

NH Department of Education
Bureau of Special Education
Special Education Program Approval and
Improvement Process

Focused Monitoring Report

SAU 28 Pelham
2011-2012

June 30, 2012

Table of Contents

Introduction	p.3
Focused Monitoring Activities	p.4
IEP Review Summary Report.....	p.6

Introduction:

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

Essential Question

April 2012

What are the contributing factors to the achievement gap (NECAP scores) between students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers and how may this gap be narrowed?

Statutory Authority for New Hampshire Department of Education Monitoring

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

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

New Hampshire Department of Education Technical Assistants

Kathryn L Skoglund, Dr. Robert Greenleaf

Leadership Team Members

Tina McCoy, Sara Monte, Dorothy Mohr, Tom Adamakos, Carol Gariepy,
Amanda Lecaroz, Megan Larson, Cathy Pinsonneault, Shirlee Sullivan

Achievement Team Members

Stephen Scaer, Sandra McCarthy, Amy Gilfoyle, Heather Jardine,
Kim Kearney, Gail Tocco

IEP Review Team Members

Tina McCoy, Sara Monte, Kathryn Skoglund, Robert Greenleaf, Stephen
Scaer, Val Morse, Elaine French, Carol Eldridge, Ada McDowell, Mary
English, Heather Jardine, Deb Carson, Kim Kearney, Carol Tomer, Nicole
Covart, Jodi Parker, Keeschia Frasier, Shirlee Sullivan

Visiting Team Members

Theo Denoncour, Colleen Sliva, Amy Sarsfield, Kim Spears

Focused Monitoring Activities:

The Focused Monitoring Process is designed to meet the individual needs of each selected school district. As a result, each district progresses through process at a different pace and often in a unique sequence. Please utilize this section of the report to capture the process and activities utilized in your district. The following list of focus areas and methodologies should serve as a **guide** as this portion of the report is developed. Not all of the items listed will be addressed by one district; please select and expand upon the activities and processes utilized in your district. Refer to the Focused Monitoring Timeline Document, past agendas and minutes to assist with this portion of the report. (Include all meeting dates, i.e.: focus groups and training sessions)

June 14, 2011 (Leadership team)

5 Step Inquiry Process

Explanation of the of the 5-step process was made and discussed, as well as selecting the achievement team members.

Organizational process was put into place.

Discussion of having staff complete Readiness Survey focusing on individual perspectives of what is taking place both in and out of the school related to the educational environment.

September 19, 2011 (Leadership team & Achievement team)

5 Step Inquiry Process

The facilitators from the DOE explained to the group the purpose and process of focused monitoring. Our district was chosen for this process due to the achievement gap between our general and special education students as indicated by NECAP results. The goal of this group is to determine the cause of this gap and create a plan to close this gap. The work will be completed using the 5 step inquiry process. The focus this year will be on the first four steps of the five.

Readiness Survey results were discussed.

Highlighted the top 12 sections that were rated with the poorest responses.

Broke into individual teams to talk about:

1. How much control we have on each item

2. How many resources it takes to achieve
3. If it is in place will the item improve the gap? Looked at school and community, technology, vertically aligned curriculum.

Mapped the initiatives from the SINI and DINI plans and broke them into 5 categories.

1. Culture and climate
2. Assessment
3. Curriculum
4. Instruction
5. community

Worked in small groups and prioritized top three initiatives in each category.

Wrap-up decision: It was determined to further survey the staff and have them answer the following questions:

- What do you think is the cause of the gap?
- What is one thing you think would help to narrow the gap?

October 24, 2011 (Leadership team & Achievement team)

Organizing and Analyzing (Data Inventory)

Investigating Factors

A chart was made based on a discussion of the five categories listed above. Observations and patterns were made by the team about the chart. Discussion took place around over arching issues around special education and families with the focus on the RTI process. Causes of the gap were discussed based on survey information and hypotheses regarding how to close the gap were developed.

November 14, 2011 (Leadership team & Achievement team)

Broke into groups to discuss the article: “Fixed vs. Broke Intelligence Mind Set” as it relates to the four A’s. Talked about the four A’s: assumptions, agree with, argue with and what do I aspire to? The group discussed the belief that all students can learn. The over arching understanding was that the community’s perspective based on their views and value of education has a significant impact on overall performance.

We looked at the hypothesis of what activities will close the gap and decided to focus on curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

December 5, 2011(Leadership team & Achievement team)

Curriculum Work Update: Working on creating curriculum documents that align with the Common Core Standards in reading, math, literacy, and technology

We reviewed each of the three hypothesis regarding the most effective tasks to close the achievement gap and revised them as needed, as well as discussed resources needed to complete and evaluate these tasks.

January 30, 2012(Leadership team & Achievement team)

We focused our work on the areas of curriculum, assessment, and instruction; culture; and the role of leadership. We discussed the efforts needed to improve each of these focus areas and began to look at the plan that will be developed and how to create it. The role of various stakeholders in implementing the plan was discussed.

February 20, 2012(Leadership team & Achievement team)

The team discussed concerns regarding educating the staff, creating a positive culture, and maintaining momentum. The IEP review summary and the need for corrective action was discussed. The team

reviewed the Willingham/Daniel article and it's implications for focusing on the fundamentals, or "must-haves." The resources needed and methods of monitoring progress were discussed. Assignments for the Focused Monitoring Final Report were delegated.

March 29, 2012(Leadership Team and Achievement Team)

The team discussed special education concerns: two parallel systems between special education and regular education, the referral process, and the effectiveness of the RTI process and use of interventions before referrals are made. The team then reviewed the Focused Monitoring Plan and addressed questions about the time and implementation of the plan. Teams will begin their work on the action plan by choosing fundamentals for each grade level in math and reading.

**IEP Review Summary Special Education Compliance Component of NHDOE
Focused Monitoring Process
Pelham school District**

**Dates of NHDOE Focused Monitoring Compliance and IEP Review: 9/27-29/11; 12/6/11
(additional Indicator #13 IEPs); 1/10/12(Out-of-District)**

Introduction:

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

Data Collection Activities:

As part of the NHDOE Focused Monitoring Process a Special Education compliance review was conducted in the Pelham School District on 9/27-29/11, 12/6/11, and 1/10/12. Listed below is the data that was reviewed as part of the compliance review, all of which are summarized in this report:

- Review of randomly selected IEPs
- Review of LEA Focused Monitoring Compliance Application including:
 - Special Education Policy and Procedures
 - Special Education staff qualifications
 - Program descriptions
- Review of all district Special Education programming
- Review of Out of District Files
- When appropriate, review of student records for students with disabilities who are attending Charter Schools
- Review of parent feedback collected through the focused monitoring data collection activities
- Review of requests for approval of new programs, and/or changes to existing programs
- Review of six (6) additional high school IEPs, with particular attention paid to Indicator 13, Secondary Transition Planning.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS:

IEP Review Process: Conducted on 9/27-29/11, 12/6/11, 1/10/12:

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

As required by the IEP review process, general and special educators in the Pelham School District were provided with a collaborative opportunity to review 13 IEPs (7 IEPs were reviewed generally; an additional 6 were reviewed for compliance with Indicator #13 and 3 Out of District) that were randomly selected to determine if the documents included the following information:

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

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

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

Building/District Summary of IEP Review Process Conclusions/Patterns Trends Identified Through IEP Review Process: (Including Preschool and Secondary Transitions)

- Was it possible to assess the degree to which IEPs were designed to provide educational benefit (access to, participation and progress in the general curriculum)?
 1. It was not possible to consistently determine the degree to which students with IEPs were progressing in the general curriculum or whether they were receiving educational benefit from the curriculum.
- How has this process informed future plans for improving the writing of student IEPs and ensuring the student's participation in the general education curriculum?

1. Goals will be written in clearly measurable terms including baseline and target.
 2. Goals will be linked to specific curriculum standards/expectations.
 3. Student profiles will include current assessment data and present levels of performance.
 4. Number of accommodations will be limited to those critical for academic success in the classroom.
 5. Measurement of student progress will be stated in clear terminology and will incorporate assessment data.
 6. Goals will be revised annually to reflect growth in specific content areas.
 7. All goals will be supported by objectives and/or benchmarks unless specifically waived by IEP team including parents/guardians.
 8. All IEPs will include a statement regarding *why* a student is not being educated with non-disabled peers; not just *that* he is.
- Describe how individual student performance information is conveyed from grade to grade/school to school:
 1. Student performance information is communicated from grade to grade or school to school via IEP team meetings, meeting between special educators and guidance counselors and/or special education building coordinators.
 - How will the district further explore the factors that have impacted poor scores for individual students on state assessments and in the general education curriculum?
 1. The Pelham School District is currently participating in the Focused Monitoring process that is directly addressing performance of students with IEPs on state assessments. Work on the FM team is focusing on: the establishment of a core curriculum, the establishment of power standards or “fundamentals”, linking the essential learnings to IEP goal development and progress monitoring, addressing the “culture” of the school community and its belief that ALL children can learn, and refining the general role of leadership in supporting the academic progress of all students, but especially those with IEPs.
 - Strengths and suggestions identified related to IEP development/progress monitoring and services:

Strengths:

1. *Parent-teacher communication is frequent and meaningful.*
2. *Staffing is supportive of special education services, specifically the access to the school psychologist and the Board Certified Behavior Analyst on staff.*
3. *IEP teams integrate input from a variety of sources in the development of the IEP: parents, related services providers, classroom teachers, and the students themselves.*
4. *A large variety of Extended Learning Opportunities (ELOs) in the community are available at the high school level.*
5. *Related Services providers are focused on the carryover of skills into the classroom; therapy services support progress in the general curriculum.*
6. *At the preschool level a large amount of student data is collected, analyzed, and applied to program development and IEP progress monitoring.*

7. *At the preschool level, IEPs are designed to develop and maintain pre-academic or academic skills in preparation for entry in Kindergarten.*
8. *At the elementary level particularly, classroom teachers are working shoulder-to-shoulder with special educators in support of all students, particularly those with IEPs.*
9. *At the elementary level, a Response To Intervention (RTI) model is being developed which should provide intervening services to all students before they struggle academically.*

Suggestions:

1. *Expand upon the current process of gathering parent input for the IEP, giving parents advance notice that their input is required and giving them ample opportunity to provide their information.*
2. *Include specific and current student assessment data and identify assessments in the Student Profile.*
3. ** Encourage all special education staff working with students age 16 and older to participate in Transition and Indicator #13 training.*
4. *When developing or renewing an IEP select only those Accommodations that are critical to the student's progressing in the general curriculum, thereby reducing the number of Accommodations in each IEP.*
5. *When monitoring a student's progress on an IEP ensure that there are "real" data connected to each goal in order to measure the student's progress on a regular basis.*
6. ** Working with school administration, school board and community members, continue to investigate ways to ensure that Pelham preschool students with IEPs have regular and sustained access to their typical peers.*
7. *Ensure that, as IEPs are reviewed and revised annually, that the goals are revised to reflect progress (or lack thereof) and do not look the same year to year.*
8. *Link IEP academic goals to GLEs/GSEs (either in the NH Curriculum Frameworks or in the Common Core) so that participation and progress in the general curriculum can actually be observed and measured.*
9. ** Provide formal training for special education staff at all levels in the development of measurable goals.*
10. **. Ensure that all IEP goals are accompanied by objectives and/or benchmarks unless specifically waived by a parent/guardian.*
11. **. Make sure that the IEP explains why a student is removed from the general education classroom or is not participating with non-disabled peers in extra-curricular activities, not just **that** he is removed (Non-participation justification).*

* Indicates Finding of Non-compliance

District Wide Commendations:

- Knowledgeable guidance and support is available to the schools from the central office special education administration.
- There is consistent evidence of strong collaboration between special and regular education throughout the district.

- Pelham school district has a strong and caring special education staff which is also very supportive of each other.
- Special education staff is eager for guidance in weak areas and committed to making changes that will benefit their students.
- Special and regular education staff is clear that a collective responsibility for ALL students is necessary.
- There is a sincere and constructive attitude toward parents of students with IEPs and real effort is made to gather their input and make them feel welcome in the IEP process.

LEA Focused Monitoring Compliance Application

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

Out of District File Review:

Based on the random review of three student files, one of which was for a student 16 years or older, for children with disabilities placed out of district, there were:

- Three (3) files without measurable goals
- One (1) file without a statement of how the student will participate with non-disabled peers in extracurricular or non-academic activities
- One (1) file without a statement of how the students will participate in state or district testing
- Two (2) files without student schedules, daily or weekly

Students with Disabilities Attending Charter Schools: None

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

As part to the Focused Monitoring Compliance Component, the NHDOE reviews all requests for new programs in the district, and/or requests for changes to existing programs. As such, the NHDOE worked with the Pelham School District in the review of the following changes to existing approved programs: As part of the IEP Review process, a visit was made to the Pelham Elementary School to observe the Pelham Alternative Learning Setting (PALS) program in operation. All required submissions had been made to Program Approval upon the initiation of the program and the program was found to be in full compliance with state and federal special education requirements.

Building/District Summary of IEP Review, Out-of-District File Review Processes and Six NHDOE Indicator 13 reviews.

Preschool	1
Elementary School	2
Middle School	3
High School, Age below 16	1
High School, Age 16 or above	3
Additional 6 IEPs Reviewed for Ind 13	6
Total Number of IEPs Reviewed	16

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

Findings of noncompliance are defined as deficiencies that have been identified through the IEP Review Process, which are in violation of state and federal special education rules and regulations. Findings of noncompliance may result from review of policies and procedures and related application materials, review of student records or any other program approval activity related to the visit

As a result of the review of sixteen (16) files selected for the IEP Reviews 9/27-29/11, 12/6/11, and 1/10/12 the following Findings of Noncompliance were identified:

Child Specific Findings of Noncompliance

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

ED 1109.01(a)/34CFR 300.320 Statement of annual, measurable goals:

Six out of sixteen IEPs reviewed did not contain annual, measurable goals.

ED 1109.01(a)(6)/34CFR 300.320 Short-term objectives or benchmarks:

Three out of sixteen IEPs reviewed did not contain short-term objectives or benchmarks.

ED 11090.01(a)(10)/34CFR 300.320(b) Transition Services/Statement of Transition Services:

Two out of two IEPs reviewed that required Transition Services did not have measurable, post-secondary goals.

One out of two IEPs reviewed that required Transition Services did not have transition services need to assist the child in reaching the post-secondary goals.

Two out of two IEPs reviewed that required a statement of transition service needs did not have a statement of transition service needs.

Two out of two IEPs reviewed that required evidence that the student was invited to attend the Transition meeting did not have evidence that the student was invited to the Transition meeting.

ED1109.01 (a)(1)/34 CFR 300.320 An explanation of the extent, if any, to which the child will not participate with non-disabled children in the regular class:

Five out of sixteen IEPs reviewed did not contain an explanation of the extent to which the child will not participate with non-disabled children in the regular class.

34CFR 300.320(a)(4)(5) Access to Appropriate Preschool Activities: to be educated and participate with other children with disabilities and non-disabled children:

One out one preschool IEP reviewed did not provide the student access to non-disabled children in the preschool setting.

Please note: As part of the Indicator 13 data collection required by NHDOE, the six additional Secondary Transition Plans were reviewed and findings are summarized below:

Six out of the six additional IEPs reviewed for Indicator #13 MET all criteria for Indicator #13.

Systemic Findings of Noncompliance

Systemic Findings of Non-compliance are defined as systemic deficiencies that have been identified through the IEP Review Process, which are in violation of state and federal special education rules and regulations. The NHDOE, Bureau of Special Education, requires that all Systemic Findings of Non-compliance be corrected as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the report date.

Based on visits to each of these programs it was determined that the following areas reflect systemic areas of non-compliance:

ED1109.01 (a)(1)/34CFR 300.320 Statement of annual, measurable goals

Six out of sixteen IEPs reviewed did not contain annual, measurable goals.

ED1109.01 (a)(1) Explanation of the extent, if any, the child will not participate with non-disabled children in the regular classroom

Five out of sixteen IEPs reviewed stated *that* the child would be removed from the regular classroom/his non-disabled peers, but did not offer an explanation of why that was necessary.

One out of one preschool IEP reviewed did not provide the child access to non-disabled children in the preschool setting.

Conclusions:

1. While there is evidence of effective special education services throughout the district, additional training and support must be provided to the special education staff in writing measurable goals, including benchmarks or objectives.
2. The special and regular education staff members are emerging as a collaborative and cooperative faculty with shared responsibility for all students. Continued efforts in that direction will only improve the outcomes for students with disabilities.
3. The central office special education administration is supportive of the teaching staff by offering training, resources, and guidance in areas that need improvement. By the same turn, the staff is eager to know how to improve their services to students and participate willingly in training opportunities.

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

SAU#: 28	NAME OF SAU: Pelham School District	SUPERINTENDENT: Dr. Henry LaBranche
SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTOR: Tina H. McCoy		DATE OF PLAN: April 10, 2012

SYSTEMIC FINDINGS OF NON-COMPLIANCE: Systemic Findings of Non-compliance are defined as systemic deficiencies that have been identified through the IEP Review Process, which are in violation of state and federal special education rules and regulations.

The NHDOE, Bureau of Special Education, requires that all Systemic Findings of Non-compliance be corrected as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the final report date – **February 16, 2013**

PLEASE NOTE: If applicable, Child Specific Findings of Non-compliance identified through the IEP Review Process and noted separately on the Assurance Form, are required to be resolved within 45 days.

**For Use By
Technical
Assistant At
Follow Up Visit**

SYSTEMIC FINDINGS OF NON-COMPLIANCE	CORRECTIVE ACTION	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	EVIDENCE OF COMPLIANCE AND EVIDENCE OF IMPACT ON STUDENTS, AS APPROPRIATE	TIMELINE (Check appropriate columns below to indicate expected completion time for each activity.)	Date of follow up visit (or date of acceptance of evidence submitted to indicate correction):
					Note as Met, In Process or Not Met

				5/12	8/12	11/12	2/13	
ED1109.01 (a)(1)/34CFR 300.320 Statement of annual, measurable goals	Training for all student services professionals regarding how to write annual measurable goals in accordance with NH DOE standards; as appropriate measurable goals will be linked to curriculum standards.	Student Services Director and/or Coordinator	Documentation of initial trainings, incorporation into teacher induction training, and annual student services trainings (at start of each school year); review and assessment of IEPs will provide documentation of progress as well.	Training and Tools Completed	Internal Checks	Formative Assessment and Feedback	Summative Assessment	

				5/12	8/12	11/12	2/13	
ED1109.01 (a)(1) Explanation of the extent, if any, the child will not participate with non-disabled children in the regular classroom	Guidance specific to this requirement will be incorporated into a detailed IEP writing guide; the guide will be available to all student services professionals and LEA representatives after initial introductory training.	Student Services Director and/or Coordinator	IEP writing guide will be developed and distributed and initial training will take place; the guide will be included in teacher induction binder; review and assessment of IEPs will provide documentation of progress as well.	Training and Tools Completed	Internal Checks	Formative Assessment and Feedback	Summative Assessment	
(Working with school administration, school board and community members, continue to investigate ways to ensure that Pelham preschool students with IEPs have regular and sustained access to their typical peers.)	A plan to develop an integrated preschool program will be developed and vetted by district administrators in consultation with representatives of the NH DOE. The plan, when completed, will be presented to the Pelham School Board for consideration and potential approval.	Director of Student Services and/or Coordinator and Preschool Coordinator.	A copy of the plan will be made available for review; school board minutes will reflect consideration by the Pelham School Board.	Draft Plan will be developed and reviewed with NHDOE consultants	Adjusted plan will be developed	Plan will be presented to the School Board for consideration and potential approval.	If plan is approved, then PPS will begin taking registrations in February of 2013.	

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

SAU#: 28	NAME OF SAU: Pelham School District	SUPERINTENDENT: Dr. Henry LaBranche			
SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTOR: Tina H. McCoy		DATE OF PLAN: March 15, 2012			
<p>SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT: Suggestions for improvement, simply stated, are recommendations provided by the visiting team that are intended to strengthen and enhance programs, services, instruction and professional development. While the school or district is not held accountable for follow up on suggestions for improvement, the NHDOE strongly encourages the school or district to seriously consider the suggestions, determine which are most appropriate, and address those in the corrective action plan.</p>					<p>For Use By Technical Assistant At Follow Up Visit</p>
SUGGESTIONS	IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITY	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	EVIDENCE OF COMPLIANCE AND EVIDENCE OF IMPACT ON STUDENTS, AS APPROPRIATE	TIMELINE	Date of follow up visit (or date of acceptance of evidence submitted to indicate correction):
					Note as Met, In Process or Not Met
<i>1. Expand upon the current process of gathering parent input for the IEP, giving parents advance notice that their input is required and giving them ample opportunity to provide their information.</i>	Reintroduce parent input form and review its' use; incorporate information regarding this requirement into IEP writing guide.	Director of Student Services and/or Coordinator and Preschool Coordinator	IEP writing guide will be developed and distributed and initial training will take place; the guide will be included in teacher induction binder.	August, 2012	
<i>2. Include specific and current student assessment data and identify assessments in the Student Profile.</i>	Guidance specific to this requirement will be incorporated into a detailed IEP writing guide; the guide will be available to all student services professionals and LEA representatives after initial introductory training.	Director of Student Services and/or Coordinator	IEP writing guide will be developed and distributed and initial training will take place; the guide will be included in teacher induction binder.	August, 2012	
<i>3.* Encourage all special education staff working with</i>	To ensure accuracy and consistency of information, provide in-district training to staff members working	Director of Student Services and/or	Documentation of training and corresponding materials;	October, 2012	

<i>students age 16 and older to participate in Transition and Indicator #13 training.</i>	with students with disabilities age 16 and up regarding Transition and Indicator #13.	Coordinator	materials/information will be added to teacher induction binder.		
<i>4. When developing or renewing an IEP select only those Accommodations that are critical to the student's progressing in the general curriculum, thereby reducing the number of Accommodations in each IEP.</i>	Guidance specific to this requirement will be incorporated into a detailed IEP writing guide; the guide will be available to all student services professionals and LEA representatives after initial introductory training.	Director of Student Services and/or Coordinator	IEP writing guide will be developed and distributed and initial training will take place; the guide will be included in teacher induction binder.	August, 2012	
<i>5. When monitoring a student's progress on an IEP ensure that there are "real" data connected to each goal in order to measure the student's progress on a regular basis.</i>	In addition to the IEP writing guide, and the implementation of paraprofessional support decision guidelines that include a requirement for baseline data, a simple rubric to assess measurability of goals/objectives or benchmarks will be developed for use by LEA representatives and evaluating administrators. Guidelines for progress reporting will be incorporated.	Director of Student Services and/or Coordinator	IEP writing guide will be developed and distributed and initial training will take place; this guide, the paraprofessional guidelines information and IEP goal measurability rubric will also be included in the teacher induction binder along with guidelines for progress reporting.	November, 2012	
<i>6. *Working with school administration, school board and community members, continue to investigate ways to ensure that Pelham preschool students with IEPs have regular and sustained access to their typical peers.</i>	See Corrective Action under Systemic Findings on CA Plan				
<i>7. Ensure that, as IEPs are reviewed and revised annually, that the goals are revised to reflect progress (or lack</i>	Guidance specific to this important consideration will be incorporated into a detailed IEP writing guide; teams will be required to 'close' out IEPs with progress information in	Director of Student Services and/or Coordinator and Preschool	This important supplementary information will be added to the IEP writing guide will be developed and distributed	January, 2013	

<i>thereof) and do not look the same year to year.</i>	each area. This information will be added to the IEP guide and will be stressed during training with all student services professionals and LEA representatives after initial introductory training.	Coordinator	after training takes place with professionals and LE representatives. The information will then be included in teacher induction binder.		
<i>8.Link IEP academic goals to GLEs/GSEs (either in the NH Curriculum Frameworks or in the Common Core) so that participation and progress in the general curriculum can actually be observed and measured.</i>	Guidance specific to this requirement will be incorporated into a detailed IEP writing guide; the guide will be available to all student services professionals and LEA representatives after initial introductory training. The IEP assessment rubric will include information related to this requirement.	Director of Student Services and/or Coordinator	IEP writing guide will be developed and distributed and initial training will take place; the guide will be included in teacher induction binder.	February, 2013	
<i>9.* Provide formal training for special education staff at all levels in the development of measurable goals.</i>	Trainings will be provided to all student services professionals and will be incorporated into new teacher induction.	Director of Student Services and/or Coordinator	Documentation of Training Sessions and corresponding training materials.	August, 2012	
<i>10.*Ensure that all IEP goals are accompanied by objectives and/or benchmarks unless specifically waived by a parent/guardian.</i>	Guidance specific to this requirement will be incorporated into a detailed IEP writing guide; the guide will be available to all student services professionals and LEA representatives after initial introductory training.	Director of Student Services and/or Coordinator and Preschool Coordinator	IEP writing guide will be developed and distributed and initial training will take place; the guide will be included in teacher induction binder.	August, 2012	
<i>11.*Make sure that the IEP explains why a student is removed from the general education classroom or is not participating with non-disabled peers in extra-curricular activities, not just that he is removed (Non-participation justification).</i>	Guidance specific to this requirement will be incorporated into a detailed IEP writing guide; the guide will be available to all student services professionals and LEA representatives after initial introductory training.	Director of Student Services and/or Coordinator and Preschool Coordinator	IEP writing guide will be developed and distributed and initial training will take place; the guide will be included in teacher induction binder.	August, 2012	

