FFY 2013 or FFY 2014, therefore the state is not held to the targets for these years.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	<a href="#">3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</a>	n	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	<a href="#">3.1 Number of resolution sessions</a>	5	null

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
2	5	80.00%	62.00% - 72.00%	40.00%

**Explanation of Slippage**

NH did not meet the threshold of at least 10 resolution sessions for FFY 2014. Therefore, although NH did not meet the target, NH is not required to meet the target because there were fewer than 10 resolution sessions in this year.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2014. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

**Required Actions**

**Indicator 16: Mediation**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2005		2006		2007		2008				
Target	-		79.00%	-		81.00%	-		82.00%	-	
Data	88.33%		51.50%		100%		78.00%				

FFY	2009		2010		2011		2012								
Target	65.00%	-		85.00%	-		75.00%	-		85.00%	75.00%	-		85.00%	65.00%
Data	82.00%		60.00%		78.20%		71.40%								

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014		2015		2016		2017		2018						
Target	65.00%	-	75.00%	65.00%	-	75.00%	65.00%	-	75.00%	65.00%	-	75.00%	70.00%	-	80.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Prior to the submission of the FFY 2013 SPP, the NHDOE Bureau of Special Education and the Office of Legislation & Hearings convened a stakeholder meeting via Go-To meeting with representatives from the NH Parent Information Center (PIC), local special education administrators (Director of Student Services and Assistant Superintendent), a hearing officer/mediator and the Special Education TA provider for the NH Association of School Administrators. This format allowed participants from across the state to engage in the discussion, regardless of weather conditions, travel constraints and busy schedules. The NHDOE provided an overview of the SPP and the measurement for this indicator. The group reviewed historical data, past targets and FFY 2013 data; looking at trends and comparisons of various data points. There was a rich discussion about factors that impact this indicator such as changes in IDEA, a decrease in the number of due process hearings held, and the culture in NH around dispute resolution. There was a review of CADRE's analysis of the data and summary of history of this indicator which notes that the national mediation agreement rate is 69.8%. The NHDOE shared a summary of other state's targets from the previous SPP (provided through technical assistance from IDC) to help the group think about potential ranges for the targets.

The group agreed that baseline should be aligned with the most current data. There were some concerns that the nature of mediations and the small number of mediations held makes it challenging to set targets for this indicator. Given the historical data, the group discussed what might be reasonable for future targets. There was discussion about strategies to improve parent-school partnerships, ways to enrich parent's understanding of dispute resolution options, and the need to review our current mediation process (including training of mediators and procedures) to improve results for this indicator.

**Prepopulated Data**

**FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	<a href="#">2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</a>	14	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	<a href="#">2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</a>	16	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	<a href="#">2.1 Mediations held</a>	36	null

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
14	16	36	68.97%	65.00% - 75.00%	83.33%

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

### Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014
Target ≥		71.13%
Data	71.13%	85.30%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  
 Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	71.13%	73.71%	76.29%	78.90%

Key:

### Description of Measure

The State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) states that preschool children with disabilities in the identified subset of districts will substantially increase their rate of growth in the area of improved positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) by the time they turn six years of age or exit preschool special education. The calculation for determining Indicator 17 baseline for the subset of 16 districts uses the same measurement as Indicator 7, Outcome A, Summary Statement 1. Below is a comparison of the SSIP SiMR baseline calculation to the statewide data for SPP Indicator 7A SS1.

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	FFY 13 B17 Num.	FFY 13 B17 Denom.	FFY 13 B17 Baseline	FFY 13 B17 Data
A1: Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Formula: $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	138 (62+76)	194 (3+53+62+76)	71.13%	80.94% (777/960)

In FFY 2013, there were 1210 preschool children with disabilities who exited preschool special education in New Hampshire. SSIP baseline data was derived from a subset of 16 districts representing approximately 20% ( $241/1210 \times 100$ ) of the preschool children with disabilities who exited preschool special education in FFY 2013 (July 1, 2013-June 30, 2014). These districts represent each of the seven Preschool Technical Assistance Network regions and the five Superintendent Regions. Both assessment tools recommended by the NHDOE for measuring child outcomes are utilized within these districts: six of the districts use AEPSi™ and ten use TS Gold™. These districts range in size, with child count ranging from fewer than five to more than 100 preschool children with disabilities and offer a variety of service models and placement options. A significant factor used in identifying these districts was a readiness and willingness to improve the social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities.

Alignment with initiatives that can be leveraged to promote improved social-emotional outcomes was also considered in the selection of the districts. All of these districts have participated in initiatives supported by the Bureau of Special Education regarding preschool special education. Three of these districts are

involved with the SEE Change initiative and three with the NH Safe Schools/Healthy Students State planning grant (SAMSHA). This connection to key initiatives in the state increases the likelihood that New Hampshire will see and be able to measure improved social-emotional outcomes in the five year SSIP. See the Infrastructure Analysis section for more information on these initiatives.

The data below provides the actual numbers in each of the progress categories for the children in the subset of districts:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	3	1.24%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	53	21.99%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	62	25.73%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	76	31.54%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	47	19.50%
Total	N=241	100%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Phase I: In March 2015, the NHDOE Bureau of Special Education 619/SSIP Coordinator, with support from the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy) and the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA), conducted a target-setting webinar with the SSIP Stakeholder Input team to gather input regarding targets for the SSIP. This format allowed participants from across the state to engage in the discussion, regardless of weather conditions, travel constraints and busy schedules. Please refer to the attached document, "NH Part B SSIP Stakeholder Input team", for more information on the SSIP Stakeholder Input team, including a description of the responsibilities of the team, the roles/agencies represented and other information such as alignment to initiatives and committees. The SSIP Stakeholder Input team was established early in the development of the SSIP, giving participants a foundation to support them with making recommendations for targets. The rationale for the indicator measurement and targets was informed by stakeholder input on the statistical analyses used to define realistic expectations for targets.

The target-setting meeting included an overview of the SPP/APR and the indicator, as well as a review of the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) and the child outcome progress categories a.-e. (refer to the attached "POMS Primer" document for more information). Information about criteria for the selection of the subset of districts and the subsequent baseline data was shared with participants. For each district, the NHDOE with support from DaSy, examined the current and historical data for Indicator 7 Outcome A to determine a reasonable increase in the percentage for Summary Statement 1 (SS1), which would involve children achieving improvement in the trajectory of their social-emotional outcomes from progress category b. into category c. or d. From this, the total number of children that the subset of districts would need to move as a whole was computed. This analysis was shared with the SSIP Stakeholder Input team to support them in making informed recommendations regarding targets for this indicator. Further analysis was done based on the progress category distributions across the districts participating in the SSIP. Using the Meaningful Differences Calculator developed by the Early Childhood Outcome Center, stakeholders learned that a minimum of 15 children need to move from category b. (percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) to category c. (percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) or d. (percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level

comparable to same-aged peers) in order to effect a meaningful change in the results for Outcome A. SS1 for both Indicator 17 and Indicator 7. The questions for the stakeholders were: "Is this change ambitious yet achievable?" and "Once the coherent improvement strategies are implemented, how soon do we believe we can get there?".

In order to establish targets, there was an assumption that the base number of children would remain constant. This was made because there were no anticipated changes to eligibility or expected fluctuations to the population. There was unanimous agreement among stakeholders that achieving a measurable improvement in outcomes for 15 children as seen in movement from category b. to category c. or d. by FFY 2018 was an achievable but ambitious goal. Based on the Meaningful Differences Calculator, a target of improved outcomes for 15 children would result in a statistically significant improvement and would also positively impact Indicator 7. The stakeholders agreed that, since interventions (coherent improvement strategies) have not yet occurred and because of the time it takes for children to enter and exit preschool special education (generally two years), the targets should remain constant with the baseline data for FFY 2014 and FFY 2015. There was recognition by the stakeholders that the districts in the subset are involved in various ways with key initiatives and will have access to different resources and supports to promote improvement. While the subset of 16 districts performed considerably below the state aggregate as a whole, there were distinct differences in performance within the districts, especially when viewed over time. There was a strategic discussion about how to move to the final target. Stakeholders explored the option to stagger the number of children who would demonstrate improvement (FFY 2016: three children, FFY 2017 & 2018: six children each year). The final decision, made by consensus, was that we would set the targets based on reaching an additional five children each year for FFY 2016, 2017 and 2018.

#### *Overall Process for Gathering Stakeholder Input for Phase I: Leading by Convening*

Stakeholder input into the targets was much more than just this one meeting. In order to tell the full story of stakeholder input into the SSIP targets, NHDOE needs to go back to the beginning of the development of the SSIP and talk about the process for Phase I: data and infrastructure analysis, identification of the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR), coherent improvement activities and the Theory of Action.

The development of Phase I of the SSIP was an iterative process, with each step informed by and built on the work that preceded it. Bureau staff participated in OSEP sponsored events to better understand the requirements/expectations of the SSIP. Consultants from DaSy, IDEA Data Center (IDC), ECTA and the North East Regional Resource Center (NERRC) provided ongoing technical assistance throughout Phase I to support the data and infrastructure analysis, identification of the SiMR, coherent improvement strategies and the Theory of Action, as well as co-planning and facilitation of SSIP Stakeholder Input team meetings. The NHDOE looks forward to expanding on connections made with the new National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) as Phase I is completed and Phase II begins. The Bureau of Special Education 619 Coordinator serves as a member of NH Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), and participated in Part C SSIP development, coordinating SSIP development across systems as much as possible and sharing an ongoing commitment into Phase II of the SSIP. The NHDOE has the capacity to lead the work of the Part B SSIP and to coordinate with and support the work of the Part C SiMR.

The Bureau of Special Education with input from stakeholders began Phase I with preliminary data and infrastructure analysis; considering the broader landscape; and addressed the "current organizational and political climate to assess readiness to both begin and sustain implementation and scaling up (or expansion) of new practices or an innovation" (A Guide to the Implementation Process: Stages, Steps and Activities produced by ECTA). At this stage, the NHDOE maximized opportunities to talk to a wide-range of stakeholders, representing various roles across preschool and school-age special education, early childhood and general education. In this process, we reviewed what is already occurring in the state and looked to current research and evidence-based practices. The NHDOE, with stakeholders, considered the risk-benefit of potential areas of focus and identified gaps. There was consideration of how to leverage work that is already happening. The NHDOE mindfully engaged stakeholders in a variety of ways, using natural opportunities to take the pulse of stakeholders, and used input gathered through other means such as environmental scans and surveys. The NHDOE asked ourselves and our stakeholders: when we consider the potential areas to focus our efforts for the next five to six years, where can we get the most long-term positive impact for children with disabilities? What area(s) do we already have investment in and where could we benefit from greater focus? Who are the people who need to be at the table as we develop and implement this plan?

This broad analysis explored a variety of data sources and information about infrastructure, including but not limited to the SPP data, the NH Race to The Top application, NH Story of Transformation ("successes and struggles to transform an entire education system from the bottom up rather than the top down"), SWIFT, ESEA and the Flexibility Waiver, changes to State Assessment, NH Early Childhood Strategic Plan, Spark NH vision and mission, Next Steps State Personnel Development Grant (focused on developing and sustaining the skills of New Hampshire school district personnel and families to increase the number of students with disabilities graduating from high school who are college and career ready), the Secondary Transition Community of Practice and key research and briefs such as the NGA (National Governor's Association) Guide to Early Literacy. Data from the State Performance Plan for all indicators, including compliance data and data on state assessment, race/ethnicity, suspensions/expulsions and graduation/drop out was reviewed for potential areas of focus. As a result of this initial analysis the Bureau, with stakeholder input, narrowed the focus of the SiMR to preschool special education. Some of the reasons for this were: 1) because of the impending change in state-assessment, a focus on Indicator 3 did not seem prudent; 2) there were already a number of initiatives in place regarding graduation and dropout prevention and the data did not make a compelling case to focus on this area at this time; 3) research supports that maximum student achievement results occur when there are strong supports and services in place for young children. As stated by New Hampshire's Early Childhood Advisory Council, Spark NH: "Developmental science shows that a child's earliest experiences lay the foundation for the brain's developing architecture, setting a sturdy or fragile stage for all the learning, health, and behavior that follows. Making sure children in every community have access to the resources and experiences that promote development - health, nutrition, learning- will make them more likely to succeed in school and later in life."

In the spring of 2014, the NHDOE 619/SSIP Coordinator attended the NH State Advisory Committee (SAC) for Children with Disabilities (NH's federally mandated State Advisory Panel) to inform them about the new State Performance Plan and in particular about the SSIP. There was discussion about preschool special education services and settings, and the importance of improving outcomes for preschool children with disabilities. Three SAC members were identified by the committee to participate in the SSIP Stakeholder Input team.

Once the area of focus was identified as preschool special education, the NHDOE formally established the SSIP Stakeholder Input team to support the SSIP development, implementation and evaluation throughout the process in Phases I, II and III. Participants were invited based on perspectives needed for development of the SSIP and specific areas of expertise such as general education, early childhood, special education practitioner and administrators, families, TA providers, and so on. As the focus has evolved, the essential players were refined to ensure that stakeholders with the direct expertise, commitment and experience were included. Participants included individuals skilled at and knowledgeable about: data collection and analysis; intra- and inter-agency connections; TA and early childhood systems; family engagement; quality standards and program development; local and state infrastructure components; and evidenced-based practices. This brought both technical skills and systems-thinkers to the table. Please refer to the, "NH Part B SSIP Stakeholder Input team", document for more information on stakeholders.

The first formal SSIP Stakeholder Input team meeting focused on data analysis and was held on October 2, 2014. Susan Falkenhan, NH State Contact from OSEP, presented (remotely) to the team on Results Driven Accountability (RDA) and an overview of the SSIP. In order to facilitate participants' understanding of the work ahead of them, pre-meeting materials were sent out [Part B SPP Indicator 17: SSIP; Tip Sheet on Child Outcomes; Explanation of Impact of Cell Size; Link to NH APR; Link to ECTA webinars on Child Outcomes; ECTA Systems Framework Draft Components (infrastructure)]. See the section on Data Analysis for more information on what the data discussion entailed. The objectives for the meeting were for participants to:

1. Become familiar with OSEP Results Driven Accountability system and the State Systemic Improvement Plan process
2. Learn about the broad based infrastructure and data analysis conducted to date
3. Understand the Summary Statements for the child outcomes for preschool children with IEPs
4. Explore data regarding child outcomes for preschool children with IEPs, with a specific emphasis on Outcome A: Social-Emotional and Outcome B: Acquisition of Knowledge & Skills
5. Provide input to the NHDOE based on the exploration of the data
6. Identify next steps for infrastructure analysis and identification of a State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)

The NHDOE sought more wide-spread input into the SSIP, using outputs from the SSIP Stakeholder Input team meeting to determine what other information was needed from local practitioners and administrators. Through the 619 sponsored Preschool Technical Assistance Network (PTAN), regional input sessions were conducted twice during the year (with another session set for this spring). At these

sessions, groups of preschool special education coordinators and special education administrators in each of the seven PTAN regions across the state met to increase understanding of the SSIP, seek input regarding the data and infrastructure analysis, and to inform the SiMR selection. These sessions were open to all districts in the state. By reaching out to the field, the NHDOE was able to garner more substantial input, ensuring the equitable distribution of input from direct practitioners and administrators. At the first PTAN input session, the two possible SiMRs were explored and the results of that input are in the section on State-identified Measurable Results *Description*. The data analysis, combined with infrastructure analysis, supports a focus on Summary Statement 1 (increasing the percentage of children who substantially increase their rate of growth by the time they exit the program) rather than on Summary Statement 2 (preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in the outcome by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program). The consensus of stakeholders, supported in consultation with DaSy, ECTA and IDC, was that it was more reasonable to begin with a focus on changing the trajectory of a child's rate of growth relative to an outcome rather than starting with changing the percentage of children who exited within age expectations.

During the second in the series of PTAN input meetings, practitioners and administrators further explored the evidence-based, DEC Recommended Practices. The focus was on those practices that are most closely aligned with improving child engagement with adults, peers and materials because research tells us that engagement yields improved social-emotional outcomes. This provided more insight into potential coherent improvement strategies, surfacing practices that are well-established and specific areas for improvement. As a result of these sessions, overarching themes were identified that have the greatest potential for impact in social-emotional outcomes on the state as a whole.

The SSIP Stakeholder Input team met on December 15, 2014 to conduct an in-depth infrastructure analysis focused on the selected SiMR topic, improved social-emotional skills for Preschoolers with Disabilities. The 619/SSIP Coordinator engaged stakeholders in a process to move from the previously completed broad infrastructure analysis to an in-depth infrastructure analysis. More information on the results of this work can be found in the Analysis of State Infrastructure section.

The 619/SSIP Coordinator reached out to key representatives from each of the 16 districts in the subset. They expressed enthusiasm and commitment to participation in the SSIP and an eagerness to improve social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities in their district. Each district offered insights into local practices and systems. Through these discussions, districts readily raised possible root causes that impact performance and provided insights that informed coherent improvement strategies.

The root cause analyses occurred at the state, regional and district level and was informed by the infrastructure and data analysis. The results of these analyses have been provided in the Data and Infrastructure sections. They have been synthesized and used to inform the development of the coherent improvement activities and the theory of action. The results are described in the sections on Coherent Improvement Activities and the Theory of Action.

The SSIP Stakeholder Input Team was actively involved in the development of each step of Phase I of the SSIP and will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II and Phase III of the SSIP.

**Overview**

**Data Analysis**

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

The preliminary data analysis, which led to the broad area of focus for the SSIP (improved outcomes for preschool children with disabilities) and the overall process for engaging stakeholders was described in

the section "Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input". Next, the NHDOE and stakeholders engaged in a more focused data analysis of key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. That in-depth analysis is described in this section.

#### *In-Depth Data Analysis*

The SPP Indicator 7 Preschool Child Outcome Data (entry and exit), in the state aggregate, was recognized as the primary data source for measuring outcomes for preschool children with disabilities available in NH. Based on the State Child Outcomes Data Quality Profiles and national analysis conducted by ECTA, NH Child Outcome data was considered to be of high quality, demonstrating the indicators of valid and reliable data. NH uses two tools, AEPSi™ by Brookes Publishing and TS Gold™ by Teaching Strategies, to assess child outcomes. The tool-by-tool comparison also supports the strength of these data. It was explained to stakeholders that we need to have a specific, measurable data set aligned with our indicators. Stakeholders were asked to think about what other data sources the State should consider to help inform in-depth data analysis that will lead to further drill-down on potential root causes of low performance. However, no other comprehensive data sets were identified by the stakeholders.

There are three Preschool Outcome Measurement System (POMS) outcomes: 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. The POMS data are reported based on progress categories that range from a. children who do not improve functioning in the outcome area to e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers. The results are then analyzed based on two summary statements: Summary Statement 1 (SS1) ~ Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program; Summary Statement 2 (SS2) ~ The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each outcome by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program. Refer to the attached "POMS Primer" for more detail.

In the broad data and infrastructure analyses, several factors (research, stakeholder input, alignment with other key initiatives) pointed to either A. social-emotional outcomes or B. acquisition of knowledge and skills as an area of focus. Several initiatives in the state align with Outcome A. (the SAMSHA Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant; SEE Change; Child Care Inclusion Project). The NH Part C SSIP is focusing on Outcome B. and that outcome aligns closely with the NHDOE Transformation and ESEA Flexibility Waiver. The Early Childhood Strategic Plan and the Framework for Policy Priorities developed by Spark NH also promote both of these outcomes. Therefore, the drill-down of data concentrated on those two outcomes as having the best likelihood of leading to improved child outcomes if developed into a SiMR. See the section on Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input for more detail on process for the selection of the SiMR and the section on Measurable Results for an explanation of the selection.

When New Hampshire first began to gather Child Outcome data for federal reporting, filters were built into the system by the publishers of the tools to allow the state to have access to only the data required for federal reporting. As a result, the NHDOE was not able to disaggregate child outcome data at the state level by race/ethnicity, age, disability, length of time in service or setting. Based on recommendations from the SSIP Stakeholder Input team and the PTAN regional input sessions, access to disaggregated data will support the ongoing work of the SSIP and the SiMR. In the spring of 2015 the NHDOE will work with the publishers of the online tools to remove the filters and allow for more discreet data analysis; this will allow the state to look at demographic differences and to provide better technical assistance to districts when there are data glitches that need to be researched. This may lead to more alignment with other data collection within the department, such as Kindergarten entry data, state assessment, Title 1 data and free and reduced lunch in future years. NHDOE was able to disaggregate other data sets by multiple variables, and conduct a meaningful, focused data analysis.

Trends over time in the State Aggregate (see attachment State Trends for SS1 and SS2) showed substantial increases for all three outcomes for Summary Statement 1, with targets met for each outcome over time. Summary Statement 2 had some downward trends, which in some part are believed to be an artifact related to a third assessment tool that was no longer being used. The state aggregate results did not point clearly to any specific area for a State-identified Measurable Result.

The NHDOE was able to disaggregate the child outcome data by district. Data were presented based on PTAN regions and in clusters according to cell size for both summary statements for Outcome A and B. The regional data indicated some differences in performance and was used as a prompt for regional discussions about SiMR selection and root causes for low performance. Because there is no overarching infrastructure to the regions, the regional data had limitations and could not be used for establishing a cohort of districts and baseline data. The DaSy Center staff recommended identifying a minimum cell size for stable reporting of data, with a minimum set at 25 children. In 2012, only seven out of 172 districts reporting child outcomes met the minimum cell size. Of those, only three consistently reported 25 or more children exiting over time.

Data were then analyzed based on cohort groups organized by cell size. Districts were grouped based

on child count size of 1-7, 8-14, 15-24, 25-39 and 40 or more preschool children with disabilities. Within each group, the performance on the Summary Statements by the cluster of districts was compared to state actual data. While conclusions about performance by districts with small cell size were not possible, it led to many insights about potential root causes contributing to low performance. This data process narrowed the analysis from the state aggregate to a regional review and then to an analysis of districts by size. This process then informed the SiMR and the selection of the subset of districts for the SSIP.

Data were also analyzed for Indicator 6: Early Childhood settings. Because of the limits on access to individual child data through the Child Outcome system, respect for IEP team decisions regarding the appropriate location of services, and the impact of small cell size on district level percentages, these data had limitations regarding the selection of the SiMR and the identification of district for the subset. These data will be considered as part understanding how and where preschool special education services are provided in the subset of districts. In Phase II the preschool LRE data will be reviewed for each of the 16 districts to ascertain how these data can be used within local programs to assess impact on social-emotional outcomes and to tell the story of preschool special education within the district.

#### *Root causes contributing to low performance based on Data Analysis*

The root cause analyses occurred at the state, regional and district level based on the infrastructure and multiple data analyses. The results of these analyses have been provided in the Data and Infrastructure sections. They have been synthesized and used to inform the development of the coherent improvement activities and are described in the section on Selection of Coherent Improvement Activities. NHDOE will collect identified data and evaluate the root cause hypotheses in Phase II of the SSIP.

1. The NHDOE was not able to disaggregate child outcome data by race/ethnicity, age, disability, length of time in service or setting. As a result, the NHDOE was not able to determine if these factors were impacting social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities.
2. The NHDOE was not able to link child outcome data to Part C or to the K-12 longitudinal data system. As a result, no conclusions could be made on child outcomes from Part C to Part B or regarding impact of preschool special education over time.
3. Local district personnel have varied ability to link data at the local level from preschool special education to the K-12 system. As a result, they are not able to analyze the long term impact of services by demographic and programmatic factors.
4. Local district personnel have limited capacity to analyze data to inform instruction and to guide IEP development. As a result, data are not used across all districts to the fullest effect and opportunities to refine practices to improve outcomes may be missed.
5. While the State-level data have been determined to be of high quality, some districts have identified a need to strengthen inter-rater reliability and to hone assessment skills. As a result, some data may not be accurately reflecting the social-emotional outcomes for individual children and assessments may not be conducted in the most efficient manner, creating a more cumbersome assessment process.

#### *Cautions*

When analyzing New Hampshire's child outcomes data, it is imperative that we not jump to conclusions, especially when so much of the data, although valid and reliable, are unstable due to small cell size. It is not the expectation that all children with disabilities will exit preschool special education functioning at the same level as their peers. In New Hampshire, because of the small size of the districts and the state, a district's performance does not necessarily indicate the quality of programs and staff. The data do not tell the full story and therefore there was much value in obtaining stakeholder input and developing hypotheses on potential root causes to low performance.

#### *Compliance Data*

After a review of compliance data, no concerns regarding compliance data and potential barriers to improvement were identified. Strengths of the compliance data are described in this section. Indicator 7 data were complete, timely and valid. Transitions from Part C to Part B were extremely smooth and effective and initial evaluations overall were completed within timelines. The NHDOE, across bureaus, and the NH Department of Health & Human Services Part C office work closely together and are exploring ways to use data to view the long-term results for children from Part C to preschool special education to elementary school. The NHDHHS Child Care Administrator has convened a stakeholder group, including the 619 Coordinator, to develop an Expulsion Prevention policy. As the work on Expulsion Prevention policy evolves, there may be more connections to suspension and expulsion data but at this time there was no indication that compliance data resulted in potential barriers to improvement.

#### *Conclusions*

The data analysis, combined with the preliminary infrastructure analysis supports the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) selection of improved positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) for preschool children with disabilities. See content under SiMR for more details.

### Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

The NHDOE conducted a systematic process for infrastructure analysis, beginning with a broad infrastructure analysis and assessing the landscape from 30,000 feet. Through this process, the NHDOE and stakeholders considered the capacity of our current infrastructure to support improvement and build local capacity, scanning to identify strengths, weakness and opportunities across a wide array of potential focus areas. In this step, the NHDOE and stakeholders reflected on the bigger picture, asking essential questions about alignment with other bureaus, agencies and initiatives; looking to potential areas of focus that would result in improved outcomes for children with disabilities. This step, because it was intricately connected to the preliminary data analysis and the ongoing, meaningful engagement of a wide array of stakeholders, has been described in more detail in the section on Targets: Description of Stakeholder Involvement.

As the NHDOE and stakeholders defined our SiMR, we refined our analysis of the infrastructure. NHDOE Bureau of Special Education staff, with support from IDC, convened the SSIP Stakeholder Input team (described in the Stakeholder Target Setting section) on December 15, 2014 to conduct a more in-depth infrastructure analysis focused on state capacity for the SiMR. This process was informed by ongoing technical assistance from DaSy, ECTA, IDC and NERRC; the broad infrastructure analysis; data analysis; stakeholder input; and Regional PTAN input sessions.

NHDOE staff focused the infrastructure analysis with stakeholders on the selected SiMR topic, improved social-emotional skills for preschoolers with disabilities. The infrastructure analysis was defined by and organized according to the ECTA Systems Framework component areas: Governance and Advisory Bodies, Data, Fiscal, Quality Standards, Accountability and Monitoring, and Professional Development, Technical Assistance and Guidance. NHDOE added a component on Current Initiatives and Priorities in order to capture needed stakeholder input. NHDOE organized the process and subsequent analysis across levels of state systems (statewide early childhood, departmental, program, provider, community and family) by State, Regional and District level in order to better enable NHDOE to support improvement and build capacity across state systems and at the program and provider levels.

Stakeholders reviewed and discussed ECTA Infrastructure Framework in order to establish shared understanding of the terms and guidance questions prior to working on infrastructure. Stakeholders describe the state's capacity to support improvement and build capacity in the local districts to implement, scale-up and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities.

Stakeholders were instructed to address:

- What does New Hampshire have in place that supports or addresses improved Social-Emotional Outcomes for Preschoolers with Disabilities?
- Think about current state-level improvement plans and initiatives, and how you (or the NHDOE) can leverage each of the infrastructure components for these outcome areas.
- Are there regions, districts, and/or programs in the state that have effectively addressed social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities?

Stakeholders worked in pairs to review and populate each infrastructure component with known strengths and concerns. In order to elicit a depth of thinking about the component areas, stakeholders were asked to consider leverage points and barriers that would be most likely to improve the success of the SiMR. The NHDOE and stakeholders used this information to look for patterns across the component areas and to inform root cause analysis, Coherent Improvement Strategies and the Theory of Action.

Participants obtained technical assistance from IDC during the process, as need. Individually, stakeholders reviewed the group input for each of the components and then discussed each component as a full group. The following narrative summarizes the descriptions of the component areas based on the infrastructure analysis.

*Component Area: Governance and Advisory Bodies*

New Hampshire is a small, collaborative and innovative state that works across agencies at the state and local level, leveraging public and private partnerships and resources to achieve results. The NHDOE Bureau of Special Education and the NH Parent Information Center (NH PTI) have a long-standing commitment to partner together to utilize the strategies of implementation science, promote the implementation of evidence-based practices and develop sustainable systems that promote improved outcomes for children with disabilities. Families, practitioners, local administrators, TA providers and state personnel work in concert to enhance systems and improve result.

The Early Childhood Workgroup, sponsored by the NHDOE, Bureau of Integrated Programs (Title 1) with intra- and inter-agency representation, is focusing on the development of tools for districts on the transition to public kindergarten. The workgroup will develop a statewide Early Childhood Task Force focused on Early Learning: "To foster a prekindergarten - third grade system to better meet the unique needs of all children while preparing them as competent and confident learners and to ensure the instructional practice is grounded in the essential understandings of developmentally appropriate practices in prekindergarten-third grade.

The SSIP Stakeholder Input team identified a number of advisory councils within the state that directly or indirectly impact social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities. There was a recognition that advisory bodies have various levels of authority. Inter-agency alignment is challenging because the various agencies with responsibilities for preschoolers with disabilities (i.e. local districts, Head Start, child care) have different infrastructures and authority. One example of advisory councils that have greater potential to leverage support for the SSIP is Spark NH. Spark NH is the federally mandated early childhood advisory council for the State of New Hampshire, consisting of 23 public and private members who represent early education, health and family support. The vision for Spark NH is that "All NH children and their families are healthy, learning and thriving now and in the future". Spark NH recently released *A Framework for Action for NH's Young Children*. One of the identified actions is to "Strengthen NH's capacity to promote healthy social-emotional development of infants, toddlers, other young children and their families and to provide mental health services and supports".

The New Hampshire Association for Infant Mental Health "works to ensure healthy social-emotional development before birth and beyond. We promote evidence-based and evidenced informed practices to strengthen collaboration, services and supports for families with infants and young children." NHDOE views potential inter- agency alignment in support of the SSIP.

One of the goals of the Safe Schools Healthy Students (SS/HS) state planning grant (SAMSHA) is to "Substantially improve the social and emotional skills and preparedness for long-term educational success of young children, birth through five years". The SS/HS grant has a Management Team. Each community has hired an Early Childhood Coordinator. NHDOE incorporated SAMSHA in the selection of some of the targeted districts for implementation of the SSIP.

The NHDOE 619 Coordinator has well-established relationships and shared initiatives with other governing organizations. She is a long-standing member of the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC). She is Vice-Chair of Spark NH and serves on the Workforce and Professional Development committee. The Bureau of Special Education works closely with the Head Start Collaboration Office and Office of Child Care which oversees the Child Development Block grant.

Collaborations cut across Spark NH and other committees, work groups and task forces. These collaborations are evident in the development of: Early Learning Standards, Kindergarten Readiness Indicators, Core Competencies for Early Childhood, and most recently the Preschool Expulsion Policy Task Force. Watch Me Grow is a statewide screening and referral system that has cross-agency oversight at the state level.

The NHDOE has established policies and procedures for the Preschool Outcome Measurement System (POMS), providing guidance to districts on the requirements for assessing and reporting on Preschool Outcomes. This system has allowed NH to collect valid and reliable data consistent with federal reporting requirements. It was designed to go beyond federal reporting, allowing local districts to use the data to drive improvements in programming, personnel development, curriculum and instruction with the goal of improving results for preschool children with disabilities.

At the local level, districts coordinate with local agencies and organizations for child find. There are Memorandums of Agreement between local districts and Family-Centered Early Supports and Services (early intervention) and between districts and Head Start programs. Ultimately, it is the local district's responsibility to ensure the provision of a Free Appropriate Public Education for preschool children with disabilities. Because of local control, there are inconsistencies that result from local school boards, administrative decisions/priorities, and local budgets. At this time, there is no requirement for kindergarten screening or for reporting results of screenings to the NHDOE.

Effective with the 2010-2011 school year, every public school district in New Hampshire is required to offer a minimum of a half-day Kindergarten program. The cut-off enrollment date is set locally by each district. In addition, each community decides if it will offer a full day or a half day program.

*Component Area: Data (intra- and inter- agency data sharing, data quality):*

Preschool Outcome Measurement System (POMS) data for Indicator 7 of the State Performance Plan are collected online through the publishers websites using one of two assessment tools (Brookes Publishing: AEPSi™ and Teaching Strategies: TS Gold™). Through extensive TA and support from the NHDOE to local districts, the state is moving to a culture of using the data to inform practice. POMS data are not connected to longitudinal data at the State level; but, POMS data may be used over time at the local level. NH's POMS data are recognized by ECTA as being of high quality, valid and reliable. More information on this primary data source for assessing improved positive social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities is included in the data analysis section of the SSIP and in Indicator 7 of the SPP. The NHDOE is exploring the request by district personnel that POMS data be linked to the statewide data systems (NHSEIS and i4See) in order to enable longitudinal data tracking at the district level.

The NH Special Education Information System (NHSEIS) is the statewide special education data system that collects information for state and federal special education reporting purposes. Students are assigned a Special Education ID and reconciled with the state assigned student identifier (SASID). The system collects 618 data such as child count and LRE data.

Districts report general education data through i4see (Initiative for School Empowerment and Excellence). From the NHDOE website:

"The Initiative for School Empowerment and Excellence (i4see) is a student level data collection that will eliminate many of the aggregate school and district reports. i4see will reduce the burden on districts, improve the quality of data and enable important analysis such as gains based analysis of assessments and the ability to help reduce the drop-out rate.

The Initiative for School Empowerment and Excellence (i4see) has changed the way the department collects and leverages student and school data. Central to the effort is an overarching principle that we should not only collect data for reporting needs, but that we should add value to the data being collected and provide information back to schools to empower teachers, administrators, policy makers, and parents to increase student achievement - enabling schools to follow every child and to analyze groups of students over time.

Administrators and teachers will have easy access to valuable data, helping improve the education for every child. The assignment of a state assigned student identifier (SASID) is the first deliverable of this initiative."

Data systems are also in place for collecting and reporting on key initiatives, such as SAMSHA grant and PBIS and the NH SEE Change initiative.

Spark NH Data Committee supported the development of "The Early Childhood Data System Blueprint and Recommendations" in August of 2013. According to that report, regarding NH Department of Health & Human Services early childhood data: "The State of New Hampshire enterprise data warehouse includes some early childhood data; however, the majority of NH early childhood data resides in program-based operational databases including Division of Vital Records Administration, a DHHS Endeca data platform, and six DHHS programs that provide direct services to families and children ages birth to five.....Each of the six programs has its own data collection process, database, and unique record identifier making correlation of records and services across programs and longitudinally difficult. Head Start program data is located in five individual provider data systems and the each program reports directly to the federal Office of Head Start. Data sharing across DHHS sectors requires programs to adhere to the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) and Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) legislation and regulations."

The report goes on to say: "Limited data are shared between DHHS programs and between DHHS and DOE programs. A data dictionary of the information elements shared was available. However, documented guidelines establishing an authoritative data source, identifying a steward or named person responsible for maintaining specific data elements and criteria for data element format were not available."

Data are shared on children referred from Part C Family-Centered Early Supports and Services (early intervention) and Part B special education consistent with federal requirements at both the state and local level. The NHDOE and NHDHHS are not yet able to link that data to more long term results.

*Component Area: Fiscal*

Local school districts are responsible for ensuring that special education supports, services and programs are offered at no cost to the family. In general this is done through local school district budgets. In some cases, parents of children without disabilities pay a tuition or fee to support preschool programming for their child within the public school. Each district's school board has a different understanding of the requirements to provide special education to preschool children and a different commitment to funding quality supports, services and programs for preschool children with disabilities.

State Aid: Average Daily Membership (ADM) is used to count students for State Aid based on the Estimated Cost of an Adequate Education. Students in kindergarten are counted as no more than .50 ADM. Preschool students are not included. There is differential aid that increases the cost per student for special education students, K-12.

A portion of IDEA funds, based on a federal formula, are allocated to local districts under both IDEA Section 611 and 619. Districts determine the use of these funds to support and provide services to preschool children with disabilities in the district based on local need and priorities. Section 619 funds are limited to preschool special education and have not been increased for many years. Section 611 funds may be designated for preschool through school age special education. These activities are approved by the NHDOE and districts are reimbursed for allowable activities after they have occurred.

The IDEA 619 Preschool Special Education grant provides funding each year for other state-level activities. The NHDOE has focused these dollars on technical assistance, professional development and cross-agency systems building. In addition, the Bureau of Special Education is permitting IDEA Part B 611 funds to support the coherent improvement strategies of the State Systemic Improvement Plan.

There is a need to understand more about how to blend and braid funding to support quality public/private preschool programs at the local level. The NHDOE, Bureau of Integrated Programs (Title 1) is developing resources to clarify how Head Start and Title 1 can jointly support programs. Once that is done, there will be a focus on creating guidance for fiscal models for programs that support preschoolers with disabilities and Title 1.

The New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE), Bureau of Special Education was awarded an \$8.6 million grant from the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration (SAMHSA) to implement a multi-year Safe Schools and Healthy Students State Planning Project. The NHDOE, in conjunction with the New Hampshire Department of Health and Human Services' Bureau of Behavioral Health (BBH) is the oversight and coordinating entity responsible for project implementation. The Safe Schools, Healthy Students State Planning Grant includes support for an Early Childhood Coordinator in each of the three NH school districts and communities participating in the project. These three districts have agreed to participate in the SSIP.

*Component Area: Quality Standards*

The quality of programs and the application of quality standards vary greatly and are difficult to regulate. The state definition of public elementary schools does not include preschool. Public preschools (and preschools operated by approved nonpublic schools) are license-exempt from child care licensing and are not under any state standards or regulations.

New Hampshire's voluntary quality rating and improvement system (QRIS), Licensed Plus, recognizes programs for their efforts to improve the quality of care for young children and rewards programs that strive to improve their practices and staff qualifications. It also allows families to identify programs with higher quality. Levels in the QRIS build from a foundation of minimum standards for licensing to full national accreditation. New Hampshire is in the process of revising its QRIS. Public preschool programs that seek child care licensing (even though they are license exempt) may participate in QRIS.

The Spark NH Quality of Early Childhood Programs and Services Committee recently produced two new products: Quality Early Childhood Programs: What Families May Want to Know and Quality Early Childhood Programs: What Providers May Want to Know. The products were designed to: raise provider and family awareness about the quality of early childhood programs and services, as defined by the Quality Committee and endorsed by Spark NH; and; help providers and families think about quality in terms of the statewide definition, which pertains to programs and services for expectant families and young children, birth through 3<sup>rd</sup> grade and their families in the areas of early learning, health and family support.

As part of the methodology in state's Flexibility Waiver for ESEA, the NHDOE selected Title 1 Focus, Priority and Reward schools. Being a part of a Focus or Priority School cohort will provide additional resources and partnerships to these schools to support the students they serve. This includes being a part of certain professional learning networks. The Focus and Priority Schools are mandated to use Indistar® as part of improvement process. The NHDOE has expanded the Indistar® indicators to include Early Learning. Indistar® is a web-based system for use with district and/or school improvement teams to inform, coach, sustain, track, and report improvement activities. This frames the focus areas for improvement plan and is tied to funding. Other districts may use the indicators, but are not required to. The indicators include items that explore culture and climate standards.

*Component Area: Accountability and Monitoring*

The description of the General Supervision System for Special Education is described in the Introduction to the State Performance Plan. The focus of the General Supervision system is on: A) Improving educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities; and B) Ensuring that New Hampshire, at both the state and local levels, meets the federal and state requirements for special education. In this section, we will focus on the aspects of accountability and monitoring as they relate specifically to preschool special education.

State Performance Plan (SPP): In addition to the SSIP, the State Performance Plan has four indicators specific to preschool special education. These four indicators drive the priorities of the Bureau of Special Education regarding preschools special education initiatives within the state. The NHDOE has built in verification processes to promote timely and accurate data regarding these indicators.

- Indicator 6: Preschool Least Restrictive Environment reports on the settings where preschool children with disabilities spend their days and where they receive special education supports and services.
- Indicator 7: Preschool Outcome Measurement System assesses the progress children make from entry to exiting preschool special education.
- Indicator 8: Parent Involvement survey of parents of preschool and school age children with disabilities to determine the degree to which schools facilitate parent's involvement in the special education process.
- Indicator 12: Early Transitions measures the timely transition of toddlers from Family-centered Early Supports and Services (early intervention) to preschool special education.

Integrated Monitoring Activities: When a district is selected for on-site monitoring, the comprehensive monitoring process spans all ages covered by the district, preschool through grade 12. The NHDOE 619 Coordinator works with the Compliance and Improvement Monitoring team to provide Technical Assistance specific to preschool. Because the configuration of preschool programs varies from district to district (some use community-based options, some operate public preschools, and there are some preschool special education programs), the 619 Coordinator works with the team to ensure equitable review of files specific to preschool children with disabilities.

*Component Area: Professional Development, Technical Assistance and Guidance*

The Introduction to the SPP includes a description of the Bureau of Special Education Technical Assistance and Professional Development system, which supports professionals working with both preschool and school age children with disabilities.

The New Hampshire Network is the NHDOE's online site to support collaboration and learning across education in the state. The network's features let users connect to educators, reach out to experts in the field, explore hundreds of curated resources in the Knowledgebase library, and join communities and networks across the state. The Early Childhood Network is a network designed to provide resources, professional learning opportunities and communities of practice for early childhood educators and agencies serving families and children birth through grade three. This is being developed by the Bureau

of Integrated Programs and can be expanded to support collaboration and learning specific to preschool special education. This tool is just beginning to be used by the early childhood sector.

In support of all Title I schools, including the Focus, Priority, and Reward schools identified as part of the NHDOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver, the NHDOE sponsors Quarterly Innovation meetings with state staff, Superintendents, principals and educators to promote the transformation of schools through a problems of practice model of innovation.

The 2015 NHDOE Educator's Summer Summit has an Early Childhood Leadership strand with a key-note and 18 sessions directly connected to improving outcomes for young children. The Spark NH Executive Committee (including the 619 coordinator) is helping plan for this event.

The Workforce and Professional Development (WF/PD) Committee of Spark NH develops recommendations and implementation plans to enhance New Hampshire's capacity for the recruitment, retention, advancement, and support of professionals across early childhood programs via education, training, and credentialing. In 2013, the WF/PD committee, through Spark NH, contracted to have the Center for the Study of Child Care Employment at the University of California, Berkeley complete *The State of Early Childhood Higher Education in New Hampshire: The NH Early Childhood Higher Education Inventory*. The WF/PD committee is currently engaged in two projects of significance: 1) developing of a common set of core competencies for early childhood professionals and 2) establishing a Blueprint for a Cross-Sector Early Childhood Professional Development System.

#### *Current Early Childhood Initiatives and Priorities*

As mentioned earlier, the NHDOE Bureau of Special Education dedicates IDEA state-set aside dollars (from Section 619 and 611) to promote improved outcomes for preschool children with disabilities. Current activities with the potential to be leveraged for the SSIP include:

#### **NH Bold Initiatives for Preschool Special Education: Bringing Better Outcomes through Leadership, Learning and Data**

- Vision: New Hampshire preschool children with disabilities will demonstrate improved outcomes (draft)
- Mission: NHDOE-funded initiatives will coordinate and collaborate to enhance family engagement and to promote quality programs, compliance, and improved outcomes for preschool children with disabilities through professional development and technical assistance (draft)
- Lead staff from each of the NHDOE-funded Preschool Special Education initiatives meet as a group with the 619 Coordinator three to four times a year
- Meetings strive to strengthen linkages and communication across initiatives
- A combined evaluation of the initiatives is conducted annually to assess impact of the initiatives on local policy, procedures and practices

#### Preschool Technical Assistance Network (PTAN)

- Statewide technical assistance and support network
- Promotes quality, developmentally appropriate and culturally competent programs for NH's young children with special needs and their families
- Supports regional stakeholder input groups
- Primary vehicle for universal professional development and technical assistance for preschool special education
- Promotes the NHDOE Priorities for Preschool Special Education based on the SPP
- Grantee: Southeastern Regional Education Service Center (SERESC)

#### Race2K: Maximizing results for preschool children with disabilities, because kindergarten is too late

- Focus on the special education process for preschool children with disabilities and program improvement, including child find, early transitions and the continuum of settings (FAPE in the LRE)
- Provides universal, targeted and intensive technical assistance to districts
- Grantee: Parent Information Center

#### Preschool Outcome Measurement System (POMS) Technical Assistance Consultant

- Supports districts with data collection and utilization to improve outcomes for preschool children with

disabilities

- Resource for utilization of child outcome data to inform instruction and IEP development
- Building the practice of tying data to instruction
- Grantee: Creative Educational Consulting

#### Mentorship

- Funded jointly by the NH Department of Education and NH Department of Health & Human Services
- Provides mentorship opportunities for personnel in Family-Centered Early Supports & Services, Child Care and Preschool Special Education
- Grantee: Early Education and Intervention Network (eein)

#### Distinguished Early Childhood Special Educator

- One year agreement for exceptional educator to work with NHDOE 619 Coordinator
- Supports the work of the State Systemic Improvement Plan, including support to local districts with implementation of evidence-based practices
- Provides local district perspective to inform state work
- Coordinate and collaborate with NH Preschool Special Education Initiatives
- Memorandum of Agreement between NHDOE and local district

#### NH Connections

- NH Connections is a project of the Parent Information Center and is funded by the NH Department of Education, Bureau of Special Education to support school district personnel and families to strengthen family-school partnerships in special education.

The work of this New Hampshire Connections project involves a statewide plan that includes activities that enhance school, family, and community partnerships. The New Hampshire Connections Family - School Partnership Plan supports the participation of school/district personnel, parents and community members based on a best-practice model that guides families and schools in developing effective family and school partnerships as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

#### Other Relevant Early Childhood Initiatives and Priorities

SEE Change: Sustainable Early Engagement for Change. NH applied for and was selected to receive intensive training and technical assistance from the federally funded Early Childhood TA Center (ECTA). This is a cross-sector, birth through age five initiative that supports the implementation of evidence-based practices (DEC Recommended Practices) that are most likely to increase child engagement with peers, adults and materials. There are three sites/districts implementing SEE Change at the center-based preschool level. These three districts have agreed to participate in the SSIP.

PTAN Child Care Inclusion project, funded by NH Department of Health & Human Services, focuses on building the capacity of child care programs to maintain children with challenging behaviors in their programs. It is a comprehensive statewide program that offers:

- Free and equitable access to consultation and training for NH child care programs;
- Short- and long-term consultation and technical assistance to support a program's efforts to maintain children with challenging behaviors and other special needs in their programs;
- On-going, program improvement consultation and training to increase capacity of child care programs for parents of children with special needs;
- Regional, community and program-specific trainings that provide the knowledge and skills necessary to successful child care inclusion;
- Pre-service work to build the capacity of students at the Associate, Bachelor and Masters level to support the inclusion of young children with disabilities

#### Parent Information Center of NH (PIC)

- NH's Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) funded by the US Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs
- PIC is a statewide family organization that strives to achieve positive outcomes for children and

youth with disabilities and special healthcare needs

- Partnerships with families, educators, youth, professionals and organizations are central to the work of PIC

- PIC is the successful recipient of various grants (NH Connections and Race2K described elsewhere in this section)

- PIC is the fiscal agent for NH Family Voices, the Family to Family Health Information Center. This center is staffed by parents of children and young adults with special health care needs/disabilities. From their website: "As parents, we also travel through the maze of services and programs designed to help our kids, so we understand the issues that families face. We provide options and advice, offers a multitude of resources, and tap into a network of other families and professionals to help provide you with support and information."

Safe Schools/Healthy Students State Planning Grant [(SAMHSA), aka: NH Communities for Children] has a goal to "Substantially improve the social and emotional skills and preparedness for long-term educational success of young children, birth through five years of age". The three communities in this project have agreed to participate in the SSIP.

#### New Hampshire Accessible Educational Materials (NHAEM)

- Provides resources for educators, parents, students, accessible media producers to ensure that all students including students with print disabilities receive their materials in a timely manner;
- Accessible educational materials, or AEM, are materials that are designed or converted in a way that makes them usable across the widest range of student variability regardless of format (print, digital, graphical, audio, video);
- Provides technical assistance regarding need, selection, acquisition of AEM including information critical components and quality indicators to develop policies and systems that support implementation and sustainability at the district level.

#### Watch Me Grow (WMG)

- New Hampshire's developmental screening, referral and information system for families of children birth to six years
- Coordinated by the NH Department of Health & Human Services and the WMG Steering Committee, which includes representatives from state agencies and public and private organizations.

#### Conclusions

The infrastructure analysis presents a story of readiness and commitment at the state and local level to improve social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities. Stakeholders are involved at all stages of development of the SSIP. The state has a mechanism to engage the SSIP Stakeholder Input team as well as seeking ongoing input from the broader community through the PTAN Input sessions. The myriad of advisory committees and initiatives whose visions and missions align with the SiMR are legion. There are strong linkages and built in methods for communication across agencies, organizations, committees and initiatives. Even so, there is no overarching governance or advisory body, such as a State Leadership team, to guide this work.

Local control is strong in New Hampshire. This infrastructure analysis drilled down into each of the identified component areas at a state level and (in general) at the local level. What this analysis confirms is that the infrastructure at the local level varies greatly from community to community based on a variety of factors. NHDOE engaged each of the 16 districts in the subset in Phase I of the SSIP: data, infrastructure, improvement strategies, target setting and theory of action. Each district will continue with additional in-depth analyses in Phase 2 of the SSIP. For example, districts will assess their infrastructure strengths and challenges in order to inform their implementation and evaluation plans in Phase II.

Many of the infrastructure challenges, such as connecting the NHDHHS and NHDOE intra- and inter data systems and the lack of State-aid for preschool age children are beyond the scope of the SSIP. There are some areas, however, that the NHDOE Bureau of Special Education can strategically influence efforts moving forward. We can support efforts to build the capacity of the data systems that will provide longitudinal data.

Current early childhood initiatives are well-developed, coordinated and poised to support not only the 16 districts in the SSIP, but also to support scale-up and sustainability over time. By leveraging these initiatives as part of the coherent improvement strategies, districts can receive high quality, content specific support to improve social-emotional outcomes for preschool

children with disabilities.

#### *Root cause analysis based on Infrastructure Analysis*

The root cause analyses focused on the state, regional and district levels based on the infrastructure and data analysis. The results of these analyses have been synthesized and used to inform the development of the coherent improvement activities and is described in the section on Selection of Coherent Improvement Activities.

1. There was no formal state-level structure (advisory body or leadership team) that focused on improving social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities. As a result, efforts are fragmented and there was no system in place for inter- intra-agency coordination to guide interventions, make recommendations and evaluate the success of improvement strategies.
2. Local administrators and school board members did not uniformly understand the factors that impact positive social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities and cost-benefit of intervening early with sound, evidence-based practices. As a result, they have not always made decisions regarding funding, staffing and program development that are most likely to result in improved social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities.
3. Practitioners (district and community-based) have a range of knowledge and skill regarding the implementation with fidelity of evidence-based practices that are likely to improve social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities. As a result, the quality of services and support vary in their effectiveness.

#### **State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities**

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

##### *Statement*

Preschool children with disabilities in the identified subset of districts will substantially increase their rate of growth in the area of improved positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) by the time they turned six years of age or exit the program.

##### *Description*

The SiMR was aligned to Indicator 7: Outcome A, Summary Statement 1 and was identified based on the comprehensive infrastructure and data analysis and extensive stakeholder input described earlier in this document. Please refer to the Description of Measure, Targets: Description of Stakeholders and Data and Infrastructure Analysis for more on the SiMR.

The NHDOE and stakeholders considered a variety of data sources when developing the SiMR. Data on kindergarten entry, socio-economic status and other demographics were either not available or were insufficient to establish a SiMR. Based on the data analysis, it was determined that the SiMR would align either with Outcome A (social-emotional development) or Outcome B (acquisition of knowledge and skills). Stakeholders made a case for both; there were rationale and data for either choice. During the PTAN Input sessions (described in the Targets: Description Stakeholder Input section), there were strong proponents of both outcomes but a slightly stronger case was made for Outcome A, Summary Statement 1. Here is a summary of the stakeholder input:

Outcome A lends itself to a cross-sector approach to support children and their families, strengthening broader community

connections and interagency support. It builds on the momentum in the state around early childhood initiatives, connecting to the work being done through Spark NH (State Early Childhood Advisory Council), SAMSHA Safe School Healthy Students grant, SEE Change (Intensive TA from ECTA around child engagement), Indistar (K-12) focus on Culture and Climate (NH Title 1 Priority schools and ESEA turn-around principal) and the Child Care Inclusion project which seeks to reduce expulsion of children from child care. Outcome A aligns to the work going on nationally and within the state; the SiMR alignment with current national and agency initiatives supports the likelihood of successful implementation and improvement in social-emotional outcomes. Massachusetts and Nebraska have similar SiMR statements and ECTA Social-Emotional Community of Practice offers enhanced access to resources and support as we consider this within the bigger context. Two key points that stakeholders identified regarding improving social-emotional outcomes: 1) social-emotional well-being is foundational to the acquisition of knowledge and skills and 2) the interagency, cross-sector nature of improving social-emotional outcomes deepens the path we are already on.

By contrast, Outcome B was viewed as connecting to the NH Part C SiMR and to the K-3 reading and math goals. Stakeholders discussed that although a focus for this outcome lay more within the scope of the mission of education and is potentially more under our control and aligned cleanly with K-12 system, limited data on kindergarten entry and changes to the state assessment presented challenges to focusing on this outcome as the SiMR. While this outcome was seen as very important, and both outcomes support each other, the consensus was that Outcome A was the more compelling choice for a SiMR. The investment in improving social-emotional outcomes will build a stronger infrastructure across early childhood and is foundational to acquisition of knowledge and skills.

The next question debated by stakeholders with support from DaSy was regarding a focus on Summary Statement 1 (increasing the percentage of children who substantially increase their rate of growth by the time they exit the program) or Summary Statement 2 (increasing the percentage of children functioning within age expectations by the time they exit the program. Summary Statement 2 includes those children who enter and exit the program at age expectations in the outcome (progress category e.), which is largely outside of the state's control, aside from preventing declines. The consensus of stakeholders, supported in consultation with DaSy and IDC, was that it was more reasonable to start with expected change in the trajectory of a child's rate of growth relative to an outcome rather than starting with change in the percentage of children who exited within age expectations.

The NHDOE and stakeholders have selected a SiMR that focuses on improving results for a subset of the districts in the state. This subset represents approximately 20% of the population. Based on results using the Meaningful Differences Calculator to estimate targets for the SSIP, improving the results for this subset of the population will result in improvement on a state-wide basis. In addition, the NHDOE has a system of technical assistance and professional development that will maximize the scale-up of successful strategies across the state, increasing the likelihood of more systemic improvement.

Baseline data and measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the five years from FFY 2014-FFY 2018 have been provided in the section on Baseline and Targets. That section of the SSIP also describes how the state determined that the FFY 2018 targets reflect measurable improvement over the FFY 2013 baseline data and are presented in the table below.

FFY 2013 Baseline	FFY 2014	FFY 2015	FFY 2016	FFY 2017	FFY 2018
71.13%	71.13%	71.13%	73.71%	76.29%	78.90%

**Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies**

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

*Overview of supports in place to improve social-emotional outcomes (Indicator 7)*

The NHDOE has a well-established and comprehensive system of General Supervision for special

education. As described in the Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP): "The New Hampshire Department of Education, Bureau of Special Education provides a tiered approach to technical assistance (TA) to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence based technical assistance and support to districts. The TA is closely paired with professional development (PD) to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities."

For preschool special education, the NHDOE has established a statewide Preschool Technical Assistance Network (PTAN) that serves as the primary vehicle for universal TA/PD. Through this network, preschool special education coordinators and administrators meet in regional communities of practices to explore and address evidence-based practices, successful strategies and challenges. PTAN creates a learning community for new preschool special education coordinators, to orient them to responsibilities and to connect them to other resources within the state.

For more targeted and intensive TA, the NHDOE supports Race2K and the POMS TA consultant to work with districts on specific issues regarding policy, procedures and practices around preschool LRE, child find and early transitions, and child outcomes.

A Distinguished Educator from a local district has been identified to support the work of the SSIP and will be joining the team in the summer of 2015. She has particular expertise with the Preschool Outcome Measurement System (POMS) and is on the SEE Change State Leadership Team which focuses on the implementation of evidence-based practices to improve outcomes for preschool children with disabilities.

All of these individual initiatives are organized under NH BOLD (Bringing Better Outcomes through Leadership, Learning and Data). Through NH Bold, coordination and collaboration are strengthened. These initiatives are founded on the priorities established through the SPP indicators: 1) Indicator 6: Preschool LRE; 2) Indicator 7: Child Outcomes; 3) Indicator 8: Parent Involvement; and 4) Indicator 12: Early Transitions.

*Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan: Development of Coherent Improvement Strategies based on Root Cause Analysis*

As established by the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR), Indicator 17 differentiates itself from Indicator 7 because it has a more narrow, analyses-driven focus on improving social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities in 16 districts in the state. These districts represent approximately 20% of the children who exited last year. There are two results anticipated to be achieved by concentrating efforts in these 16 districts. First, there will be an increase in the likelihood of a significant, measurable improvement in the social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities in the districts. Second, by building on the established infrastructure to support these districts, there will be an increase in the likelihood of a significant, measurable improvement in the social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities across the state.

*Synthesis of Root Cause Analysis*

The root cause analysis focused on the state, regional and district level and was based on the data and infrastructure analyses with stakeholder input. Drawing on the data and infrastructure analysis, the SSIP Stakeholder Input team identified state-level conditions contributing to low performance. A root cause analysis regarding child outcomes was also conducted with preschool special education coordinators and special education administrators within each of the seven PTAN regions across the state. This information was used to guide and prompt deeper root cause analysis conducted via interview by the NHDOE 619/SSIP Coordinator with key personnel from the districts in the subset for the SSIP. Based on these analyses, the following summary presents the hypothesized root causes contributing to low performance in social-emotional outcomes for preschool children at the state level and within the 16 districts in the SSIP subset. This information has been used to inform coherent improvement strategies and the theory of action.

1. There was no formal state-level structure (advisory body or leadership team) that focused on improving social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities. As a result, efforts are fragmented and there was no system in place for inter- intra-agency coordination to guide interventions, make recommendations and evaluate the success of improvement strategies.
2. The NHDOE was not able to disaggregate child outcome data by race/ethnicity, age, disability, length of time in service or setting. As a result, the NHDOE was not able to determine if these factors were impacting social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities.

3. The NHDOE was not able to link child outcome data to Part C or to the K-12 longitudinal data system. As a result, no conclusions could be made on child outcomes from Part C to Part B or regarding impact of preschool special education over time.
4. Local administrators and school board members did not uniformly understand the factors that impact positive social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities and cost benefit of intervening early with sound, evidence-based practices. As a result, they have not always made decisions regarding funding, staffing and program development that are most likely to result in improved social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities.
5. Local district personnel have varied ability to link data at the local level from preschool special education to the K-12 system. As a result, they are not able to analyze the long term impact of services by demographic and programmatic factors.
6. Local district personnel have limited capacity to analyze data to inform instruction and to guide IEP development. As a result, data are not used across all districts to the fullest effect and opportunities to refine practices to improve outcomes may be missed.
7. While the State-level data have been determined to be of high quality, some districts have identified a need to strengthen inter-rater reliability and to hone assessment skills. As a result, some data may not be accurately reflecting the social-emotional outcomes for individual children and assessments may not be conducted in the most efficient manner, creating a more cumbersome assessment process.
8. Practitioners (district and community-based) have a range of knowledge and skill regarding the implementation with fidelity of evidence-based practices that are likely to improve social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities. As a result, the quality of services and support vary in their effectiveness.

*Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies (CIS) based on Root Cause Analysis*

The selection of districts for the subset was intentionally aligned with current initiatives. The goal of aligning current initiatives with the SiMR was to maximize efficiencies and resources, as well as support implementation based on each district's readiness to improve outcomes. The districts were selected based on readiness, commitment to improving social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities and the preliminary infrastructure analysis and the data analysis. Each of the 16 SSIP districts has a history of successful participation in the NH Bold initiatives. This includes participation in regional PTAN meetings, receiving universal, targeted and intensive technical assistance from POMS TA consultant and Race2K. In addition, three of the districts are part of the Safe Schools/Healthy Students State Planning Grant (SAMSHA) and have an Early Childhood Coordinator. Three districts are SEE Change implementation sites.

Based on all the work done to date with stakeholders regarding data and infrastructure analyses and the analysis of root causes of possible conditions contributing to low performance, the NHDOE has developed the following coherent improvement strategies (CIS) to improve social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities.

*CIS 1: In order to strengthen the state infrastructure, the NHDOE will: continue to engage stakeholders in the SSIP; establish a SSIP state leadership team; and will continue to support a system of TA/PD.*

*CIS 1.1: Stakeholder Input: Leading by Convening*

- A. The NHDOE Bureau of Special Education will continue to convene the SSIP Stakeholder Input team to inform the development and implementation of Phase II and Phase III of the SSIP.
- B. The PTAN regional input sessions will be used to engage a broad array of administrators and practitioners to provide feedback on local perspectives, challenges and successes. These sessions will yield information regarding the broad adoption and implementation of evidence-based practices.
- C. The NHDOE will work with the Parent Information Center to assess and implement effective strategies to gather more input from families regarding the SSIP.
- D. Lead personnel in each of the 16 districts in the subset will be actively engaged in providing

input into the SSIP. An initial interview between the NHDOE 619/SSIP Coordinator and a representative from each of the districts has already occurred.

E. Input gathered through other incidental means (state scans, surveys, natural opportunities) will continue to be incorporated into the development of the SSIP.

*CIS 1.2 Establish a State Leadership Team*

Through the infrastructure analysis, it was determined that there is no team currently in place to serve as the State Leadership team for the SSIP. The NHDOE, with the SSIP Stakeholder Input team, NH Bold and the State Leadership Team for the See Change project, will establish a consistent, dedicated group to support the implementation of the improvement strategies in the SSIP. These three groups will assist the state with the identification of key players to serve on this team. Once established, the SSIP State Leadership team will develop a vision and mission statement and promote implementation of the SSIP.

*CIS 1.3 Promote TA/PD system*

The NHDOE will promote activities that build the expertise of Technical Assistance and Professional Development providers, maximizing their individual talents and building on their prior knowledge.

*CIS 2: The NHDOE will lead data systems development to support improved social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities.*

*CIS 2.1:* The NHDOE, with the publishers of the two POMS assessment tools (Brookes and Teaching Strategies), will explore ways to expand data reporting and collection to include more student specific and demographic information, starting with removing the filter that currently masks specific data. This will increase state access to disaggregated student data.

*CIS 2.2:* The NHDOE will investigate linking POMS data with other state education data systems. By linking to the state data system for special education (NHSEIS), POMS data could be associated with other special education data points such as: transition from early intervention, age of identification, length of time in service, disability, race/ethnicity, suspension/expulsion data, exit reasons and age at exit. By connecting to the state longitudinal data system, i4see, would yield information about race/ethnicity and long term impacts in K-12.

*CIS 2.3:* The NHDOE, with the NH Part C Coordinator, will assess the feasibility of gathering and reporting longitudinal outcome data for children who exit Part C and enter preschool special education.

*CIS 2.4:* The NHDOE Bureau of Special Education will work with the NHDOE Bureau of Data Management to determine what, if any, longitudinal data can be collected and reported specific to social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities. This data collection may have the potential to inform future root cause analysis.

*CIS 3: In alignment with current initiatives, the NHDOE will support the subset of 16 districts with ongoing infrastructure and data analyses tied to the exploration stage and subsequent implementation of coherent improvement strategies designed to remedy root causes that contribute to low performance in social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities.*

*CIS 3.1:* The NHDOE, with NH Bold, will create a framework for conducting an in-depth self-assessment for the subset of districts regarding infrastructure, data analysis and current implementation of the evidence-based practices. Each district will have supports and strategies based on the information collected. Support from national TA providers will be elicited and the team will draw from nationally developed resources/tools.

*CIS 3.1.1:* The in-depth data analysis will include but not be limited to: a) demographic data of preschool special education population (gender, disability, length of time in program, etc.) in general and in each of the progress categories (especially category b); c) projections for population exiting over next few years; and d) assess what data are available longitudinally.

*CIS 3.1.2:* The in-depth infrastructure analysis may be based on the Adapted Hexagon Improvement Strategy Exploration Tool component areas for: need, fit, resources, evidence, readiness and capacity.

*CIS 3.2:* A liaison will be assigned from the initiatives that are in NH Bold to work with each of the 16 districts. When possible, the person will be someone already working with the district, such as the Master Cadre assigned for SEE Change. This liaison will work as a coach in the district, assisting the district with completing an infrastructure and data analysis and with assessing current implementation of the evidence-based practices. Based on the results of the self-assessment, the liaison will support the district with creating an action plan to address identified needs and to implement the evidence-based practices with fidelity.

*CIS 3.3:* Based on local in-depth data and infrastructure analyses, districts in the subset will identify current initiatives, strengths to leverage opportunities for improvement, and challenges/barriers that will identify any conditions that result in low performance (root cause analysis).

*CIS 3.4:* Building off the data, infrastructure and root cause analysis, districts in the subset, with coaching from their assigned liaison, will identify coherent improvement strategies. Improvement strategies will:

*CIS 3.4.1:* Address how to enhance the implementation of evidence-based practices within the district in order to improve social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities.

*CIS 3.4.2:* Describe how families will be engaged in supporting improved social-emotional outcomes for their children.

*CIS 3.4.3:* Progress through the stages of implementation science as part of planning and organization: exploration; installation-building system capacity; initial implementation; full implementation.

*CIS 3.4.4:* The subset of 16 districts will collect, analyze and use interim data as needed, to inform progress.

*CIS 3.4.5:* Align with existing initiatives, especially those already being implemented in the district.

Tie the district implementation plan to the district Master Plan for Professional Development and certification requirements.

*CIS 3.4.7:* Utilize Principals of Adult Learning Strategies (PALS) for active learner involvement in all professional development opportunities (Introduction, Application, Informed Understanding, Repeat).

*CIS 3.4.8:* Consider longitudinal implications (look vertically to Part C and K-12).

*CIS 3.4.9:* Consider community implications (look horizontally across other early childhood supports and services within the community).

*CIS 4:* *The NHDOE will promote the capacity of the 16 districts to sustain improved results in social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities within their districts, and will align efforts to scale-up improvement strategies throughout the state.*

*CIS 4.1:* In order for the 16 districts to sustain their capacity to implement the evidenced-based practices with fidelity, the coherent improvement strategies developed by the districts will include strategies to:

*CIS 4.1.1:* Build personnel capacity to utilize data to inform instruction in order to improve social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities.

*CIS 4.1.2:* Create mechanisms to ensure ongoing training and support regarding POMS and the implementation of DEC Recommended Practices.

*CIS 4.1.3:* Educate administration and school board members about the cost-benefit of quality early childhood supports and services.

*CIS 4.1.4:* *Define markers of success and evaluate the improvement strategies. Use evaluation data for continuous improvement at each district.*

CIS 4.2: In order to scale-up improved social-emotional outcomes for preschool children across the state, the NHDOE, with the NH Bold leadership, will support the expansion of this work beyond the 16 districts identified in the subset.

CIS 4.2.1: Ongoing alignment across preschool special education and related initiatives to promote activities statewide that increase the likelihood of improving social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities.

CIS 4.2.2: National resources will be maximized to promote high quality support, including:

- A. DEC (Division of Early Childhood: Council of Exceptional Children) Recommended Practices
- B. ECTA is developing practice guides and checklists to be used to rate and track practitioner implementation of the DEC Recommended Practices.
- C. Other centers such as the IRIS Center or the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) are developing products that may be of value.

CIS 4.2.3: The NHDOE, in collaboration with the NH Parent Information Center, will develop resources for districts that increase family engagement and promote positive social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities. Areas of focus may include:

- A. How schools communicate with families about concerns regarding a child’s social-emotional development
- B. Strategies to support social-emotional development at home
- C. Strengthening the understanding of the role of district in helping families connect to social-emotional resources

**Theory of Action**

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State’s capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

[Theory of Action Update Phase II](#) Theory of Action Update Phase II

Illustration

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

In Phase II of the SSIP the NHDOE, with feedback from stakeholders, made minor changes to the text of the Theory of Action. These changes provide more consistency of language, clarification of intent and strengthen alignment with the emerging evaluation plan.

Brief Description of the Theory of Action

*The Theory of Action Layout and Orientation*

Consistent with OSEP’s *State Systemic Improvement Plan Questions and Answers*, the graphic illustration of the NH SSIP theory of action uses “If-Then” statements (in red) to reflect the “rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State’s capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs or EIS programs, and achieve improvement in the SIMR for children with disabilities.” The If-Then statements read horizontally across the page, with each statement supporting the next; providing an overview of key entities responsible for the action and a summation of what is

expected to occur. The If-Then columns present the crux of the coherent improvement activities, making the logical connections across activities, grounded in implementation science and founded on the implementation of evidence-based practices.

The colorful trapezoids present an overview of activities at each level (state, district, classroom and child) that are necessary in order for the If-Then statements to occur. These activities have been informed by the data, infrastructure and root cause analyses and they are designed to lead to the desired result. They showcase that, with purposeful investments in activities at each level, there is an increase in the likelihood of success in achieving the SiMR.

At the bottom of the page is the foundation and support for the theory of action; guaranteeing relevance and buy-in. Families and stakeholders are essential partners whose perspectives, support and insight are critical to long-term success. The recognition from the Governor's office of the importance of promoting a system of early childhood speaks to a political climate that will continue to support state-level activities to improve outcomes for young children. Underpinning it all is the research-base which is significant on many levels. The research validates the science of systems change; imparts a growing body of knowledge about social-emotional development in young children; and supports the connections of healthy social-emotional development to long term academic and personal success.

#### *Description of the Rationale Underlying the Theory of Action*

This theory of action is a logical and cohesive representation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan. It marries initiatives and supports (State, District and Classroom Activities) to actions (If NHDOE does this..., then that enables districts to..., which enables classroom staff to..., which creates a classroom environment that supports preschool children with disabilities to...) leading to improved social-emotional outcomes. It depicts the three foundational points of family and stakeholder engagement, political will and research that are essential to ensure that the State-identified Measurable Result is achieved. The theory of action is grounded in implementation science, beginning with exploration and moving through the subsequent phases based on the evaluation of each step. The NHDOE will implement this plan, with the expectation of achieving the targets of the SiMR for improving social-emotional outcomes through FFY 2018.

The theory of action illustrates the plan for the NHDOE to engage districts in a process of data and infrastructure analyses that parallels the analyses done at the state level. Implementation science serves as a guide, taking districts through logical phases to build their capacity for local implementation of evidence-based practices. This investment in local capacity begins with exploration of the level of implementation for existing initiatives related to the SiMR in the subset of districts. Districts and their SSIP liaison/coach will develop SSIP plans based on the information collected, resulting in strengthened infrastructure at the local level and as a SSIP cohort. A focus of the work of the SSIP liaison/coach with the district and classroom staff will be on implementation with fidelity of evidence-based practices.

#### *Description of Stakeholder Involvement in the Development of the Theory of Action*

The theory of action was created as a graphic representation of the coherent improvement strategies. The coherent improvement strategies were identified based on extensive input of the SSIP Stakeholder Input team (see attached document named "NH Part B SSIP Stakeholder Input team"), the PTAN regional input sessions and interviews with the 16 districts regarding the infrastructure, data and root cause analyses. These in-depth analyses provided an understanding of the needs and the work to be accomplished which are reflected in the theory of action. In addition, NH Bold supported the NHDOE in refining the stakeholder input, assessing the capacity of initiatives to implement the identified strategies in an effective and efficient manner and identifying gaps in capacity to be enhanced. The NHDOE reached out to the Parent Information Center (PIC) for additional feedback on the theory of action, to ensure that it was consistent with the PIC's priorities and understanding of local capacity and systems development. The flow of the activities and the subsequent If-Then statements are consistent with the data refinement and analyses. These interconnected strategies and stages build on the interviews with the 16 districts, the input from the regional groups, the stakeholder input and research around systems change and effective practices. Each level of system is responsible to and dependent on the levels above and below and builds on improvement cycles.

**Infrastructure Development**

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

**Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices**

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

**Evaluation**

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

**Technical Assistance and Support**

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

## Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

**Selected:** Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Ruth Littlefield

Title: SPP/APR Coordinator

Email: ruth.littlefield@doe.nh.gov

Phone: 603-271-2178