

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

SAU #83

Fremont School District

Summary Report

William Lander, Superintendent of Schools

Dawn Lewis, Director of Special Education

Bob Andrews, Ed. Consultants SERESC

Jen Dolloff, Ed. Consultants SERESC

Report Date: June 1, 2011

Table of Contents

Introduction	p. 3
Focused Monitoring Activities	p. 7
IEP Review Summary	p.12
Action Plan	p. 21
Next Steps	p. 28
Addendums	

2. Introduction

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

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

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

Date of Report: June 1, 2011

Statutory Authority for New Hampshire Department of Education Monitoring

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

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

Achievement Team Members:

Bill Lander, Superintendent *

Dawn Lewis, Principal/Special Education Director *

John Safina, Principal *

Brenda Fabrizio, School Psychologist

Melissa McKeon, Out of District Coordinator *

Deb Genthner, School Board Member/Parent

Colleen Gagnon, Special Education Teacher

Kathy Schreiber, Classroom Teacher

Annmarie Wright, Classroom Teacher

Deb Weber, Classroom Teacher

Lisa Forsythe, Classroom Teacher

Sue Pipitone, Classroom Teacher

Ted Merideth, Special Education Teacher
Mary Hale, Special Education Teacher
Jill Leveille, Special Education Teacher
Heatha Normandin, Classroom Teacher
Jen Thomas, Reading Specialist
Jen Dolloff – SERESC Consultant
Bob Andrews – SERECS Consultant
* Denotes Leadership Team Member

IEP Review Team Members:

Brigid Connelly
Dianne Karpman
Bethany Lane
Bryn Hazelwood
Kathy Scriber
Colleen Gagnon
Jackie Driscoll
Heatha Normandin
Jen Stolk
Mary Hale
Robin Lee
Lisa Forsyth
Gail Wentworth
Kristine Kane
Ted Meredith
John Herman
LeeAnn Wells
Melissa Mckeen
Dawn Lewis

The Fremont School District, SAU 83, is comprised of the Ellis School, kindergarten through eighth grade. Ellis school also has an integrated preschool program. High school students attend Sanborn Regional High School in Kingston, NH. We also have several students attending the Seacoast Charter School in Kingston, NH.

The Mission of SAU 83 is:

The mission of the Fremont School District, in partnership with the parents and community, is to ensure that each student achieves their full potential through educational excellence in teaching. Students will be able to apply their knowledge to solve problems and think critically, both independently and working cooperatively with others. They will acquire a thirst to learn while developing a strong confident character, show empathy for others and value community involvement.

Developed in 2009, the goals of the Fremont School District are:

FREMONT SCHOOL DISTRICT 3-5 YEAR GOALS

FALL 2009

Educational Improvement is a Process not an Event

1. The Fremont School District will improve student achievement.

Strategies for success:

- Assess the K-8 programs
- Determine systemic focus areas and timelines for improvement (i.e., literacy)
- Coordination of taught curriculum with New Hampshire Grade Level Expectations(GLE's)
- Use of curriculum mapping
- Use of common assessment data
- Differentiated instruction

Indicators of success: Comprehensive Assessment including:

- NECAP testing fall 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014
- Annual NWEA fall/spring testing data
- Common grade level/course assessment
- AIMS WEB assessment
- Everyday Math Assessments
- Wilson Reading Assessment
- Student Portfolios

Other indicators of school success:

- Increased attendance
- Decrease in discipline (SWIS data)
- Fremont high school ranking
- Increased parent involvement
- Reduction of student interventions (RTI)

2. The Fremont School District will improve communication and dissemination of information to the public (and throughout the school/district).

Indicator of success:

- Reduction/elimination of complaints regarding communication

3. The Fremont School District will develop a systematic approach to support Professional Development.

Strategies of success: Using the Professional Learning Community model, the FSD will:

Learn to use data to make instructional learning decisions

- Gain proficiency in utilizing the RTI model
- Use sustained, "in-house" professional development to improve teaching strategies (beginning with literacy)
- Learn to integrate higher order/critical thinking skills/arts education into the curriculum
- Identify funding sources for professional development
- Develop time schedules for professional development

Indicators of success:

- Improved student achievement (see #1)

4. The Fremont School District will complete the strategic plan for the district so that the highest quality education can be provided to all students.

Indicators of success:

- A completed and implemented Strategic Plan reviewed and adjusted as necessary annually.

The Fremont school district school was in their first year of a district in need of improvement in 2010/11. Upon entering the focus monitoring process, it was decided to combine the efforts of the DINI plan and the focus monitoring activity. The team felt it paramount to address the needs of all students. Our essential question became:

What are the contributing factors to the achievement gap between students performing in the proficient and students performing in the non proficient range and how can this gap be narrowed.

Using the “5-Step Inquiry Process” we broke our task into the following steps:

- 1. Get ready for inquiry**
- 2. Organize and analyze data**
- 3. Investigate factors impacting student achievement**
- 4. Determine effective practice and write a plan**
- 5. Implement, monitor and evaluate**

Five Step Inquiry Process:

Step 1: Get Ready for Inquiry

As a first step, the team assessed its readiness to undertake a systems change process and examine the district’s decision making process. We engaged in “Data Dialogue” to analyze the readiness data. The team inventoried its available student performance data and its current district initiatives. It then determined what additional data was needed to gather in order to answer the essential question.

Step 2: Organize and Analyze Data

During step two, the team focused on determining the nature of the achievement gap between students who are proficient and those who are non-proficient. The team decided to conduct perception surveys of teachers to provide it with additional student performance data. It triangulated (using multiple data sources), aggregated (summarized to determine patterns, connections, discrepancies), disaggregated (determined performance of subgroups) and communicated (displayed data) the performance data.

Step 3: Investigate Factors Impacting Student Achievement

Next, the team determined the root causes of underperformance and identified the significant challenges and needs of the district. It needed to seek answers to the essential question from a holistic system perspective, and examined curriculum, instruction, and assessment issues that impacted all students in both general and special education settings. The team then prepared a set of findings from its data analysis. The findings provided the foundation for its system improvement plan.

Step 4: Determine Effective Practices and Write a Plan

The team is now ready to covert district challenges/needs into priority goals for its action plan that will address the root causes of the achievement gap. The team will establish and examine a set of alternative system changes to determine their basis in research and their effectiveness. At this point in the inquiry process, the team may decide to conduct perception surveys of students, parents, and teachers with regard to strategies being considered. The team will prepare a final report on the year’s study which includes the action plan and an application for an implementation grant to assist the team in carrying out its action plan.

Step 5: Implement, Monitor, and Evaluate

Year two of the Focused Monitoring process will be the implementation year for the district’s action plan. At the end of year two, the team will be asked to evaluate the implementation of the action plan.

The Fremont School District already has a number of proactive programs and activities in place to enhance our plan. They include but are not limited to:

- RTI is already in place and being used in the building. We have a number of intervention programs through put the grade levels.
- The Ellis School is a fully inclusive Special Education program.
- Collaboration and shared leadership.
- Training has been done on writing goals, benchmarks, and objectives,
- Standards Based Reporting.
- Literacy committee
- Power Standards in Reading
- We have not been a District In Need Of Improvement until this year
- Use of Data for student interventions.
- Full day kindergarten in 2011-2012 school year.

3. Focused Monitoring Activities

Organize and Analyze Data

The Fremont School District review included the following types of data during the Focus Monitoring Process.

NECAP Scores

NWEA Scores

AIMSWeb Scores

SWIS Data

Mapping Current Initiatives - Inventory of Initiatives

PCI (Positives, Concerns, Interesting Insights)

Reading Assessments Survey and Grade-Level Assessment Survey

Use of Performance Pathways

Top New Hampshire Schools & Reading

Response to Intervention and Extended Learning Opportunities

Needs for Scheduling

Focus Group Discussions

District Readiness Survey

Review of DINI/SINI Status and Plans

Review of IEP Summary

Review of NECAP data for 2009-2010

State assessment data showed that there was no positive movement for students with Individualized Education Plans. The data also suggests that students without individualized educational plans consistently made some gains across grade levels; however, no grade level is meeting the state average. The rate of proficiency in 2009 was 63 percent and in 2010 was 68 percent.

Review of NWEA data.

As a group we looked at the NWEA data and asked ourselves the following questions: Should we teach to the test? Would we assume that students who did poorly on the NECAP test would also do poorly on the NWEA tests? Should we teach the language of the test? Can we see individualized progress for students with/without individualized education plans? What is going on with the core? The team decided that looking at data in this way would be helpful to each grade level team.

AIMS Web Data

AIMS Web is a benchmark and progress monitoring system based on direct, frequent, and continuous student assessment. The results are reported to teachers and administrators via a web-based data management and reporting system to determine response to intervention. At Ellis School Benchmark monitoring is completed three times a year on all elementary students. The data received from the Benchmarks are reviewed and students in need of intervention are identified. Students in need of intervention are placed into Response-To-Intervention groups and provided remediation in identified areas. At the Ellis Elementary School students in the Response-To-Intervention groups are monitored weekly via AIMS Web which documents their progress. At the Focus Monitoring Meeting, the team discussed the usefulness of the AIMS Web data collection system in the Elementary School and determined that it would be effective for the Middle School to begin using the same system. In the spring of 2011, an AIMS Web Data instructional meeting was held for Middle School Staff. The Middle School is currently piloting AIMS Web for the remainder of the 2010-2011 school year and plan to begin the full implementation in the fall of 2011.

Review of SWIS (School-Wide Information System) Data

In reviewing the SWIS data, we have determined the following: the problem behaviors that are most reported (for K-8) are contact and disrespect; most behaviors occur on the bus, classroom, and playground. We found that behavior referrals have been cut in half since the 2005-2006 school year. In place at Ellis School is the Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS) program. The most significant decrease in all behavior referrals is for minor infractions. Major referrals have decreased since the 2004-2005 school year by 34%. Minor referrals have also been cut in half since the 2005-2006 school year.

Mapping Current Initiatives Inventory of Initiatives

After mapping the initiatives used by elementary and middle school, we realized there were a number of different initiatives, but the initiatives were not aligned. The initiatives were all valuable and beneficial to students and teachers, but they were not moving us toward our goal. Many of the initiatives were not providing data to measure and assess student growth and the effectiveness of the program. We discussed ways of aligning initiatives and improving utilization.

PCI (Positives, Concerns, Interesting Insights)

The PCI was filled out at the end of each Focus Monitoring meeting and used as an emotional thermometer for people's opinions of what was going well and what they felt still needed to be addressed.

Reading Assessments Survey and Grade-Level Assessment Survey

A teacher survey was done asking which assessments they used, which ones informed instruction, and which ones were most effective to monitor student growth and identify needs. The different assessments used were NECAPS, NWEA, AIMS Web Benchmarks, AIMS Web Progress Monitoring, QRI, Reading A-Z running records, Corrective Reading screening, Wilson Assessments, and Gates-MacGinitie. The results showed that the NWEA was used the most to inform instruction and identify needs. AIMS Web benchmarks and progress monitoring were second. The Grade-Level Assessments Survey found that teachers were generally happy with the assessments utilized at their grade levels. The QRI was the only assessment to be found by teachers to be ineffective. It was decided that next year those grade levels using the QRI would utilize a different assessment. There was concern about the lack of consistency of assessments among the grades, and there were concerns that this made it difficult to measure true reading progress grade to grade.

Use of Performance Pathways

The focus monitoring team was shown how to find the district's report card on the Department of Ed. web site. We were also shown how to find the following: NECAP scores, district rankings, growth patterns, special education report card, longitudinal data, and performance plus. This information was used during the data dialogue discussion. It was noted that passwords were needed for teachers to access this.

Top New Hampshire Schools & Reading

Our reading specialist, Jen Thomas, researched the top New Hampshire Schools. They are the following: Strafford School, Bernice Ray Elementary (Hanover), Lincoln Akerman School (Hampton Falls), Hollis Primary School, Bedford Elementary Schools, Exeter Elementary Schools, and Rye Elementary School. In her research, she found that the top schools had very strong early intervention programs. Some of these schools had balanced literacy approaches, while other schools used prescribed programs. For those schools that did not use a prescribed reading program, more reading specialists were on staff. Every school had clear procedures when the core curriculum was not working and what the next steps were. The next steps included tier programs that were regularly monitored for effectiveness. High standards and school-wide infra-structures were behind these successful schools.

Response to Intervention and Extended Learning Opportunities

Ellis school has implemented Response to Intervention (RTI) and Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO) throughout the school. RTI is executed in the middle school, grades 5-8 while ELO is implemented in the elementary school grades K-4. In the middle school, RTI gives all students who are performing below grade level opportunities for remediation in both reading and mathematics while also providing students performing at or above grade level opportunities for enrichment. In the middle school, RTI occurs on a daily basis for 50 minutes. The Corrective Reading program is used for students who perform below grade level based on the NWEA, NECAP, and AIMS Web testing. (The middle school teachers providing reading interventions were recently given training on AIMS Web testing for use next year.) The data is reviewed each trimester to determine growth and individual needs. Ellis School has recently acquired a prescriptive math program to meet the remedial needs of our students. This program is called *Number Worlds*.

In the elementary grades, ELO is implemented daily. In grades 1-3, students have two opportunities per day. In grades K and 4, students are given one opportunity per day. Multiple interventions, depending on the needs of the student, are put into effect. This variety of programs can be viewed in the appendix of this document. One of the interventions is the Corrective Reading program that the middle school uses. The elementary school has a literacy coach on their staff who helps provide these interventions. Students who do not require remediation explore areas of enrichment. The staff has been in discussion regarding how to use personnel in order to provide a more systematic tiered approach. The elementary staff uses the AIMS Web data to determine needs. The progress monitoring is administered three times per year while students identified for remedial intervention are given the probes weekly.

Needs of Scheduling

At the Ellis School, there is a split opening of the school day between the middle and elementary school. This split makes it difficult for scheduling. Staff members who could be utilized for interventions are on two different schedules making it impossible to maximize personnel resources. Scheduling is further challenged by the need to use the cafeteria which has a duo-purpose - lunch and physical education classes. There are approximately two hours of missed instructional time. Other areas that are challenging are: common staff meetings, staff development, communication (especially for transition meetings), and staff morale. A common opening would make Ellis School a single K-8 school rather than a divided elementary and middle school.

Focus Group Discussions

These Focus Group interviews took place at the Ellis School in March. Staff members were invited to come in small groups and discuss topics such as curriculum and GLE's, academic achievement, and discipline with the Focus Team leaders Bob Andrews and Jen Dolloff.

In general, the staff felt confident that they understand their grade level GLE's but feel they do not have a good understanding of grade level GLE's above or below them. The staff felt that a reading curriculum may be needed as a baseline with supplemental resources to reach kids that need extra help. The school currently uses a Response-To-Intervention model, but staff felt they needed more direction and leadership in this area. The staff also felt that PBIS needs to be implemented and used consistently throughout the building and with fidelity by the staff.

When asked about some things the staff would like to see changed at Ellis School the answers were varied. Some trends found in the answers were: better communication, same schedule for both elementary and middle school, a teacher mentor program, and the hope that case managers will do more work collaboratively with classroom teachers.

District Readiness Survey

In September of 2010, SERESC developed a School Evaluation Survey that was completed by the staff via Survey Monkey. The staff was asked to rate the school district in the areas of curriculum, professional development, instruction, student behavior, school expectations, school mission, communication to the community, school improvement plan and staff development/evaluation.

Analysis of this data indicated that staff felt there were a number of factors impacting student achievement. The staff identified the need for an increased amount of time for collaboration, training and teaching. It was strongly recommended that the lack of a full day kindergarten program is negatively impacting the students at Ellis School and that a full day kindergarten program should be implemented. Full day kindergarten was approved by the Fremont School Board to begin the 2011-2012 school year. The allocation of current resources was identified as an area of concern and staff indicated that training on current resources would be useful. Staff indicated the NECAP data was concerning. Following this input, grade-level teams discussed strategies to teach the students how to stay focused during the test and how to teach students the language of the test. Student behavior was identified as having a negative impact on student achievement. In response to this input, the Focus Monitoring Team determined the team would review the SWIS data. The physical space/building of Ellis School was identified as a negative factor. Staff reported the need for space/room for Response-To-Intervention (RTI) services, teaching, training, collaboration and curriculum development. The RTI services themselves were also an identified theme in the survey. Staff appeared uncertain about what instruction can be missed to provide time for remediation. Staff also expressed that 45 minutes was not enough time for the interventions. Time for collaboration regarding RTI is needed and the need for programs and training for RTI instruction.

The Focus Monitoring Team took the information gained through the analysis of the survey data and utilized it to inform their creation of the action plan items.

Process of Communication

- Staff meetings
- E-mails (summary of PCIs)
- Meeting minutes from focus monitoring group
- Discussions during meetings which were brought back to grade-level teams
- Bob and Jen spoke to teachers regarding the on-site evaluation/process (prior to on-site, team meetings, and shared their power point presentation)
- Parent/School Board Member as a committee member
- Progress to school board

- Principals gave updates at staff meetings
- Leadership team
- Parent Night (special education parent group)

Individual Education Plan (IEP) Review:

An IEP review was completed at the IEP team level. Four IEP teams were reviewed. During the IEP review process each team reviewed assessment data and Individual Education Plans over a three year period. The IEP review was facilitated by members of SERESC. The results of the IEP review identified positive areas that Ellis is already completing and areas of need that Ellis needs to work on completing better.

Positive results were identified as Ellis School has a dedicated staff, is child focused, has strong collaboration, staff know the students and their needs, team members have effective communication, there is good relationships with parents and evaluations are planned to occur at critical points of transition.

Suggestions to improve areas of need were to ensure that goals that are appropriate and measurable, that there be concise, clear baseline data, that there be better use of Data, that there are more Criteria-Based Measurements (CBM) and that there be more collaboration between classroom teacher and special educator.

Factors Impacting Student Achievement

The Fremont Focused Monitoring Team identified an essential question to guide them through the Focus Monitoring Process.

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

To begin to answer this essential question, the team investigated multiple factors impacting student achievement. The process began with initial data collection activities. These data collection activities included: a School Evaluation Survey (District Readiness Survey), a Staff Survey, NECAP data analysis, NWEA data analysis, AIMS Web data analysis, Reading Assessment Survey, SWIS data review and Focus Group Meetings. The Team met monthly beginning in September 2010 and ending in May 2011. Throughout the first half of the year, the team read the book Annual Growth, Catch Up Growth written by; L. Fielding, N. Kerr and P. Rosier and a few articles that focused on high performing schools and how they got to be high performing. At the monthly meetings, the team discussions focused on analyzing the collected data and comparing Ellis School’s practices with the practices of high performing schools. The discussions included generating hypotheses, Chalk Talk, the reasons Ellis has an achievement gap, identifying the needs of Ellis students and teachers, review of Performance Pathways, Data Driven Dialogue, review of the school wide schedule, Professional Learning Communities, and a reflection of each meeting using the PCI format. The team also met in subcommittees between monthly meetings to finish the remaining data collection of assessment needs.

Following the collection and review of all data, the team prioritized the factors impacting student achievement into two areas: Curriculum and Assessment. Two subgroups were then formed within the achievement team to look more closely at the existing data and to collect other data sources. Each subcommittee generated a list of the possible factors that contributed to the low performance of students in the district. Based on the review of the data, the team determined what additional data was needed. Subcommittee goals were determined based upon patterns and trends identified within the data.

The objectives determined were as follows:

Subcommittee 1:

Objective: Ellis School will create a school wide system of instruction and intervention that is aligned vertically and horizontally.

Activities:

1. Core Curriculum to meet the needs of 80% of students with 100% participation.
2. Clearly defined entrance and exit criteria for RTI Interventions.
3. Create a K-8 Master Schedule
4. Staff development in Literacy and RTI Training.
5. Creative allocation of staff resources and define job roles for efficient and effective use of personnel.

Subcommittee 2:

Objective: Data collection will be utilized to effectively drive instruction.

Activities:

1. To streamline K-8 assessments.
2. To provide staff development regarding data collection programs (AIMS Web, Everyday Math, etc). Provide time for staff to practice using data collection programs. Assign data team member to monitor staff use of data collection programs.
3. Staff development on utilizing data in a prescriptive manner that will change the way we instruct our students.
4. Identify and provide reading resources for tier 2 instruction.
5. Current staff resources will be identified and allocated for effective implementation of RTI.

4. IEP Review Summary

IEP Review Summary Special Education Compliance Component of NHDOE Focused Monitoring Process

Fremont School District

Date of NHDOE Focused Monitoring Compliance and IEP Review: February 17, 2011

Introduction:

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

The rural town of Fremont, is located in southeastern New Hampshire, and has a population of 4,152. The change in population since 2005 is an increase of 18.3%. The Ellis School enrolls 535 students in grades P-K and K-8, compared to an enrollment of 502 students in 2005. The increase in student enrollment in the last several years has in part led to the use of four portable classrooms, two of which are used for grade 5/6 classrooms and the other portable classrooms are used for Music and Computer. The Kindergarten program, which began in 2007, is currently a half day program and enrolls 44 students. The Integrated Pre-School Program with an enrollment of 23 students is also a half-day program. In 2005, 5.46% of the students at Ellis School were eligible for Free or Reduced Lunch, compared to approximately 20.17% of students in 2010. Approximately 19% of the students at Ellis School have Individual Education Plans (IEPs). At the time of the program visit, the Fremont School District had five (5) students placed in out of district settings.

Data Collection Activities:

As part of the NHDOE Focused Monitoring Process a Special Education compliance review was conducted in the Fremont School District on February 17, 2011. Listed below is the data that was reviewed as part of the compliance review, all of which are summarized in this report.

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

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS:

IEP Review Process: Conducted on February 17, 2011

As part of the compliance component of Focused Monitoring, the NHDOE worked in collaboration with the Fremont 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 Fremont School District were provided with a collaborative opportunity to review seven (7) IEPs 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
- Identification of who will gather assessment data, where/when it will be gathered and how data is recorded
- The revision of goals and/or objectives/benchmarks to the general education curriculum, instruction and assessment practices when students are not demonstrating success, when appropriate
- Three-year look back at the student's progress toward key IEP goals and the documented evidence of student gains

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.

Building/District Summary of IEP Review Process: Total Number IEPs reviewed: seven (7); Preschool: one (1) Age 16+: one (1) - Out of District: two (2); one (1) Charter School

	Yes	No
Is there a relationship between the student’s needs resulting from his/her disability and the goals?	7	0
Are the annual goals measurable (i.e. contain criteria for measurable and achievable progress?)	5	2
Is there evidence that the student is making progress? (Measuring Progress #3)	6	1
Does this year’s goal reflect last year’s progress)? E.g., more complex goal(s) address needs commensurate with the progress and present levels of performance.) Longitudinal IEP Review #4)	6	1

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

**Building/District Summary of IEP Review Process
Conclusions/Patterns Trends Identified Through IEP Review Process:**

- **How has this process informed future plans for improving the writing of student IEPs?**
 1. All IEPs need to include measurable goals, including baseline measurements to indicate student’s academic and functional performance levels from which the goal will be measured.
 2. All IEPs must include a statement of a student’s level of proficiency / targets.
 3. All IEPs must include academic goals.
 4. All IEP benchmarks/objectives must connect to the annual goals.
 5. Clearer statements of Present Levels of Performance must be developed to include state assessment data, district-wide assessments and classroom based assessments.
 6. All IEPs should identify that the student’s behavior impedes his or her learning or that of others.
 7. All IEPs should state when progress measurement will occur.
 8. Evidence of student progress toward annual goals by the end of the IEP should be included.
 9. All IEPs must include modifications that would enable the student to make effective progress.
 10. The services in the IEP should address all of the student’s identified needs.
 11. On out of district student IEPs, projected dates and duration of services must be included.

- **Describe how individual student performance information is conveyed from grade to grade/school to school:**
 1. Early Support and Services (ESS) are involved in transition planning with the Kindergarten teachers and related service personnel.
 2. At all grades, grade level teams meet with the next year teachers to review IEP and student needs.
 3. IEP are provided in advance of the school year to all teachers.
 4. Grade 5-8 students often have the same teachers during their middle school experience.
 5. Individual Transition Meetings for each Grade 8 student is held at Sanborn High School with student, parents and Staff from Ellis School and Sanborn High School.
 6. The Out of District Coordinator coordinates all IEP meetings for Grade 8 students who transition to Sanborn Regional High School (SRHS). Ellis School Staff meets with SRHS Staff and parents to review student needs and grade 9 courses.

- **How will the district further explore the factors that have impacted poor scores for individual students on state assessments?**
 1. Results of the IEP review visits were included and examined during the 2010-2011 year long Focused Monitoring Process.
 2. The District is currently aligning the curriculum to the state standards grades K-8 and identifying a Core curriculum which will be designed to meet the needs of 80% of students in the regular classroom.

3. Power standards will be developed for each grade level.
 4. A district wide effort is underway to continue the development of a Response to Intervention Model at Ellis School to better address the needs of all students and focus more directly on students who are not proficient on state assessments.
 5. Further training and utilization of Performance Plus by grade level teams will assist teachers in better meeting the needs of individual students.
 6. Additional time for collaboration between regular education and special education teachers will be made available.
 7. Training will be offered to Special Education Staff at Ellis School in writing Goals and Benchmarks.
- **Strengths and suggestions identified related to IEP development/progress monitoring and services:**

Strengths:

- On-going development of Response to Intervention Grades K-8 at Ellis School.
- Therapies in pre-school program are scheduled both in and outside the regular classroom.
- Pre-school program fosters student independence and encourages Parental Involvement.
- The District Literacy Committee has begun to investigate a formal Reading Program for district adoption.
- A strong core of dedicated and seasoned staff at all level Pre-School through grade 8.

Suggestions:

- Schedule more time for collaboration between regular classroom and special education staff as well as to develop IEPs.
- More detailed and concise baseline information to establish a clear and concise present level of performance to establish the current baseline.
- Gather more curriculum based data regarding student progress and growth.
- All annual IEP goals are measurable and include appropriate benchmarks that relate back to the goal.
- All goals should be reviewed and updated on an annual basis.
- Use multiple sources of data to develop student profiles and present level of performance including state and/or district assessment data.
- Using common assessment instruments to measure student progress on IEPs will yield data which is skill specific and easily implemented in all grades at Ellis School as well as with students who have transitioned to Sanborn High School.

District Wide Commendations:

- A comprehensive Transition Program is available to all grade 8 students as they move from Ellis School to Sanborn High School which includes individual transition meetings, Parent Open House, Student Tours, Student Orientation, school visitations, and a Dance. In addition, the first day of school is only for grade 9 students.
- Communication among Staff and with parents is well established and effective.
- Strong Pre-school Team is in place that is child-focused and works collaboratively.
- Ellis School Staff are dedicated, resourceful and knowledgeable of individual students.
- Students are invited and encouraged to participate in the IEP meeting.
- As evidenced through Focused Monitoring, Ellis School District has initiated a comprehensive system wide improvement planning process which will align all district initiatives.

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.

Based on the review of the documents, it was determined that the local plan meets all requirements. No findings of non-compliance were identified. As part of the review, credentials of special education staff were reviewed and found to be current. A suggestion would be to update any documents in the Policy and Procedure Manual should be review for duplication of documents as well as correcting any dates on expired or revised documents to keep the Manual current.

Students with Disabilities Attending Charter Schools:

There are five (5) students with disabilities attending Charter Schools. One IEP was randomly selected and reviewed. There were no Findings of Non-compliance.

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 Fremont School District in the review of the following changes to existing approved programs: **There are no New Programs or Changes to Existing Programs in the Fremont School District.**

Out of District File Review:

Based on the random review of two (2) student files for children with disabilities placed out of district, there was one citation of non compliance identified.

1. *Projected dates and duration of services were not provided on one IEP.
2. Extensive efforts are made by staff to communicate with out of district facilities and attend meetings
3. Evidence of efforts to insure parent participation as well as inclusion of surrogate, foster parent and Guardian ad Litem.
4. LEA provides ongoing assistance to student and providers in out of district settings.

Charter School File Review:

Based on a random review of one (1) student file for children with disabilities attending a Charter School, there were no Findings of non compliance identified. The student was enrolled at Seacoast Charter School in Kingston, NH.

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

Preschool	1
Elementary School	3
Middle School	2
High School, Age below 16	
High School, Age 16 or above	1
Total Number of IEPs Reviewed	7

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

As a result of the seven (7) IEPs that were selected for the IEP Reviews February 17, 2011 the following findings of Noncompliance were identified:

Student Specific Findings of Noncompliance

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

Ed 1109.01 IEP, Goals and Objectives/Benchmarks

34 CRF 300.320

Two of the seven (7) IEPs reviewed contained student specific Findings of Noncompliance.

- The annual goals were not measurable
- Baseline data was not provided in the goal or the goal's present level of performance.
- The students' expected level of proficiency levels/targets were not stated
- The IEP did not contain academic goals
- The IEP did not provide an explanation of the extent, if any, to which the student will not participate with nondisabled peers in the regular class and other educational settings.
- Determination of student behavior impeding learning of student or others was not identified.
- When measurement of student progress was not stated.
- No evidence of progress sufficient to achieve the annual goals by end of IEP was provided.

Ed 1113.08 Related Services and Curriculum

34 CFR 300.34

Two of seven (7) IEPs reviewed contained student specific Findings of Noncompliance.

Identified student academic, developmental and functional needs were not addressed by services in the IEP

Ed 1109.03 (e) IEP

34 CFR 300.323

One Out of District Student IEP contained a student specific Finding of Noncompliance

The current IEP did not contain projected dates and duration of services.

Systemic Findings of Noncompliance

Systemic Findings of Noncompliance be addressed in a corrective action plan and met within one year of the date of the report

Based on a review of the 7 IEPs that were selected for the IEP Reviews on February 17, 2011, the following findings of non-compliance were identified:

Ed 1109.01 Measurable Goals

34CFR 300.320

Of the 7 IEPs reviewed, preschool through secondary, 2 did not contain measurable goals.

Of the 7 IEPs reviewed, 2 did not contain baseline data in either the goal or the present level of performance

Of the 7 IEPs reviewed, 2 did not contain the student's expected proficiency levels/targets

Of the 7 IEPs reviewed, 1 did not include an academic goal

Of the 7 IEPs reviewed, 1 did not contain benchmarks that connected to the annual goal

Of the 7 IEPs reviewed, 2 did not identify that behavior impeded the learning of the student or others

Of the 7 IEPs reviewed, 1 did not indicate when the progress measurement would occur

Of the 7 IEPs reviewed, 1 did not include evidence that the student is making progress sufficient to achieve the annual goal

Ed 1113.08 Related Services and Curriculum

34 CFR 300.04

Two of the IEPs reviewed did not include services that address all the identified academic, developmental and functional needs of the student

Ed 1109.01(a) (1) Transition

One student's IEP age 16 years or older did not include all required components, including projected dates and duration of services as part of the Transition Plan

Conclusions:

Throughout the IEP Review Process it was evident that the Administration and Staff at Ellis School in the Fremont School District are committed to serving the needs of all students and are attempting to address the achievement gap between students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers. An example of this is the Focused Monitoring essential question developed by the Leadership Team which is as follows: "What are the contributing factors to the achievement gap between students performing in the proficient range and students performing in the non-proficient range, and how can this gap be narrowed?"

The Fremont School District has begun efforts to meet the needs of all learners by initiating a Response to Intervention Model, with an emphasis on Literacy for grades K-8. The school district has also fully supported the work of Focused Monitoring and the Focused Monitoring IEP Review. Staff actively participated in the reviews and utilized the Review Process as an opportunity to improve current knowledge and practices.

Corrective Action Plan

SAU#: 83	NAME OF SCHOOL DISTRICT: Fremont School District	SUPERINTENDENT/EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Bill Lander						
SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTOR: Dawn Lewis			DATE OF PLAN: May 26, 2011					
THE NHDOE, BUREAU OF SPECIAL EDUCATION, REQUIRES THAT ALL FINDINGS OF NON-COMPLIANCE BE CORRECTED AS SOON AS POSSIBLE, BUT NO LATER THAN ONE YEAR FROM THE FINAL REPORT DATE – BY February 17, 2012								
FINDINGS OF NON-COMPLIANCE: Findings of non-compliance are defined as deficiencies that have been identified through the Focused Monitoring Review Process, which are in violation of state and federal Special Education rules and regulations.					For Use By Technical Assistant At Follow Up Visit			
FINDINGS OF NON-COMPLIANCE	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.) Please note: findings re: individual students must be benchmarked in the first quarter.				Date of follow up visit (or date of acceptance of evidence submitted to indicate correction):
				9/11	12/11	3/12	6/12	Note as Met, In Process or Not Met
Ed 1109.01 Measurable Goals 34CFR 300.320 Of the 7 IEPs reviewed, preschool through secondary, 2 did not contain measurable goals. Of the 7 IEPs reviewed, 2 did not contain baseline data in either the goal or the present level of performance Of the 7 IEPs reviewed, 2 did not contain the student’s expected proficiency levels/targets Of the 7 IEPs reviewed, 1 did not include an academic goal Of the 7 IEPs reviewed, 1 did not contain benchmarks that connected to	Staff will receive professional development in writing measurable goals. *Staff will receive PD on determining, present level of performance. *Staff will receive PD on: Performance	Special Education Director.	IEP’s will reflect measurable goals: Performance indicators and measurement of performance, functional and developmental needs of students, benchmarks and goals, progress measurement, transition, behavior goals, objectives and its impact on the students and others.					

<p>the annual goal Of the 7 IEPs reviewed, 2 did not identify that behavior impeded the learning of the student or others Of the 7 IEPs reviewed, 1 did not indicate when the progress measurement would occur Of the 7 IEPs reviewed, 1 did not include evidence that the student is making progress sufficient to achieve the annual goal</p> <p>Ed 1113.08 Related Services and Curriculum 34 CFR 300.04 Two of the IEPs reviewed did not include services that address all the identified academic, developmental and functional needs of the student</p> <p>Ed 1109.01(a) (1) Transition One student's IEP age 16 years or older did not include all required components, including projected dates and duration of services as part of the Transition Plan</p>	<p>indicators.</p> <p>*Staff will receive PD on: academic goals as they relate to the IEP.</p> <p>*Staff will receive PD on: benchmarks and annual goals.</p> <p>*Staff will receive PD on: behavior goals, plans and monitoring.</p> <p>*Staff will receive a refresher on using the NHESIS.</p> <p>*Staff will receive PD on: Writing appropriate annual goals</p> <p>Staff will receive PD on: Understanding developmental and functional needs of students.</p> <p>Staff will receive PD on: Transition</p>							
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

5. Action Plan:

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

FREMONT SCHOOL DISTRICT ACTION PLAN

MEASURABLE STUDENT LEARNING GOAL: To increase the rate of proficiencies for all students by 5 percent per year.

OBJECTIVE #1: Data Collection will be utilized to effectively drive instruction.

STRATEGIES/ ACTIVITIES	ESTIMATED RESOURCES Budget, Human Resources, Materials	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE Leader and Participants	TIMELINE Begin/End	MONITORING OF IMPLEMENTATION Evidence		EVALUATING RESULTS Evidence of Effectiveness	
				What & by whom	When	What & by whom	When
1. To stream line k-8 assessments: a) A school wide assessment team (SWAT) will be developed with one teacher per grade and special education case managers. There will be elementary and middle school subcommittees of SWAT data team.	a. In-house personnel needed to create SWAT.	a. Administrators	a. August 2011	a. Administrators will develop team	November, March, June	a. Teachers will regularly attend all SWAT meetings	Monthly

The subcommittees will meet twice a month and the larger committee will meet six times a year (before and after each school wide screener).							
b. Calendar of meetings will be scheduled before the start of the school year.	None needed	b. Administrator	b. 7/1/11-9/1/11	b. Administrator will distribute by 9/1/11	9/1/11	b. Each teacher will have a calendar	b. September 1, 2011
c. SWAT agendas for the meetings will be developed.	c. none	c. SWAT team coordinator	9/1/11-6/20/12	c. publication of agendas	9/1/11-6/20/12	c. Administrator	c. monthly
d. School wide assessment of AIMS web completed 3 times a year.	d. Money for site license k-8.	d. Administrator	d. Summer 2011	d. Site license is obtained	Summer 2011	d. Site license will be in place	d. September 2011
e. The SWAT team will determine what progress monitoring assessments will be utilized k-8 and guidelines for data entry.	e. Common time will be allotted to SWAT team to determine these needs.	e. SWAT coordinator	e. September 15, 2011	e. Administrator	September 15, 2011	e. Guideline for all students has been determined.	September 15, 2011

<p>2. To provide staff training, time to practice, and a system for monitoring data collection programs:</p> <p>a. Staff meetings will be utilized as data meetings. A calendar will be developed prior to the start of the school year.</p>	<p>a. None</p>	<p>a. Administrator</p>	<p>September 1, 2011</p>	<p>a. administrator will develop a calendar</p>	<p>September 1, 2011</p>	<p>a. calendar will be distributed to teachers</p>	<p>a. September 1, 2011</p>
<p>b. Professional development will be provided to understand the different forms of assessment: formative, benchmarks, and summative.</p>	<p>b. Appropriate personnel to provide trainings and time to complete these trainings.</p>	<p>b. Administrator</p>	<p>September-December 2011</p>	<p>b. Administrators will document the trainings that have been completed.</p>	<p>December 2011</p>	<p>b. Teachers will utilize different forms of assessments to inform instruction.</p>	<p>b. December 2011</p>
<p>c. The district will provide ongoing PD for staff so that everyone understands how to use data to direct instruction.</p>	<p>c. SWAT members will be provided time to develop this resource</p>	<p>c. Administrator</p>	<p>September-November 2011</p>	<p>c. Instructional Guide for us of assessments for staff will be developed (ex. Moodle).</p>	<p>November 2011</p>	<p>c. This resource will be in place and teachers will utilize.</p>	<p>c. November</p>
<p>d. On going team level in-house training and</p>	<p>d. Time and Performance Pathway</p>	<p>d. Administrator</p>	<p>September 2011</p>	<p>d. Grade level teams are meeting regularly and utilizing</p>	<p>d. Monthly</p>	<p>d. Teachers are using performance pathway to inform instruction</p>	<p>d. monthly</p>

utilization of performance pathway.	passwords			performance pathway for planning and instruction			
e. The district will consider hiring a person to manage district data and assist staff with technology/ data use.	e. School board to authorize the position and funding	e. superintendent and principal	November 2011	e. Administration will propose to add this position to the 2012/2013 school budget.	e. November 2011	e. A person will be hired for the 2012/2013 school year.	e. July 2012
3. An RTI infrastructure will be developed to ensure all students receive an appropriate level of instruction. a. Staff development will be provided to assist staff in providing appropriate interventions in tiers two and three. b. The master schedule will be developed to ensure staff members are available to participate fully in the RTI format. c. Staff meetings will be held with all staff	a. Appropriate personnel b. none	a. Administrator b. superintendent and principal	a. September-June b. October 2012	a. Administrators scheduled PD activities b. Explore one scheduled opening and flex schedule for staff.	November b. October 2012	a. Teachers are providing appropriate interventions in tier 2 and 3. b. A master schedule is in place to allow for full implementation of RTI.	b. June 2012

k-8 to discuss data and curriculum. d. Staff members are involved in the statewide RTI professional development. e. Staff are providing appropriate math and literacy interventions at tier 2 and tier 3.	d. none e. A number of resources at each level to provide adequate instruction.	d. Administrator e. Administrator	d. Sept 2011-Ongoing e. November 2011	d. Admin will inform on state wide RTI resources. e. A Tool Box will be developed of effective interventions for Tier 2 and 3 students.	d. October 2011 e. June 2012	d. Teachers will access the NHRTI website. e. Teachers are using appropriate interventions with fidelity.	d. June 2012 e. November, March June
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------

OBJECTIVE #2: Ellis School will create a school wide system of instruction and intervention that is aligned vertically and horizontally.

STRATEGIES/ ACTIVITIES	ESTIMATED RESOURCES Budget, Human Resources, Materials	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE Leader and Participants	TIMELINE Begin/End	MONITORING OF IMPLEMENTATION Evidence		EVALUATING RESULTS Evidence of Effectiveness	
				What & by whom	When	What & by whom	When
a. Develop power standards based on the common core for Reading, Math and Writing	a. Professional days Research other school districts in the area of reading, Common Core standards.	a. Administrators	September 2011- December 2011.	a. Administrators will develop team	Summer 2011	a. Each staff member will receive a compilation of power standards and GLE for reading, math and writing.	February 2012

						b. Staff survey regarding effectiveness of the notebook	
b. An inventory of all reading and math materials will be created.	b. Reading Specialist	b. Reading specialist	b. Fall 2011	b. Reading specialist	b. November 2011	b. Teachers will be utilizing the inventory to provide appropriate instruction.	b. November 2011
2. Create eligibility requirements of each tier in a RTI model.	2. time, NH DOE website, performance pathway data	2. Administrator, literacy committee, SWAT, and special education	2. January 2011	2. Eligibility criteria will have been determined for each tier will be determined by each grade level.	2. January 2011	2. All students will be appropriately placed in tiers and successfully accessing core curriculum	2. June 2012
3. Develop the k-8 2012-2013 master schedule that includes teachers, Unified Arts, Related Service Providers	3. stipends and summer professional days	3. Administrators	3. August 2011	3. Master schedule is available to all staff by the start of the school year	3. August 2011	3. Master schedule will all more staff to provide RTI instruction	3. August 2011
4. Establish a dedicated reading and math core time (a minimum of 90 minutes for reading and 60 minutes for math).	4. none	4. Administrators	4. August 2011	4. Individual grade level schedules reflect allotted time for reading and math	4. August 2011	4. Every student is provided with 90 minutes of core reading instruction and 60 minutes of core math instruction every day.	4. August 2011
5. Update District Master Plan for PK-8 staff development to	5. professional development committee	5. Administrators	4. September 2011- June 2012	4. The Fremont School District Plan Master Plan for staff	4. April/ May 2012	4. NH DOE will approve Fremont School District Master	4. June 2012

include reading, literacy, RTI, and math				development will be presented to the staff.		Plan for staff development.	
------------------------------------------	--	--	--	---------------------------------------------	--	-----------------------------	--

6. Next Steps

As the 2010-2011 school year comes to an end and the Focused Monitoring Report Plan is completed, the Achievement Team would like to thank everyone involved in the development of this very comprehensive and exciting Action Plan. This plan would never have been able to come to fruition without the many hours of work by all the individuals who served on both the Leadership Team and the Achievement Team. These individuals represent many different aspects of our community and school and they have dedicated many hours collecting and analyzing the data that served as the basis for the plan created.

The district has discussed that one of the next steps forward in implementing this Action Plan is to create Power Standards for math and writing for grades K-8. Notebooks would then be created similar to the reading notebooks with standards and GLE's in each area. These notebooks would be given to either individual teachers or to grade levels at the beginning of the year.

7. Addenda

Surveys, inventory of initiatives, etc.