

**The New Hampshire Bureau of Special
Education
Annual Performance Report
of the
State Personnel Development Grant
CFDA # 84.323 A Grant Award # H323A070028**

April 28, 2011

Submitted by: Brent Garrett, Ph.D. & Patricia Mueller, Ed.D.

The focus of New Hampshire's State Personnel Development Grant III is to increase and improve the knowledge and skills of general and special education teachers, early intervention personnel, related services personnel, paraprofessionals and administrators in designing, delivering and evaluating scientifically-based practices in two areas: (1) response to intervention systems of positive behavioral interventions and supports and literacy instruction; and (2) intensive-level secondary transition supports for students with emotional/behavioral disorders. Project goals and objectives also include reforming and improving the systems for recruiting, hiring, and retaining education and related service personnel who are highly qualified in these areas.

This report summarizes major activities and accomplishments from April 2010 through March 2011. The report is organized around the original grant goals and objectives and includes: 1) a brief description of the initiative goals and objectives; 2) current status of the project activities; and 3) output and outcome evaluation data collected to date. The corresponding Federal Performance Report is included as Appendix D.

Table of Contents

Goals and Objectives

Goals 1 & 3: Provision of Professional Development in RtI systems of PBIS and Literacy Intervention and tertiary Secondary Transition Supports for students with EBD.....	1
Objective 1.1 Recruit at least one SAU in the 5 regions of NH.....	1
Objective 1.2 Recruit at Least 1 EC Program and 2 K-12 Schools from Each SAU.....	1
Objective 1.3 Develop & Incorporate Competencies for NH RESPONDS PD Efforts.....	3
Objective 1.4 Build SAU Capacity	4
Objective 1.5: Build School Capacity	4
Objective 1.6: Build ECE Program Capacity	28
Objective 1.7: Build Statewide Capacity in RTI and PBIS.....	35
Objective 1.8 Build Statewide Capacity to Provide Secondary Transition Supports	35
Goals 2: Retaining & Retraining Highly Qualified Professionals/Collaborating with IHEs	38
Objective 2.1: Reform/Improve State Standards for Certification/Endorsement Programs for PBIS, LI, and STS for students with Emotional Behavior Disorders.....	38
Objective 2.2: Recommend Revisions to Educator Preparation Programs to Include Competencies in RtI Systems for PBIS, LI, & STS for Students with Emotional Behavior Disorders.....	38
Objective 2.3: Develop and Engage at Least One IHE in the Development of a Undergraduate or Graduate-Level Course in School-to-Career Transition (StCT) Services.....	38

Appendices

Appendix A: NH RESPONDS Data Collection Matrix.....	40
Appendix B: Participating Personnel Survey Qualitative Data.....	45
Appendix C: NH RESPONDS March 14, 2011 RTI Tier 3 Training Report.....	51
Appendix D: 2011 Federal Performance Report.....	61

List of Tables

Table 1: NH RESPONDS SAU Demonstration Sites Information.....	2
Table 2: Content of Professional Development Provided.....	9
Table 3: NH RESPONDS Workgroup Content	9
Table 4: Frequency of Professional Development at SAUs.....	10
Table 5: Frequency of Professional Development at Participating Elementary Schools.....	10
Table 6: Frequency of Professional Development at Participating High Schools.....	10
Table 7: Impact on Participants' Knowledge.....	11
Table 8: Impact on Consensus Building.....	12

Table 9: Impact on Infrastructure.....	13
Table 10: Impact on Implementation.....	14
Table 11: Overall Impact on Behavior and Literacy.....	15
Table 12: Percent of Universal Collaborative Team Activities in Place.....	15
Table 13: Percent of Tier 2 Collaborative Team Activities In Place.....	16
Table 14: Percent of Literacy Universal Team Checklist (LUnTCh) Criteria in Place.....	17
Table 15: Percent of PET-R Results Criteria in Place.....	18
Table 16: Percent of Literacy Tier 2 Criteria in Place.....	18
Table 17: Participating Literacy Schools NECAP Reading Data (Percent Proficient)	19
Table 18: Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for Participating Literacy Schools.....	20
Table 19: Percent of PBIS Team Implementation Checklist Criteria in Place.....	21
Table 20: School-Wide Evaluation Tool (SET) Scores	22
Table 21: Percent of PBIS-NH Tier II Checklist or the RtI for Tier II Instrument Criteria in Place	23
Table 22: Number of All Discipline Referrals (Majors and Minors) (Referrals/100 Students/Year)	23
Table 23: Number of Major Office Discipline Referrals (Referrals per 100 Students Per Year)	24
Table 24: Change in the Number of In-School Suspensions (Events/100 Students)	25
Table 25: Change in the Length of In-School Suspension (Days/100 Students)	25
Table 26: Change in the Number of Out-Of-School Suspensions (Events/100 Students)	26
Table 27: Change in the Length of Out-Of-School Suspensions (Days/100 Students)	26
Table 28: Percentage of Students with Zero or at Most One Major Behavioral Incident.....	27
Table 29: Teacher Check Connect and Expect Data.....	27
Table 30: Frequency of Professional Development at Participating ECE Settings.....	30
Table 31: Impact on Knowledge of ECE RTI Literacy and Behavior	31
Table 32: Impact on ECE Infrastructure.....	32
Table 33: Impact on ECE Implementation.....	32
Table 34: Overall Impact on EC Behavior and Literacy.....	33
Table 35: Early Childhood Collaborative Team Checklist Data.....	33
Table 36: Preschool Team Leadership Checklist 3.0	34
Table 37: PreSET and CLASS Results.....	34

NH RESPONDS Annual Performance Report 2011

The focus of New Hampshire's State Personnel Development Grant (NH RESPONDS) is to increase and improve the knowledge and skills of general and special education teachers, early intervention personnel, related services personnel, paraprofessionals and administrators in designing, delivering and evaluating scientifically-based practices in two areas: (1) response to intervention systems of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) and literacy instruction; and (2) intensive-level secondary transition supports for students with emotional/behavioral disorders. Project goals and objectives also include reforming and improving the systems for recruiting, hiring, and retaining education and related service personnel who are highly qualified in these areas.

This report summarizes major activities and accomplishments from April 2010 through March 2011. The report is organized around the original grant goals and objectives and includes: 1) a brief description of the initiative goals and objectives; 2) current status of the project activities; and 3) output and outcome evaluation data collected to date. Data for this report were collected from an online Professional Development Activity Log, a participant survey conducted in March 2011, data collection instruments used in the provision of profession development, and other reports produced this past year. The full data matrix (see Appendix A) outlines the various types of data collected, the frequency of collection, the party responsible for collection, and how the data informs the project and program performance measures in the 524B report.

Goal 1: Professional Development

To improve the knowledge and skills of NH special and general education teachers, related service personnel and school administrators from five Early Childhood Education (ECE) programs and 10 K-12 public schools in designing, implementing with fidelity, and sustaining scientifically-based response to intervention (RtI) systems of PBIS and literacy and tertiary Secondary Transition Supports (STS) for students with emotional and behavior disorders (EBD). Evaluation data discussing the degree to which the eight objectives necessary to achieve this goal were accomplished are discussed in the following pages.

Objective 1.1: To recruit at least one Supervisory Administrative Unit (SAU) in the five regions of NH that shows readiness and commitment to adopting or expanding RtI systems of PBIS and Literacy Instruction and tertiary STS for students with EBD.

Objective 1.2: To recruit at least 1 ECE program and 2 K-12 schools from each SAU.

Status of Demonstration Sites

Table 1 below depicts the five SAU demonstration sites and the respective schools and ECE programs that are participating in NH RESPONDS. As noted, there are currently 9 elementary schools engaged in the project, with a range of current practices in place (e.g., Behavior and/or Literacy, Tiers 1, 2 or 3). Also note that some schools came on board with NH RESPONDS having already initiated their PBIS or Literacy Instruction reform efforts prior to the project start up. There are currently four of the five ECE programs and two high schools participating in NH RESPONDS.

Table 1: NH RESPONDS SAU Demonstration Sites Information (as of April 2011)

	Conway School District/ SAU #9	Newport School Dist/ SAU #43	Rochester School Dist/ SAU #54	Somersworth School Dist/ SAU #56	Timberlane School Dist/ SAU #55
Region	North Country	Southwest	Southeast	Southeast	South Central
City	Conway, NH 03813	Newport NH 03773	Rochester NH 03867	Somersworth, NH 03878	Plaistow, NH 03865
School 1	Pine Tree Elementary School	Towle Elementary School	Chamberlain Street School	Maplewood Elementary School	Sandown North Elementary School
Grades	K 1-6	4-5	K 1-5	P K 1-4	1-4
Start Year	2008-2009	2008-2009	2008-2009	2008-2009	2008-2009
Priority Area	Literacy/Added Behavior 2010-11	Behavior /Added Literacy 2010-11	Behavior /Added Literacy 2010-11	Literacy/Added Behavior 2010-11	Behavior/Added Literacy 2010-11
Implementation Level	Literacy Tier 1 & 2 Behavior Tier 1 & 2 Blending some at Tier 1 & 2	Behavior Tier 1 & 2 Started Literacy Tier 1, 2 & 3	Behavior Tier 1 & 2 Literacy Tier 1 & 2 (started under Reading First K-3) continued to grades 4-5	Literacy Tier 1, 2 & 3 Started Behavior Tier 1 & 2	Behavior Tier 1, 2 & 3 and Started Literacy Tier 1 - blending
School 2	John Fuller Elementary School	Richards Elementary School	East Rochester School	Hilltop Elementary School	Atkinson Academy
Grades	K 1-6	K 1-3	P K 1-5	1-4	1-5
Start Year	2009-2010	2009-2010	2009-2010	2009-2010	2009-2010
Priority Area	Literacy/Added Behavior 2010-11	Literacy	Literacy	Literacy/ Added Behavior 2010-11	Literacy
Implementation Level	Literacy Tier 1 & 2 Behavior Tier 1 & 2 Blending started	Literacy Tier 1, 2 & 3	Dropped Out as of April 2010	Literacy Tier 1, 2 & 3 Behavior Tier 1 & 2	Literacy Tier 1 & 2
Early Childhood Education Program	Children Unlimited	Early Childhood Support Prgm	Reach Pre-School	Somersworth Early Education	Timberlane Learning Center
Ages	3-5 years	3-5 years	3-5 years	3-5 years	3-5 years
Start Year	2008-2009	2009-2010	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010
Priority Area	RTI - Early Literacy and Behavior	RTI - Early Literacy and Behavior	RTI - Early Literacy and Behavior	RTI - Early Literacy and Behavior	RTI - Early Literacy and Behavior
Implementation Level	Literacy & Behavior Tier 1 & 2 blended	Behavior Tier 1 & 2 and Literacy Tier 1	Dropped out as of March 2010	Behavior Tier 1 & 2 and Literacy Tier 1	Tier 1 Behavior
High School	Kennett High School	N/A		Somersworth High School	N/A
Grades and Start Year	9-12 12/2008-2009			9-12 12/2008-2009	
Priority Area	PBIS/RENEW Tier 3			Literacy/Behavior/RENEW Tier 3	
Implementation Level	Behavior Tier 1, 2 & 3			Behavior Tier 1, 2, and 3/Started Literacy	

Objective 1.3: To develop and incorporate a set of competencies required for (a) building administrators, (b) behavior support coaches and (c) program/school-based team members to be considered qualified to design, implement with fidelity, and sustain a 3-tiered system of PBIS, Literacy Instruction, and tertiary STS into all NH RESPONDS professional development efforts.

The Administrator and Coach Competencies for Universal Level Tier 1 literacy, behavior, and secondary transition reported in last year's report were validated by NH and national content experts and finalized in January 2011. These competencies were shared with the identified NH RESPONDS IHEs to be used as a framework to assess programs of study in teacher education, administrator and related fields. These assessments can lead to the identification of gaps in programs and action plans to address those gaps. See Goal 2 on pages 38 and 39 for more details of this work and efforts to share the competencies with the State Department of Education through the NH RTI Professional Learning Community.

ECE competencies for emergent literacy and behavior were reviewed by NH experts in spring 2010. Given this feedback, the emergent literacy competencies were modified to be more flexible for different levels of early childhood educator preparation programs (associate and bachelor degree). Behavior expert feedback on the ECE behavior competencies was reviewed and incorporated into a finalized version of these competencies.

At the school and district level, the competencies can be used as a framework for thinking about the roles and responsibilities, as well as the knowledge and skills, necessary to ensure an evidence-based RTI process. School and district administrators may use the competencies to determine in-service professional development needs that are aligned with individual professional development plans or evaluate personnel. NH RESPONDS staff have requested and received copies of NH RESPONDS demonstration site job descriptions for administrators and coaches for the purpose of conducting a cross-walk between the job descriptions and the appropriate NH RESPONDS competencies. The intent of this process is to identify competencies addressed in current job descriptions and to provide suggestions of key competencies for incorporation into revised job descriptions to ensure sustainability of their SAU RTI systems.

Objective 1.4: To build SAU capacity by increasing the knowledge and skills of five SAU Leadership Teams in designing, implementing with fidelity, assessing, and sustaining RtI systems of behavior support and literacy instruction.

Objective 1.5: To build program/school capacity by increasing the knowledge and skills of 15 participating site-based primary, secondary and tertiary teams and coaches in designing, implementing with fidelity, assessing and sustaining RtI systems of behavior support and literacy instruction.

Next, we provide a summary of each participating elementary school in NH RESPONDS. This is followed by a review of the types and frequency of professional development provided and an analysis of participant feedback on satisfaction with and impact of NH RESPONDS professional development.

NH RESPONDS Elementary School Demo Sites

Pine Tree, SAU 9: This K-6 school joined NH RESPONDS during the 2008-09 year focusing on literacy instruction. The school was a previous PBIS site. This year technical assistance at Pine Tree has focused on further defining Tier 2 for literacy, refining the Universal PBIS system using evidence based practices, and improving implementation of Tier 1 for literacy. The school made considerable progress addressing literacy Tier 1 implementation issues, such as ensuring all students participate in Tier 1 instruction (i.e., students with mild-moderate disabilities from a separate special education classroom now attend general education instruction – with supports) and improving data analysis at both the universal and target team levels. Data-based differentiated instruction was designed using screening results and historical student data, at the class and grade level. Additionally, the school revised their behavior Tier 1 and 2, with considerations for blending at both tiers.

John Fuller, SAU 09: John Fuller entered NH RESPONDS during the 2009-10 school year focusing on literacy. Technical assistance at John Fuller this year has focused on further defining Tier 1 and 2 for literacy, establishing a Universal PBIS system, and improving implementation of Tier 1 for literacy. For behavior, the school created expectations and a behavior matrix, will soon apply for SWIS, is implementing a universal behavior screening, and received training on an individual teacher level and the CORE (target) team. The school leadership team made considerable progress establishing a format, protocol and schedule for quarterly data team meetings. A similar format is being designed for grade level data meetings. An action plan has been developed with specific timelines to identify, address and provide professional development for literacy Tier 1 implementation issues such as data-based differentiated instruction using screening results and historical student data, at the class and grade level. Additionally, the school began describing behavior tier 1 and 2, with considerations for blending at both tiers.

Towle, SAU 43: NH RESPONDS is working at the 4th and 5th grade level at Towle Elementary School. They initiated their work in the 2008-09 school year focused initially on behavior. This year the Newport schools underwent significant changes in the SAU Leadership and were occupied with priorities other than the NH RESPONDS project during the summer and fall of 2010. The Towle Universal Behavior team

has continued to implement key features of the universal system including teaching behaviors in multiple problematic locations (hallway to lunch line and playground). The Towle Tigers reinforcement system is being reenergized this spring after a successful positive climate activity lead by the student leadership team in March. The decisions have been based on data and a booster for classroom behavior is being planned. The Towle Tier 2 Behavior team mid-year began earnest implementation of the Teacher Check, Connect, and Expect (TCCE) intervention.

Once initiated during the winter of 2010-11, training and technical assistance at Towle, as a new school to the literacy side of the project, has focused on generating definitions and descriptions of all components and processes of the RtI for Literacy system including guiding principles/vision, Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3, and assessments (screening, progress monitoring). Relevant strategies for consensus and infrastructure development are integrated in the technical assistance. During this emphasis on designing the RtI for literacy system, Towle literacy/leadership team is working closely with the other elementary school in their SAU, Richards.

Richards, SAU 43: This K-3 school entered NH RESPONDS in 2009-2010 and is focusing on literacy. The Newport schools underwent significant changes in the SAU Leadership and were occupied with priorities other than the NH RESPONDS project during the summer and fall of 2010. Once resumed during the winter of 2010-11, training and technical assistance at Richards has focused on refining definitions and descriptions of all components and processes of the RtI for Literacy system including guiding principles/vision, Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3, and assessments (screening, progress monitoring). Relevant strategies for revisiting and maintaining consensus, continuing infrastructure development, and refining initial implementation efforts are integrated in the technical assistance. During this emphasis on designing the RtI for literacy system, Richards' literacy/leadership team is working closely with the other elementary school in their SAU, Towle.

Chamberlin Street, SAU 54: This K – 5 school's initial priority area was behavior. Work with Chamberlain in 2010-11 follows a lost year of support due to Rochester's tentative involvement with NH RESPONDS in 2009-10. The NH RESPONDS Leadership Team in spring 2010 actively re-engaged and got needed commitment at the SAU and school level for continued participation in this grant. The intent this school year was to include literacy supports with moderated behavioral support available. The school's focus with regard to RtI implementation has been influenced by the school's SINI process and obligations. Two days of training with the school's targeted (Tier 2) team and 1 training day with the school's universal team have been provided this year. In addition, a NH RESPONDS staff member attended with regularity, the school's RtI Leadership Team meetings which began in January and had a focus on development of an action plan to direct the school's SINI plan to address indicators in accordance with the NH DOE inclusive of their RTI systems framework.

The plan moving forward is to prepare the Targeted (Tier 2) Team for full implementation in 2011-12 and provide supports to target intensive systems, including: the implementation of Tier 3 activation systems, function-based behavior support planning, Life Space Crisis Intervention (LSCI) implementation (including data gathering), de-escalation response implementation (with fidelity) and community-based referral systems (including referral to Mental Health services and Wraparound).

Chamberlain grades K-3 were part of the NH Reading First program prior to starting their work with NH RESPONDS. Thus, the literacy Program at this school is fairly well established. In 2010-11, NH RESPONDS staff began providing literacy training to expand the Chamberlain School literacy system to the 4th and 5th grade. Both the current reading specialist and assistant principal were key staff in Reading First designated schools. Universal screening is in place and data is reviewed regularly to assess student progress. Technical assistance discussions have focused on issues of fidelity, accelerating growth among struggling students and implementing differentiated instruction at the Tier I level.

East Rochester, SAU 54: East Rochester (Pre-K – 5) joined NH RESPONDS in 2009-10. This school started out with a literacy focus. In April 2010, this school's staff chose to discontinue as a NH RESPONDS demonstration site given that they didn't feel it was a good match with their current work.

Maplewood, SAU 56: This Pre-K – 4 school was a previous PBIS site and in 2008-09, they joined NH RESPONDS to focus on literacy. This year technical assistance at Maple Wood has focused on further defining Tier 2 and 3 for literacy while improving implementation of Tier 1 for literacy. The school addressed literacy Tier 1 implementation issues such as: defining literacy instruction, creating units of study, providing data-based differentiated instruction, adjusting school wide schedule to accommodate tiered instruction and to work within the guidelines for Title 1. Specialized training for implementation of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions was provided. Additionally, the school began describing behavior tier 1 and 2, with considerations for blending at both tiers. The Tier 2 behavior team is focused on a data gathering plan for spring 2011, this plan includes an efficient way to screen students for social/emotional concerns with the outcomes of 1) identifying students at-risk and in need of higher level supports (students who are non-responsive to Tier 1 supports), and 2) identifying 'clusters' of need to help the targeted team to strategically formulate the most pragmatic group interventions matched to student need --- based on the most prevalent needs within the school community. Addressed in the interventions will be interventions that match prevalent student functions of behavior and prevalent skill-strengthening needs. To prepare the school for transition to a new district elementary school, some technical assistance focused on describing, reconciling differences across schools, and stabilizing a district-wide elementary school model for RtI (literacy & behavior).

Hilltop, SAU 56: Hilltop (grades 1 – 4) entered NH RESPONDS in 2009-10 focused on literacy. Technical assistance at Hilltop has focused on further defining Tier 2 and 3 for literacy while improving implementation of Tier 1. The school addressed literacy Tier 1 implementation issues such as: providing data-based differentiated instruction, aligning the reading program to Grade Level Expectations, and adjusting the school wide schedule to accommodate tiered instruction and to work within the guidelines for Title 1. Tier 2 progress monitoring tools were piloted to examine ease of use, and match to school/student needs. Extended Learning Opportunities were established for supplemental literacy instruction. Additionally, the school began describing behavior tier 1 and 2, with considerations for blending at Tier 1. To prepare the school for transition to a new district elementary school, some technical assistance focused on describing and stabilizing a district-wide elementary school model for RtI (literacy & behavior).

Sandown Northern, SAU 55: The primary focus area for Sandown has been PBIS since the 2008-09 year. Sandown North Elementary School continues to be an exemplar of systematic, data-based

implementation of blending behavior and literacy supports within a three-tiered Response to Intervention framework. The school was recognized as a statewide exemplar when the Commissioner of Education invited them to present to the NH Task Force on Effective Teaching. The team has mentored staff in the district at professional development activities; presented training for Vermont schools involved in RTI for behavior and literacy and is regularly visited by school teams from NH and Vermont.

During 2010-11, the school continued to sustain the Universal Tier I system of supports. The Sandown North Tier II Targeted Team continues to use reflective practice and data-based decision making to improve and expand student access to Tier II supports. The initial intervention in the Tier II system, Teacher Check Connect & Expect was refined in the fall of 2009. Enhancements included the tightening of decision rules regarding dosage and success indicators and the development of an implementation manual to assist with training and technical assistance activities. The Sandown North Tier III Intensive Team spent the fall working to enhance professional relationships and building procedures and communication systems between the school and the Center for Life management (CLM), the public community behavioral health center. Monthly meetings were held and attended by two members of the CLM and members of the Tier III team. The team's focus has been on expanding the team and refocusing on supporting Tier III students with additional school-based function-based behavior plans and other evidence-based supports. The expanded team began meeting in March and completed the baseline surveys and developed action plans for the rest of the school year. Students who are not responding to Tier III behavior supports have been scheduled and plans are in process.

Technical Assistance for literacy at Sandown North focused on supporting the Universal Team in developing a Literacy Action Plan with attention on Tier I. The Universal team has made considerable progress towards addressing the key components of a comprehensive literacy plan by evaluating current practices aligned with current research. The team determined the need to develop a clear vision / mission statement for literacy, to research and review effective evidenced based instructional literacy practices, to assess current instructional strategies and interventions, evaluate assessment tools available in district matched to student outcomes, and review available resources. A draft action plan has been created to address identified activities. The school selected a universal screening measure to pilot in January, 2011. All students were administered the benchmark screening.

Atkinson Academy, SAU 55: This K-5 school initiated their NH RESPONDS work in 2009-2010 with an emphasis on literacy instruction. Technical assistance for Atkinson Academy has focused on strengthening Tier I implementation practices and defining Tier 2 for literacy by discussing evidenced based practices, reviewing universal screening tools for all students and evaluating building resources. The school has made considerable progress in addressing Tier I and Tier II literacy issue by selecting and piloting two universal screening measures, developing guidelines and procedures for the Tier 2 Targeted team meetings, and establishing a timeline for rollout to staff.

High School Demonstration Sites

Somersworth SAU: The principal of Somersworth High School has been very active in the SAU Leadership Team and started a high school Leadership Team in the summer of 2009 to begin to develop consensus and explore the implementation of RtI for literacy. The Somersworth High School Leadership

Team developed a plan that included goals to improve reading and math achievement, create a reading support/ “futures” planning class, and continue the work of the PBIS 3 tiered model. The Somersworth High School Leadership Team met monthly during the school year, and created several subgroups to accomplish these goals. The Somersworth High School Leadership Team has also been designing a sustained reading block to promote the culture of literacy school wide, and through this intervention and development of Tier 2 & Tier 3 supports, increase overall literacy scores.

The Somersworth High School Tier 2 Behavior Support Team developed and implemented a small group behavioral/academic intervention, Check In and Check Out (CICO), to increase more frequent positive attention from teachers to an identified group of Tier 2 students referred to the Tier 2 Behavior Support. The goal of this intervention is to increase behavioral and academic achievement among students, increase positive adult attention, and develop greater self-monitoring skills among the students in tracking their progress. Currently, 5 students are utilizing the CICO intervention and data is being collected to monitor the success of the intervention. The intent is to increase this intervention to include more students by the end of the year after successfully piloting the intervention in the 3rd quarter. The Tier 2 team has revised their referral flowchart to increase efficiency, increase communication with faculty on an ongoing basis, improve progress monitoring on current students, and implement a quarterly reinforcement system for students achieving their goals. Somersworth High School has implemented a RENEW Oversight Team to help build sustainability for Tier 3 Intensive Supports. The NH RESPONDS staff has provided ongoing professional development and training to the RENEW Oversight Team, as well as current RENEW facilitators. Currently, there are 6 youth receiving RENEW services with a total of 30 adults trained in RENEW, to support youth in the school.

The Somersworth High School principal presented at the PBIS Leadership Institute in Illinois in October 2011 as an exemplar school for its implementation of RENEW as part of its 3-tiered system.

Conway SAU: The SAU Team in Conway included Kennett High School in all of its district-wide plans, and the principal has become more involved in PBIS implementation this year. During the fall of 2010 it was agreed upon by the administrative team at Kennett High School and the PACT team, to disband the universal team. The decision was based on the need for greater internal representation of school faculty to serve as members on the Universal Team. The prior team had only one teacher and one assistant administrator. It made it difficult to make informed data based decisions around school wide expectations when the team comprised mainly of representatives of the school board and community agencies. Hence, the collaborative team checklist was not completed due to recruiting and rebuilding a new universal team. Plans are currently in place to recruit faculty to serve as members of the Universal Team by the spring of 2011.

The Tier 2 Behavior Support Team has been very active this year, creating a referral flowchart, interview forms and data collection tools to increase the effectiveness of intervening earlier to support youth. The team received training from NH RESPONDS on data collection and functional behavior assessments to increase their knowledge base and improve the team’s efficiency in creating positive behavior supports and interventions. With ongoing technical assistance from NH RESPONDS staff, the team has developed an efficient system to refer students, develop FBA’s/BSP, and monitor the student’s progress. The team members have been using the FBA’s to meet with faculty whom are working with

the students, to teach ways they can support the students in the class in order to increase positive academic/behavioral outcomes. Currently, the Tier 2 Behavioral Support Team is following over 30 students.

Professional Development Activities: Outputs and Outcomes

To track the professional development provided to the demonstration sites, professional development providers made entries into the NH RESPONDS Professional Development Activity Log to document the type of professional development provided and to identify participants in the activity. These data are presented in Table 2. 358 unique professional development activities were entered into the Professional Development Activity Log. One activity could be coded for 2 or more content areas. For example, one entry could be PBIS -Targeted and Intensive. Each activity appears to have an evidence base supporting the intervention. 332, or 90%, of the activities were considered sustained activities. A further breakdown of the type of Workgroups is provided in Table 3.

Table 2: Content of Professional Development Provided

Professional Development Content	# of PD Activities 2008-09	# of PD Activities 2009-10	# of PD Activities 2010-11
Building Capacity-SAU/School	61	93	98
PBIS-Targeted	14	47	98
PBIS Universal	21	76	81
Family Engagement	0	10	56
Literacy-Universal	32	36	52
PBIS-Intensive	2	19	26
Secondary Transition	7	53	21
Literacy-Targeted	0	4	18
Building Capacity-Parent/Family	0	1	11
Literacy-Intensive	1	0	4
Total	138	339	465

Note: Totals are a duplicated count. For some activities, two different types of content were provided

Table 3: NH RESPONDS Workgroup Content

Workgroup	Frequency 2010-11	Workgroup	Frequency 2010-11
Leadership Team Meetings	12	Secondary Transition Services	7
Training & TA	2	Competencies, Standards, & Certification	5
Evaluation	9	Early Childhood Education	4

Development at SAUs and Schools

Tables 4 – 6 present the data collected on the frequency of professional development events at the SAU level and at participating elementary and high schools.

Table 4: Frequency of Professional Development at SAUs

Supervisory Administering Units	# of PD Activities 2008-09	# of PD Activities 2009-10	# of PD Activities 2010-11	# of PD Hours 2010-11
SAU#56 - Somersworth	15	22	35	72
SAU#9 - Conway	10	22	21	90
SAU#11 - Timberlane	8	7	6	16
SAU#54 - Rochester	7	6	3	4
SAU#43 - Newport	5	11	2	5
Total	45	68	67	187

Table 5: Frequency of Professional Development at Participating Elementary Schools

Schools	# of PD Activities 2008-09	# of PD Activities 2009-10	# of PD Activities 2010-11	# of PD Hours 2010-11
Maple Wood Elementary	22	23	23	56
Sandown North Elementary	11	9	18	41
Chamberlain Street Elementary	2	21	15	46
Towle Elementary	12	15	12	40
Hilltop Elementary	0	10	12	32
John Fuller Elementary	0	10	8	36
Pine Tree Elementary	12	10	3	14
Richards Elementary	0	7	3	16
Atkinson Academy Elementary	0	3	1	3
Total	59	114	95	284

Table 6: Frequency of Professional Development at Participating High Schools

School	# of PD Activities 2008-09	# of PD Activities 2009-10	# of PD Activities 2010-11	# of PD Hours 2010-11
Somersworth High School	3	36	81	192
Kennett High School	8	17	40	115

Participating Personnel Survey Data

In addition to tracking the professional development delivered, project evaluators disseminated a “participating personnel survey” in March 2011 to determine the extent to which the recipients increased their knowledge and skills in the targeted training areas. These data are presented below in Tables 6 – 10. Data are presented from school- and SAU-level personnel and those who sit on both SAU- and school-level teams. The results for the current year should be considered along with the information in Table 1 (Demonstration Sites Information) as some schools are in the early stages of exploration and implementation and therefore participants could not report significant increases in knowledge and skill development at this point in time. Qualitative responses from this survey can be found in Appendix B.

Table 7 illustrates the extent to which participants increased their knowledge in the RTI content areas of behavior and literacy instruction. School personnel rated the impact of each aspect of the professional development higher than SAU personnel. The greatest impact on SAU personnel was related to improved knowledge about leadership for consensus building. The greatest school-level impact was on working with student and school-level data. Both SAU and school personnel rated the impact on their knowledge of integrating literacy instruction and PBIS as the lowest impacts of the professional development provided. SAU personnel rated each item lower in 2011 than in 2010 and 2009, reversing the trend from 2009-2010. School personnel rated all items, except general knowledge of RTI for literacy and literacy instruction and increased knowledge of universal strategies of school-wide literacy support, higher in 2011 than in 2010. Overall, both groups rated the impact of NH RESPONDS professional development as a medium to large impact on their knowledge.

Table 7: Impact on Participants’ Knowledge

What impact did the NH RESPONDS professional development have on:	2009		2010		2011	
	SAU Mean (N=18)	School Mean (N=31)	SAU Mean (N=16)	School Mean (N=59)	SAU Mean (n=32)	School Mean (n=103)
Increasing your knowledge about leadership for consensus building related to RTI provision in your schools?	3.71		4.31		3.32	
Increasing your knowledge about leadership for infrastructure building related to RTI provision in your schools?	3.65		4.25		3.26	
Increasing your knowledge about leadership for implementation related to RTI provision in your schools?	3.82		4.25		3.15	
Increasing your knowledge of student and SAU/school-level data?	3.53	3.80	3.94	3.63	3.21	3.80
Increasing your general knowledge of PBS?	3.91	3.59	4.00	2.95	3.24	3.50
Increasing your knowledge of Universal strategies of PBIS?	3.55	3.72	3.93	3.05	3.08	3.41

Table 7: Impact on Participants' Knowledge (Continued)

What impact did the NH RESPONDS professional development have on:	2009		2010		2011	
	SAU Mean (N=18)	School Mean (N=31)	SAU Mean (N=16)	School Mean (N=59)	SAU Mean (n=32)	School Mean (n=103)
Increasing your knowledge of Targeted strategies of PBIS?	3.45	3.52	4.00	2.95	3.08	3.37
Increasing your knowledge of Intensive strategies of PBIS?	3.27	3.13	3.79	2.85	2.74	3.12
Increasing your general knowledge of RTI for Literacy and literacy instruction?	3.86	3.62	3.88	3.81	3.26	3.74
Increasing your knowledge of Universal strategies of School-Wide Literacy Support?	3.86	3.35	3.81	3.57	3.07	3.44
Increasing your knowledge of Targeted strategies of School-Wide Literacy Support?	3.38	2.91	3.69	3.33	3.00	3.40
Increasing your knowledge of Intensive strategies of School-Wide Literacy Support?	3.42	2.95	3.50	2.95	2.70	3.12
Increasing your knowledge of how to integrate literacy instruction and PBIS?	3.33	3.12	3.75	2.72	2.60	3.01
Average	3.60	3.37	3.93	3.18	3.05	3.39

1 = No Impact, 2 = Little Impact, 3 = Medium Impact, 4 = Large Impact, 5 = Very Large Impact

Following the Blueprint Action Planning framework (adapted from NASDSE's Blueprint), respondents reported the extent to which the professional development they received impacted their consensus building (Table 8), the infrastructure (Table 9), and implementation of the NH RESPONDS model (Table 10). As shown in Table 8, School personnel perceived a larger impact on consensus building than SAU personnel. All reported impacts were in the medium – large range. 2011 ratings were lower for school and SAU personnel than in the two previous years.

Table 8: Impact on Consensus Building

What impact did the NH RESPONDS professional development have on:	2009		2010		2011	
	SAU Mean (N=18)	School Mean (N=31)	SAU Mean (N=18)	School Mean (N=64)	SAU Mean (N=32)	School Mean (N=103)
Identifying, adopting, and using tools and strategies for building SAU/school -level consensus for RTI?	3.81	3.89	3.94	3.83	3.18	3.71
Identifying, adopting, and using tools and strategies for managing complex change?	3.69	3.69	3.82	3.61	3.04	3.55
Developing school-level action plans that helped you develop consensus building for PBIS in your SAU/school?	3.71	4.00	4.20	3.45	2.96	3.48
Developing school-level action plans that helped you develop consensus building for RTI for Literacy in your SAU/school?	3.53	3.41	3.82	3.54	3.25	3.55
Average	3.69	3.75	3.95	3.61	3.11	3.57

1 = No Impact, 2 = Little Impact, 3 = Medium Impact, 4 = Large Impact, 5 = Very Large Impact

In 2011 school personnel rated a larger impact on infrastructure than SAU personnel on every individual item (see Table 9). SAU personnel rated these items much lower than in 2010 and 2009, while school personnel rated them higher than in 2010 (but not 2009). While there were no increases for SAU personnel, the greatest gains for school personnel were related to integrated modeling of literacy instruction and PBIS (+.41) and developing school infrastructure for the implementation of universal (3.8) and targeted PBIS strategies (+.37).

Table 9: Impact on Infrastructure

What impact did the NH RESPONDS professional development have on:	2009		2010		2011	
	SAU Mean (N=18)	School Mean (N=31)	SAU Mean (N=20)	School Mean (N=64)	SAU Mean (N=32)	School Mean (N=103)
Forming and training a leadership team to lead the RTI initiative?	3.82	4.00	4.16	3.81	3.29	3.78
The leadership you provided your SAU/school around Rtl during the last year?	3.81	3.67	3.76	3.68	3.26	3.60
Increasing your infrastructure to work with data?	3.19	3.78	3.44	3.62	2.96	3.61
Increasing the infrastructure to foster collaboration among general & special education personnel at your SAU/school?	3.71	3.59	3.53	3.20	3.00	3.23
Developing SAU/school infrastructure for the implementation of Universal strategies of PBIS?	3.64	4.17	3.87	3.09	3.04	3.47
Developing SAU/school infrastructure for the implementation of Targeted strategies of PBIS?	3.27	3.86	3.80	3.07	2.81	3.44
Developing SAU/school infrastructure for the implementation of Intensive strategies of PBIS?	3.00	3.45	3.53	2.86	2.52	3.25
Developing SAU/school infrastructure for the implementation of Universal strategies of School-Wide Literacy Support?	3.73	3.33	3.67	3.61	3.29	3.56
Developing SAU/school infrastructure for the implementation of Targeted strategies of School-Wide Literacy Support?	3.46	3.00	3.44	3.28	3.04	3.38
Developing SAU/school infrastructure for the implementation of Intensive strategies of School-Wide Literacy Support?	3.38	2.91	3.41	2.94	2.57	3.17
Developing infrastructure for an integrated model of literacy instruction and positive behavior supports in your SAU/school?	3.33	3.21	3.81	2.79	2.59	3.20
Average	3.49	3.54	3.67	3.27	2.94	3.43

1 = No Impact, 2 = Little Impact, 3 = Medium Impact, 4 = Large Impact, 5 = Very Large Impact

As shown in Table 10 on the next page, in 2010 SAU personnel rated each item lower than school personnel. The highest rated items by SAU personnel were supporting the implementation of Universal strategies of School-Wide Literacy Support (3.7), implementing their SAU/ school-level action plan (3.0), and increasing the collaboration among general & special education personnel at your school (3.0). School personnel rated all but two items (providing leadership around RTI and supporting

implementation of universal strategies of school-wide literacy instruction) higher in 2011 than in 2010. SAU personnel rated all items lower in 2011 than in the previous two years.

Table 10: Impact on Implementation

What impact did the NH RESPONDS professional development have on:	2009		2010		2011	
	SAU Mean (N=18)	School Mean (N=31)	SAU Mean (N=20)	School Mean (N=64)	SAU Mean (N=32)	School Mean (N=103)
The leadership you provided your SAU/ school around RtI during the last year?	3.79	3.72	3.53	3.48	2.92	3.42
Increasing your skills to work with data?	3.00	3.36	3.06	3.28	2.59	3.39
Implementing your SAU/ school-level action plan?	3.81	3.93	3.61	3.66	3.00	3.66
Increasing the collaboration among general & special education personnel at your school?	3.63	3.55	3.28	3.05	3.07	3.28
Supporting the implementation of Universal strategies of PBIS?	3.67	4.04	3.73	3.12	2.96	3.38
Supporting the implementation of Targeted strategies of PBIS?	3.00	3.73	3.86	2.95	2.88	3.41
Supporting the implementation of Intensive strategies of PBIS?	2.91	3.32	3.71	2.83	2.75	3.23
Supporting the implementation of Universal strategies of School-Wide Literacy Support?	3.80	3.36	3.83	3.60	3.00	3.40
Supporting the implementation of Targeted strategies of School-Wide Literacy Support?	3.25	2.96	3.69	3.14	2.96	3.29
Supporting the implementation of Intensive strategies of School-Wide Literacy Support?	3.00	2.91	3.56	2.88	2.74	3.04
Implementing an integrated model of literacy instruction and positive behavior supports in your school?	3.25	3.27	3.67	2.79	2.75	3.26
Average	3.37	3.47	3.59	3.16	2.87	3.34

1 = No Impact, 2 = Little Impact, 3 = Medium Impact, 4 = Large Impact, 5 = Very Large Impact

In Table 11 on the next page, participants rated their perceptions of the overall impact of the model on behavior and literacy in their schools. SAU participants rated the impact on all outcomes lower in 2011 than in 2010 and 2009. School personnel rated each outcome higher in 2011 than in 2010. Overall, school personnel rated this set of questions higher (3.25) than SAU personnel (2.80).

Table 11: Overall Impact on Behavior and Literacy

What impact did the NH RESPONDS professional development have on:	2009		2010		2011	
	SAU Mean (N=18)	School Mean (N=31)	SAU Mean (N=20)	School Mean (N=64)	SAU Mean (N=32)	School Mean (N=103)
Improving behavior for all students in your SAU/school?	3.10	3.65	3.50	2.96	2.83	3.34
Improving behavior for students with disabilities in your SAU/ school?	3.10	3.32	3.50	2.58	2.78	3.06
Improving literacy outcomes for all students in your SAU/school?	3.54	3.17	3.12	3.30	2.77	3.38
Improving literacy outcomes for students with disabilities in your SAU/school?	3.42	3.13	3.12	2.98	2.80	3.23
Average	3.29	3.32	3.31	2.96	2.80	3.25

1 = No Impact, 2 = Little Impact, 3 = Medium Impact, 4 = Large Impact, 5 = Very Large Impact

Collaborative Team Checklists

The Universal Collaborative Team Checklist (CTC) is a 14 item checklist that measures how well a universal team (literacy, behavior, and/or integrated) functions. The instrument focuses on team membership, mission, team roles, meeting processes (agenda, ground rules, decision making processes, note taking, etc), and action planning. The instrument was to be administered twice per year in each school’s initial year, and once year thereafter. In this context, the instrument was administered to behavior teams, literacy teams, and in one case (Maple Wood), an integrated team.

Table 12: Percent of Universal Collaborative Team Activities in Place

	Spring 2009	Fall 2009		Spring 2010	Fall 2010	
Atkinson		N/C ^L		N/C ^L	79% ^L	
Chamberlain	71% ^B	86% ^B			93% ^B	N/C ^L
Hilltop		50% ^L		93% ^L		
John Fuller		50% ^L		N/C ^L	86% ^B	
Kennett	100% ^B	100% ^B		86% ^B	N/C ^B	
Maple Wood	79% ⁺	64% ⁺		93% ⁺	72% ^B	
Pine Tree		79% ^B	79% ^L		N/C ^B	100% ^L
Richards		29% ^L		79% ^L		
Sandown North		71% ^B		100% ^B	100% ^B	100% ^L
Somersworth		100% ^B			93% ^B	
Towle		71% ^B		100% ^B	71% ^B	

L=Literacy, B=Behavior, +=Both Literacy and Behavior

Black Shading = School not ready to administer Tier 2 instruments.

Light Shading = Not a current Tier 2 instrument administration period.

N/C = CTC instrument was not completed or reported when due.

As shown in Table 12 (on the previous page), there is a general trend where each participating school has shown increases in the effectiveness of their universal teams, based on the CTC scores. Some schools are in the process of adding the literacy or behavior component so they may only have one score for a specific component. As team composition changes, it's very possible scores change as these are perception data. For instance, the Kennett Universal Team disbanded temporarily, resulting in a decreased score once they reorganized and began meeting again.

Upon successful implementation of universal literacy and behavior strategies, each NH RESPONDS school is to develop a literacy, behavior, and/ or integrated targeted team. The results of the two sets of data are in Table 13. The Tier 2 CTC was first used in behavior teams in the spring of 2009, while the Tier 2 CTC was first used with literacy teams in the spring of 2010. With the exception of the Chamberlain behavior team's fall 2010 administration, there have been increases in scores for each school with multiple administrations.

Table 13: Percent of Tier 2 Collaborative Team Activities In Place

Collaborative Team Checklist Data Tier 2 Literacy			Collaborative Team Checklist Data Tier 2 Behavior			
	Spring 2010	Fall 2010	Spring 2009	Fall 2009	Spring 2010	Fall 2010
Atkinson	N/C	79%				
Chamberlain		N/C	79%	79%		64%
Hilltop	93%					57%
John Fuller	N/C	86%				57%
Kennett						71%
Maple Wood	93%					
Pine Tree	79%	100%				100%
Richards	79%					
Sandown North		100%	86%	64%	100%	100%
Somersworth						71%
Towle				57%	100%	64%

Black Shading = School not ready to administer Tier 2 instruments.

Light Shading = Not a current Tier 2 instrument administration period. .

N/C = CTC Tier 2 instrument was not completed or reported when due.

Response to Intervention - Literacy Process, Fidelity, and Outcome Data

Process, fidelity, and outcome data are provided in this section for schools who received professional development related to Response to Instruction for literacy across the three tiers. This includes data from the (a) Literacy Universal Team Checklist (LUnTCH), (b) Planning and Evaluation Tool for Effective School-Wide Reading Programs – Revised (PET-R), (c) Response to Intervention Literacy Tier 2 Instrument, and (d) NECAP and AYP reading data for participating schools. Formative literacy data examining movement among tiers has also been collected for a small number of schools, but at this are not ready to be reported on.

The Literacy Universal Team Checklist (LUnTCH) was administered to elementary schools in the fall of 2009, spring 2010, and fall 2010. The spring 2010 data will not be available until after this report is submitted. The original LUnTCH 1.0 instrument was modified in September 2009, by adding five items and shifting the domain of an existing item. The LUnTCH is a process and status measure, completed by the team overseeing Tier 1 literacy implementation. The goal is for 80% of participating elementary schools to achieve 70% on the PET-R. Two of nine (22.2%) elementary schools have met the 70% criteria (See Table 14). However, every school with at least two administrations has shown growth from baseline. Atkinson, John Fuller, and Richards have doubled their scores at the second administration. On average, there was a 20% gain between administrations.

Table 14: Percent of Literacy Universal Team Checklist (LUnTCh) Criteria in Place

	Fall 2009	Spring 2010	Fall 2010	Percent Increase at Second Administration
Atkinson	21%		41%	20%
Chamberlain			55%	-
Hilltop	34%	52%	52%	18%
John Fuller	21%*		48%	27%
Maple Wood		92%*		-
Pine Tree		58%*	76% ⁺	18%
Richards	7%	24%		17%
Sandown North			66%	-
Towle				-

* = LUnTCH 1.0

⁺ = Pine Tree was not scheduled to administer the LUnTCh in the fall 2010, but did anyway

Black Shading = School not ready to administer the LUnTCh.

Light Shading = Not a current LUnTCh administration period.

N/C = LUnTCH instrument was not completed or reported when due.

The Planning and Evaluation Tool for Effective School-Wide Reading Programs – Revised (PET-R) is used as a check on fidelity of implementation of accepted practices in elementary reading programs (Tier 1), and is completed by all school staff. In order to achieve fidelity, 70% of the PET-R criteria must

be 'in place.' It was first administered to two schools in the fall of 2008. The data are displayed in Table 15. Only four schools have had multiple administrations, with an average increase of 5% between administrations. Overall, respondents reported more PET-R criteria in place than LUnTCH criteria. Four of the eight schools who have used the PET-R have scores of 70% or higher, with two schools scoring very close to 70%.

Table 15: Percent of PET-R Results Criteria in Place

	Fall 2008	Spring 2009	Fall 2009	Spring 2010	Fall 2010	Percent Increase at Last Administration
Atkinson			N/C	N/C	N/C	-
Chamberlain					95%	-
Hilltop			64%	66%		+4%
John Fuller			72%	73%		+1%
Maple Wood	56%	N/C		N/C	68%	+12%
Pine Tree	50%	52%		N/C	73%	+23%
Richards			46%	50%		+4%
Sandown North					86%	-

Black Shading = School not ready to administer the PET-R.

Light Shading = Not a current PET-R administration period.

N/C = PET-R instrument was not completed or reported when due.

The Literacy Tier 2 instrument assesses to what degree strategies necessary to implement Tier 2 literacy strategies are in place (see Table 16). It was first introduced in the spring of 2010 with six schools, with three schools submitting data. The spring 2011 administration will not occur until after the time of this report. No schools had more than one administration of the Literacy Tier 2 instrument.

Table 16: Percent of Literacy Tier 2 Criteria in Place

	Spring 2010	Fall 2010
Atkinson	N/C	13%
Chamberlain		46%
Hilltop	4%	
John Fuller	N/C	N/C
Maple Wood	40%	
Pine Tree	44%	
Richards	N/C	N/C
Sandown North		21%
Towle		

Black Shading = School not ready to administer the Literacy Tier 2 instrument

Light Shading = Not a current Literacy Tier 2 administration period.

N/C = Literacy Tier 2 instrument was not completed or reported when due.

To assess the contribution of NH RESPONDS professional development on students' literacy skills, we examined the NECAP reading data for participating schools. Table 17 lists the percent of students scoring proficient or proficient with distinction in reading. The 2007 NECAP reading data serves as a baseline for the entire group, although it is important to remember that not all schools started at the same time. On average, there was a 7% increase across schools from the fall 2007 to the fall 2008 NECAP administration, followed by a one point increase over the next three years. Individually, school progress varied, particularly depending on when the baseline is established. Maple Wood had a 4% increase from 2007-2010, but a 7% increase from 2008-10. Sandown North had a 16% increase from 2007-10, but only a 4% increase from 2008-10. Hilltop had a 12% increase from 2007-10, but a 20% decrease from 2008-10.

Table 17: Participating Literacy Schools NECAP Reading Data (Percent Proficient)

Schools	2007 NECAP Reading Data	2008 NECAP Reading Data	2009 NECAP Reading Data	2010 NECAP Reading Data	Percent Increase from Baseline
Atkinson	82%	87%	83%	88%	6%
Chamberlain	65%	69%	67%	71%	6%
Hilltop	47%	69%	62%	59%	12%
John Fuller	74%	79%	80%	80%	6%
Maple Wood	67%	64%	65%	71%	4%
Pine Tree	74%	84%	89%	87%	13%
Richards	72%	66%	72%	74%	2%
Sandown North	73%	85%	90%	89%	16%
Towle	54%	75%	71%	66%	12%
Average	68%	75%	75%	76%	8%

Each school's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) are reported in Table 18 on the next page. In the 2007 and 2008 AYP reporting, all schools met the school-level AYP requirements. Two schools failed to meet AYP in 2007 for Title 1 students and four of the nine schools failed to meet AYP for students with an IEP. Data were similar in 2008, with only one school not meeting AYP for Title 1 students, but five schools failed to meet to AYP for students with an IEP. In 2009, three schools failed to meet AYP for the entire school population, three failed to meet AYP for Title 1 students, and five schools did not achieve AYP for students with an IEP. The results improved in 2010, with only one school not meeting the whole school AYP requirement, one school achieving AYP for Title 1 students, and five schools failing to meet AYP for students with an IEP.

Six of the nine schools met AYP for the whole school population each year. Only one school (Hilltop) missed AYP for the entire school population more than once. Hilltop was the only school to not achieve AYP for Title 1 students in three years, with Maple Wood missed AYP for this population twice. Chamberlain and Hilltop failed to achieve AYP for students with IEPs each year, while Maple Wood and Towle missed AYP for this group in three years.

Table 18: Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for Participating Literacy Schools

Schools	2007 AYP Reading Data			2008 AYP Reading Data			2009 AYP Reading Data			2010 AYP Reading Data		
	Whole School	Title 1	IEP									
Atkinson	Yes	Yes (CI)	Yes (CI)	Yes	Yes	Yes (CI)	Yes	Yes (CI)	No	Yes	Yes	Yes (SH)
Chamberlain	Yes	Yes (CI)	No	Yes	Yes (CI)	No	No	No	No	Yes (CI)	Yes (SH)	No
Hilltop	Yes (CI)	No	No	Yes	Yes (CI)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
John Fuller	Yes	Yes	Yes (SH)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes (CI)	Yes (SH)	Yes	Yes (CI)	Yes (SH)
Maple Wood	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes (CI)	Yes (CI)	Yes (SH)
Pine Tree	Yes	Yes (CI)	Yes (CI)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (CI)	Yes	Yes	No
Richards	Yes	Yes	Yes (CI)	Yes	Yes (CI)	No	Yes (CI)	Yes (CI)	Yes (SH)	Yes (CI)	Yes (CI)	No
Sandown North	Yes	Yes	Yes (SH)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Towle	Yes (CI)	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes (CI)	Yes (CI)	Yes (CI)	No	Yes (CI)	Yes (CI)	No

CI = Confidence Interval

- Schools will not be considered to have missed the performance target unless there is less than a 1% chance that their performance differed from the target because of normal variability. In other words, a school will be identified as missing its target only if that decision can be made with 99% confidence.

SH = Safe Harbor:

- The percent of students in the student group scoring below standard has to decrease by 10% from the previous year, **Or**, if the decrease in the percent of students scoring below standard is less than 10%:
- The below standard target (i.e., the percent of students scoring below standard that would represent a 10% decrease in below standard) must lie above the lower bound of a 75% confidence interval surrounding the current year's percent of students scoring below standard.

Response to Intervention - Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports Process, Fidelity, and Outcome Data

In this section, process, fidelity, and outcome data are provided for schools who received professional development related to Response to Instruction for Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (RTI for PBIS) across Tier I, core instruction in behavior, and Tier II, targeted instruction from seven elementary schools and two high schools. This includes data from the (a) Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support Team Implementation Checklist (PBIS TIC; Versions 2.2 & 3.0), (b) School-Wide Evaluation Tool (SET), (c) Targeted Tier II Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support-NH Checklist (PBIS-NH Tier II), (d) Response to Intervention Tier II Secondary Systems Team Tool (RtI for Tier II), a blended behavior and literacy instrument, and (e) behavioral incident data on minor (i.e., those handled by teachers and staff) and major infractions (i.e., those resulting in office discipline referrals (ODRs) and in and out of school suspensions).

Table 19: Percent of PBIS Team Implementation Checklist Criteria in Place

	Spring 2009	Fall 2009	Spring 2010	Fall 2010	Percent Increase at Last Administration
Chamberlain ES	61%*	45%	64%	64%	3%
Hilltop ES				64%	-
John Fuller ES				59%	-
Kennett HS		36%		45%	9%
Maple Wood ES	61%*			68%	7%
Pine Tree ES				N/C	-
Sandown North ES	86%	91%	91%	100%	14%
Somersworth HS		56%		N/C	-
Towle Upper ES	73%*	91%	91%	64%	-9%

*Version 2.2

Black Shading = School not ready to administer the TIC

Light Shading = Not a current TIC administration period.

N/C = TIC was not completed or reported when due.

The PBIS TIC is a process measure and action planning tool that indicates the degree to which the RTI School Leadership Team (SLT) perceives specific criteria of Tier I, core instruction in behavior, to be in place and prioritizes criteria to work on. The TIC is supposed to be administered each fall and spring in Year 1 of behavior support under the initiative and once thereafter. The fall assessment is typically used to help the team plan for the year with the spring measure typically being the more valid indicator of what priorities are in place. Fidelity is achieved when at least 80% of the criteria of core instruction are in place. The spring 2010 TIC administration shows that Sandown North and Towle elementary schools achieved fidelity for school year 2009-10 based on the TIC (see Table 19 above). As of the fall 2010 TIC administration, Sandown North was the only school achieving fidelity based on the TIC. Towle had achieved fidelity, but dropped to 64% in place this year, likely due to new team composition, especially

the loss of the behavior coach who left the school. Spring 2011 TIC administration, planned for May and early June 2011, will be a more valid indicator of which features of implementation have been in place for the current school year.

As shown in Table 20, five schools had a School-Wide Evaluation Tool (SET) completed during this grant period. The SET is a Tier 1 fidelity instrument completed by a trained individual(s) who does not work for the school being assessed. Two scores are reported, one of the degree to which expectations are taught and the other is the average of the expected features that are currently in place. To achieve fidelity, both scores must be 80% or higher. As of the spring 2010 administration, three schools (Sandown North, Somersworth, and Towle) had achieved fidelity. Spring 2011 SET administration is planned for May and early June 2011.

Table 20: School-Wide Evaluation Tool (SET) Scores

	Spring 2006	Spring 2007	Spring 2008	Spring 2009	Spring 2010
Chamberlain Street ES	93/100	97/100	98/100	N/C	N/C
Kennett HS			39.5%	43.5%	N/C
Sandown North ES	95/90	96/100	96/100	100/100	100/100
Somersworth ES		36/0	83/70	91/80	89/90
Towle Upper ES					96/100

Black Shading = School not ready to administer the SET

N/C = SET was not completed or reported when due.

To assess the degree to which the features of Tier II RTI for Behavior were implemented, either a PBIS-NH Tier II Checklist or the Rtl for Tier II Instrument was completed by members of each school's Tier II Oversight Team (see Table 21 on the next page). Both assess the degree to which Tier II systems, data and practices are in place and prioritize strategies to work on. Schools focusing on behavior only at Tier II use the former tool, while those blending literacy and behavior complete the later one.

The Tier II instrument is supposed to be administered each fall and spring, with the spring measure typically being the more valid indicator of what priorities are in place. Fidelity is achieved when at least 80% of the strategies are in place. As of the fall 2010 administration, no schools were implementing Tier II strategies with fidelity, although Sandown North only missed this cut point by 2% and operated at fidelity in 2010. The spring 2011 Tier II instrument administration, planned for May and early June 2011, will be a more valid indicator of which features of implementation have been in place for the current school year.

Table 21: Percent of PBIS-NH Tier II Checklist or the RtI for Tier II Instrument Criteria in Place

	Spring 2009	Fall 2009	Spring 2010	Fall 2010
Chamberlain ES	N/C	17%		22%
Hilltop ES				5%
John Fuller ES				13%*
Maple Wood ES				N/C
Pine Tree ES				N/C
Sandown North ES		75%	86%	78%
Towle ES		19%	36%	50%
Kennett				39%

* Used the PBIS-NH Tier II Checklist

Black Shading = School not ready to administer the PBIS-NH Tier II/RTI Tier II instrument

Light Shading = Not a current PBIS-NH Tier II/RTI Tier II administration period.

N/C = RTI Tier II instrument was not completed or reported when due.

To assess the impact of RTI for PBIS to decrease problem behaviors, schools are supposed to track the number of behavioral incidents that occur each year. Most schools track major infractions that result in Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs). Some schools choose to track minor behaviors that are handled by staff. As shown in Tables 22 and 23, more schools reported data on major ODRs. The percentage of minor problem behaviors occurring at Sandown North and Pine Tree schools decreased by 25.5% over the course of the grant, while Chamberlain exhibited a 30.1% increase over this same time period (see Table 22). Care must be taken in the interpretation of these data as the amount of professional development varied during this time period, as did the prior experience schools had before participating in NH RESPONDS. For instance Pine Tree had a history of PBIS implementation prior to NH RESPONDS, completed their first Collaborative Team Checklist in the fall of 2009, but was not due to complete their first TIC to the fall of 2010. So it is likely that the decrease shown by Pine Tree was influenced by multiple sources.

Table 22: Number of All Discipline Referrals (Majors and Minors) (Referrals per 100 Students Per Year)

Schools	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	Percent Change (2006 – 2011)
Sandown North ES	1,849	1642	1,543	1,377	1,377	-25.5%
Chamberlain Street ES	296	563	538	735	385	+30.1%
Pine Tree ES	361	292	260	221	269	-25.5%
Average						-6.9%

As shown in Table 23 on the next page, three (Chamberlain, Towle, and Pine Tree) of the five schools reporting data for major ODRs exhibited decreases over the course of the grant, for an average decrease of 26.6%. Again, care must be taken in interpreting these outcome data. A careful review of the professional development provided (see Tables 5 and 6) and process and fidelity instruments completed

is needed to fully understand the outcome data. While Chamberlain exhibited an increase in the percentage of minor ODRs (+30.1%), they had a 78.3% decrease in the percentage of major ODRs.

Conversely, Sandown North had a decrease in minor ODRs (25.5%) over the course of the grant period, yet an increase of 48.7% in the percentage of major ODRs. One factor likely to have accounted for the increase in majors over the course of the grant, is that Sandown North’s population of students at-risk for, and identified with, significant behavioral challenges increased during the 2008-09 and 2009-10 school years. Many of these students are more likely to exhibit major problem behavior leading to an ODR than their typical peers. Taking those data into account, the Sandown Tier II and Tier III Oversight Teams developed additional Tier II and Tier III supports in the spring of 2010 and fall of 2010 respectively. Expanded Tier II supports were implemented in fall 2009-10; Tier III supports were added in winter 2010. These supports, in combination with effective core instruction in behavior, may be one reason that the number of major behavioral incidents dropped from 144 to 116 between 2009-10 and 2010-11.

Table 23: Number of Major Office Discipline Referrals (Referrals per 100 Students Per Year)

Schools	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	Percent Change (2006 – 2011)
Sandown North ES	78	50	85	144	116	+48.7%
Chamberlain Street ES	60	24	47	36	13	-78.3%
Towle ES			132	148	106	-19.7%*
Hilltop ES					183	-
Pine Tree ES	42	23	16	22	18	-57.1%
Average						-26.6%

*Time span was 2008-2010, rather than 2006-10

Black Shading = School not ready to collect ODR data

Three of the five schools reporting in-school suspension data had decreases in the percentage of suspensions (events) per 100 students (see Table 24 on the next page). Across all six schools, there was an average decrease of 1.31 suspensions for every 100 students. Towle had the largest decrease of 5.71 fewer in-school suspensions over the course of the grant period. Sandown North has consistently maintained an extremely small use of ISS per 100 students (less than 1 event per 100 students) and the 0.7 events per 100 students are likely due to the increase in students with more significant behavioral challenges that have been enrolled in the school over the past two years as indicated previously.

Examining in-school suspensions by the number of days per suspension shows an increase of 3.20 days of suspension for every 100 students for the four schools reporting data for this indicator (see Table 25 on the next page). So over the course of the grant, while there were fewer in-school suspensions, the average in-school suspension lasted for a longer period of time. Three of the four schools had an increased number of days of in-school suspensions over the course of the grant, but decreases in the number of days of in-school suspensions between 2009-10 and 2010-11. All four schools demonstrated decreases in the number of days of in-school suspensions during the last two

years. Somersworth is the only high school in this data set and has many more in- and out-of-school suspensions than the participating elementary schools.

Table 24: Change in the Number of In-School Suspensions (Events/100 Students)

Schools	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	Change (2006 – 2011)
Sandown North ES	0.42	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.70	+0.38
Chamberlain Street ES	1.90	1.88	3.64	9.40	5.85	+3.95
Towle ES			10.26	11.32	4.55	-5.71*
Hilltop ES					N/C	-
Pine Tree ES	7.30	4.02	1.30	3.79	3.23	-4.07
Somersworth HS		29.89	59.00	49.83	28.80	-1.09
Average						-1.31

*Change Period is 2008-2011, rather than 2006-07

Black Shading = School not ready to collect in-school suspension data

N/C = In-school suspension data were not collected or reported when due.

Table 25: Change in the Length of In-School Suspension (Days/100 Students)

Schools	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	Change (2006 – 2011)
Sandown North Es	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.00	0.00	-
Chamberlain Street ES	0.41	1.21	1.33	6.27	4.60	+4.19
Towle ES			2.24	7.36	2.60	+0.36*
Hilltop ES					N/C	-
Pine Tree ES	2.15	2.68	0.43	2.84	2.07	-0.08
Somersworth HS		25.45	46.17	53.00	33.77	+8.32
Average						+3.20

*Change Period is 2008-2011, rather than 2006-07

Black Shading = School not ready to collect in-school suspension data

N/C = In-school suspension data were not collected or reported when due.

Across the four schools reporting out-of-school suspension data based on the number of suspensions (events) per 100 students (Table 26 on the next page) two showed large decreases and two had small increases, for an average decrease of 7.00 out-of-school suspensions per 100 students. This decrease was driven in large part by Somersworth High School (-22.64 events/100 students), which has exhibited a decrease in out-of-school suspensions each year of participation. Three of the four schools reported decreases in out-of-school suspensions over the last two years. Sandown North reported no out-of-school suspensions in any year.

As shown in Table 27 on the next page, there was an overall decrease of 4.72% in the number of days of out-of-school suspensions per 100 students. However, Somersworth High School was the only school of the four reporting data that demonstrated a decrease in the number of days of out-of-school

suspensions. Chamberlain had increases in the number of days of out-of-school suspensions for the first four year, but during 2010-11, decreased the average length of their out-of-school suspensions by half (22.06 in 2009-10, 10.31 in 2010-11).

Table 26: Change in the Number of Out-Of-School Suspensions (Events/100 Students)

Schools	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	Change (2006 – 2011)
Sandown North ES	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-
Chamberlain Street ES	8.97	8.31	8.74	20.10	9.47	+0.50
Towle ES			8.33	3.77	1.95	-6.38*
Hilltop ES					2.04	-
Pine Tree ES	0.86	0.45	0.87	0.95	1.38	+0.52
Somersworth HS		46.63	34.00	31.50	23.99	-22.64
Average						-7.00

*Change Period is 2008-2011, rather than 2006-07

Black Shading = School not ready to collect in-school suspension data

Table 27: Change in the Length of Out-Of-School Suspensions (Days/100 Students)

Schools	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	Change (2006 – 2011)
Sandown North ES	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-
Chamberlain Street ES	8.15	9.22	12.50	22.06	10.31	+2.16
Towle ES			3.53	2.83	3.57	+0.04*
Hilltop ES					3.40	-
Pine Tree ES	0.43	0.89	4.55	0.95	2.30	+1.87
Somersworth HS		95.98	78.42	77.25	73.02	-22.96
Average						-4.72

*Change Period is 2008-2011, rather than 2006-07

Black Shading = School not ready to collect in-school suspension data

Table 28 (on the next page) provides data on the percentage of students with no more than one major behavioral incident. Overall there was an increase of 4.25% in the number of students with zero or one major incident. The “PBIS triangle of tiers” suggests that one measure of the effectiveness of Tier I, core instruction in behavior is the extent to 80% of more students in elementary schools and 70% of students in middle and high schools have zero or no more than 1 major ODR in a school year. Three of the five elementary schools were above 80% in 2010-11, with the two remaining schools close to 80%. Towle had a five percent increase in the number of students not exhibiting major behavioral problems, scoring a 79% during this reporting period. Towle is an upper elementary school serving grades 5 and 6 and there are no national norms for that type of school. As a practical adaptation, it would seem that 75% or better would be a realistic standard for an upper elementary school.

Table 28: Percentage of Students with Zero or at Most One Major Behavioral Incident

Schools	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	Percent Change (2006 – 2011)
Sandown North ES	82%	92%	85%	80%	85%	+3%
Chamberlain Street ES	92%	95%	92%	92%	97%	+5%
Towle ES			74%	75%	79%	+5%
Hilltop ES					74%	-
Pine Tree ES	92%	95%	97%	95%	96%	+4%
Average						+4.25%

Black Shading = School not ready to collect in-school suspension data

Teacher Check Connect and Expect (TCCE) is a Tier II intervention designed for students who do not respond to the schoolwide system of behavioral supports. The intervention provides for systematic and frequent reinforcement and encouragement for positive behaviors by the classroom teacher(s) so that the student receives high rates of immediate feedback. The TCCE data from participating NH RESPONDS schools that have been trained in RTI – Behavior Tier II strategies varies significantly (see Table 29). All Towle students receiving Tier II behavior supports are responding well to the intervention, whereas 50% of a similar group of students at Chamberlain are not responding to the intervention. At Sandown North, 29% of the Tier II students are partially responding to the intervention, while the remaining students are responding well to the intervention.

Table 29: Teacher Check Connect and Expect Data

	Responding to Intervention (> 80%)	Partially Responding to Intervention (70% -79%)	Non Responding to Intervention (< 70%)	Reporting Cycle
Chamberlain (N=23)	36%	14%	50%	2/7/11 - 4/22/11
Sandown North (N=7)	71%	29%	0	1/3/11 – 4/24/11
Towle (N=12)	100%	0	0	3/9/11 – 4/19/11

Objective 1.6: To build ECE program capacity by increasing the knowledge and competency of EC and education professionals in early literacy and PBIS by providing individualized TA and support to 5 child care programs/Head Start/Early Head Start programs.

Below, we provide a summary of each participating early childhood setting in NH RESPONDS. This is followed by a review of the types and frequency of professional development provided and an analysis of participant feedback on satisfaction with and impact of NH RESPONDS professional development.

Early Childhood Education (ECE) Programs

Conway and Somersworth SAUs began incorporating their ECE selected program(s) into their demonstration site work in 2008-09. The three other SAU demonstration sites began their work in September of 2009. A tabular survey of the ECEs can be found in Table 1 on page 2 of this report.

Conway SAU: (Children Unlimited): During the 2010-2011 school year, Children Unlimited added an inclusive kindergarten classroom and successfully rolled-out the Program-wide-PBIS (PW-PBIS) and Literacy Tier 1 features to all children, staff and families. The Children Unlimited NH RESPONDS Leadership team continues to meet every other month and the PW-PBIS, screening and Literacy sub-group meetings continue to occur monthly. In addition, Children Unlimited has added a monthly family engagement sub-group with coordination from Michelle Lewis of the Parent Information Center. Children Unlimited continues to improve and fine-tune the Tier 1 systems for literacy and PW-PBIS. They have implemented a program-wide acknowledgement system and are collecting behavior incident data in both the preschool and kindergarten classrooms. Children Unlimited continues with implementation of teacher screenings for behavior and literacy in the preschool classrooms, and now includes usage of a parent screening for social-emotional development as well. The team continues to use this information for data and team-based decision-making purposes.

The SAU Preschool Coordinator is in agreement with extending use of the social-emotional screening with alternate community preschool providers and is working on an action plan for training of this within the community preschool programs as well. In addition, Children Unlimited has begun Tier 2 system development for PW-PBIS and Literacy. The program currently is implementing a small group intervention with a dual-focus on both literacy and social skills to address these areas through “co-treat” sessions with designated children using social-emotional book content. This group meets for a half hour twice per week for eight to ten weeks, and involves both preschool and kindergarten children identified for Tier 2 supports. An additional Tier 2 support being implemented allows identified preschoolers to visit the kindergarten classroom 3 times per week for an hour during story time and for literacy extension activities; these preschoolers have been assigned ‘kindergarten buddies’ as older peer role models of early literacy and social skills. The Children Unlimited team has also begun use of a function-based Tier 2 intervention called “Teacher Check, Connect & Expect” (TCCE), involving regular intervals of positive feedback to children exhibiting behavior issues due to an identified need for adult attention. In lieu of a formalized series of professional development trainings this year, Children Unlimited integrated content presentation within the context of regularly scheduled team meetings.

Newport SAU: (Early Childhood Support Program): The SAU 43 ECE Leadership team currently consists mainly of the Community Preschool Program located within Richards' Elementary School. Economic conditions at area preschool programs have become a reality-barrier, preventing the continued participation of other preschool programs on the SAU 43 ECE Leadership Team, although the Preschool Coordinator continues active efforts to maintain some participation from the area preschool programs. The Community Preschool Program has completed the development of Tier 1 systems for PW-PBIS, including finalizing a program-wide behavior matrix and acknowledgement system, tweaking the response procedure forms for increased efficiency and quality of behavior incident data collection, as well as further improving use of behavioral screening information for data-based decision-making purposes. The team has also finalized a yearly planning calendar and a tiered-support process flowchart for behavioral systems. The team has developed communication methods in various formats regarding RTI components for families. The team is now focusing on Tier 2 targeted group interventions for students, including the development of "Teacher Check, Connect and Expect" (TCCE) and small group social skill supports using evidence-based curriculum content. Additionally, The Community Preschool Program at Richards' school has begun addressing Tier 1 literacy supports for students, including the exploration of a preschool literacy curriculum and literacy-based screenings for students. This team continues to integrate professional development content within the context of regularly-scheduled team meetings.

Rochester SAU: (REACH Preschool): This ECE program voted to discontinue as a NH RESPONDS demonstration site in March 2010 as reported in last year's report. The ECE program expressed continued concern that they truly did not have a choice to participate in NH RESPONDS. They voiced major reservations, including professional development requirements that were not being fulfilled for SLPs and adding additional work and time commitments for staff that were not consistent with the REACH program's priorities. It is clear from the resistance, conflicts, and issues presented from this site that future projects similar to NH RESPONDS will need to better consider how to achieve commitment and buy-in for ECE program participation.

Somersworth SAU: (Somersworth ECE): The SAU 56 ECE Leadership Team mainly consists of the Somersworth Early Education preschool program staff and elementary kindergarten teachers that alternate attendance at monthly meetings. The school administrator has become actively involved in the preschool leadership team meetings. The team has focused on stream-lining Tier 1 supports in the preschool classroom with the Tier 1 supports established in the elementary school, including classroom expectations, finalizing a preschool behavior matrix that is in alignment with the school-wide matrix and working on the development of a preschool acknowledgement system that is developmentally appropriate for identified children and correlates with the school-wide acknowledgement system. This team has also implemented use of the same behavioral screening system used by the elementary school population, and is working on using the elementary version of the instrument for students that are in preschool but over the age of five. The team is exploring usage of various literacy screening tools that will best meet the needs of the identified population of students in the preschool program. The team continues to work on documentation procedures in order to make best use of screening data for decision-making purposes as well as a system to send pertinent information to the receiving

kindergarten teachers for students that will be entering kindergarten. In lieu of a formalized series of RTI trainings this year, the SEE preschool program has integrated content presentation within the context of regularly scheduled team meetings.

Timberlane SAU: (Timberlane Learning Center): The Timberlane Learning Center program (TLC) continues to make progress on implementing Tier I behavior supports. Changes in key staff positions did not interrupt the organized approach of the universal leadership team as new members were identified and trained in a seamless manner. The team formally rolled out the program based on the three expectations of Safety, Respect and Strive this year beginning with a parent informational program in the fall. Other positive preventative features of Tier I behavior support including the routine based matrix was revised based on feedback from last spring. A train theme, use of developmentally appropriate songs, props and art projects, and the idea of students as conductors have made the overall theme fun for students and staff. The first teaching rollout involved the routine of using the smart board technology (a first in any preschool program that I know of) and the second focused on hallway behavior. Train tickets have been developed and paired with specific verbal praise to acknowledge students for exhibiting the expected behaviors within the program routines. Challenging behaviors, definitions, appropriate corrective responses were approved by the team, administration and staff.

The focus on the remainder of the year will be on strengthening the acknowledgement system and making decisions on Tier 1 data collection given that the ECE data management system is not ready for implementation as hoped for at this time as well as any spring rollouts of additional routines. The team will make a decision this month on when to plan and implement Tier 2 supports (spring, summer or fall).

Frequency of Professional Development at Early Childhood Settings

Tables 30 present the data collected on the frequency of professional development in early childhood settings and at the participating schools

Table 30: Frequency of Professional Development at Participating ECE Settings

Early Childhood Programs	# of PD Activities 2008-09	# of PD Activities 2009-10	# of PD Activities 2010-11	# of PD Hours 2010-11
SAU#9 - Conway	10	22	20	48
SAU#43 - Newport	5	11	9	23
SAU#56 - Somersworth	15	22	7	15
SAU#11 - Timberlane	8	7	5	10
SAU#54 - Rochester	7	6	0	0
Total	45	68	41	96

Participating Personnel Survey Data

In addition to tracking the professional development delivered, project evaluators disseminated a “participating personnel survey” in March 2011 to determine the extent to which the recipients increased their knowledge and skills in the targeted training areas. These data are presented below in Tables 31-34.

Table 31 illustrates an increase of 0.36 (7%) in participants knowledge of ECE RTI literacy and behavior strategies, working with data, and developing action plans to guide their work between 2011 and 2010 survey administrations. The highest rated items in 2011 were developing program/center-level action plans that helped them develop consensus building for Positive Behavior Supports in their program/center (3.75) and increasing their knowledgeable of Positive Behavior Supports (3.67).

Table 31: Impact on Knowledge of ECE RTI Literacy and Behavior

What impact did the professional development (e.g., action planning, technical assistance, coaching) provided by NH RESPONDS have on:	2009-10 Average (N=13-17)	2010-11 Average (N=12)
Developing program/center-level action plans that helped you develop consensus building for Positive Behavior Supports in your program/center?	3.27	3.75
Increasing your knowledgeable of Positive Behavior Supports?	3.00	3.67
Identifying, adopting, and using tools and strategies for building program/center-level consensus for RTI?	3.27	3.50
Identifying, adopting, and using tools and strategies for managing complex change?	3.08	3.50
Increasing your knowledgeable of early literacy?	2.86	3.45
Increasing your knowledge of child and program/center-level data?	3.13	3.42
Increasing your knowledge of how to integrate literacy instruction and Positive Behavior Supports?	3.14	3.25
Developing program/center-level action plans that helped you develop consensus building for RTI for early literacy in your program/center?	2.93	3.08
Average	3.09	3.45

1 = No Impact, 2 = Little Impact, 3 = Medium Impact, 4 = Large Impact, 5 = Very Large Impact

Table 32 (on the next page) provides responses about the impact that NH RESPONDS professional development had on developing an infrastructure to support the implementation of RTI early literacy and PBIS strategies. The results suggest that NH RESPONDS has had a medium to large impact on the infrastructure of the participating early childhood settings (3.64). The highest rated items were the actual provision of leadership around RTI (4.08) and forming and training an RTI leadership team (3.92). The lowest rated items included developing the infrastructure necessary to support an integrated model of literacy instruction and PBIS (3.08). The largest increase from 2010-11 was increasing the infrastructure to foster collaboration among general and special education personnel (2.86 in 2010 to 3.82 in 2011).

Table 32: Impact on ECE Infrastructure

What impact did the professional development (e.g., action planning, technical assistance, coaching) provided by NH RESPONDS have on:	2009-10 Average (N=12-15)	2010-11 Average (N=12)
The leadership you provided your program/center around RTI during the last year?	3.29	4.08
Forming and training a leadership team to lead the RTI initiative?	3.31	3.92
Increasing your program/center's infrastructure to foster collaboration among general & special education personnel?	2.86	3.82
Developing infrastructure for the implementation of Positive Behavior Supports?	3.00	3.67
Increasing your program/center's infrastructure to work with data?	2.86	3.50
Developing infrastructure for the implementation of early literacy efforts?	3.00	3.17
Developing infrastructure for an integrated model of literacy instruction and positive behavior supports in your center/program?	2.80	3.08
Average	3.02	3.61

1 = No Impact, 2 = Little Impact, 3 = Medium Impact, 4 = Large Impact, 5 = Very Large Impact

Similar increases were found regarding the impact of NH RESPONDS professional development on the implementation of PBIS and early literacy and are displayed in Table 33. The provision of leadership (4.17), implementing the center/program action plan (4.00), and increasing the collaboration among general and special educators (4.0) were perceived to have had the largest impact on ECE implementation of RTI early literacy and behavior strategies. In a similar manner to the consensus building questions in Table 30, participants reported a large increase in the degree of collaboration among general and special educators (from 2.92 in 2010 to 4.00 in 2011).

Table 33: Impact on ECE Implementation

What impact did the professional development (e.g., action planning, technical assistance, coaching) provided by NH RESPONDS have on:	2009-10 Average (N=12-14)	2010-11 Average (N=12)
The leadership you provided your center/program around RTI during the last year?	3.23	4.17
Implementing your center/program action plan?	3.31	4.00
Increasing the collaboration among general & special education personnel at your center/program?	2.92	4.00
Supporting the implementation of Positive Behavior Supports?	3.07	3.92
Increasing your skills to work with data?	2.93	3.17
Supporting the implementation of early literacy strategies?	3.17	3.17
Implementing an integrated model of early literacy instruction and positive behavior supports in your school?	3.00	3.08
Average	3.09	3.64

1 = No Impact, 2 = Little Impact, 3 = Medium Impact, 4 = Large Impact, 5 = Very Large Impact

Finally, personnel working in early childhood settings who received professional development from NH RESPONDS rated the impact of the professional development they received on child-level outcomes

(see Table 34). The largest impacts were for literacy outcomes for the general population (3.42) and children with disabilities (3.42).

Table 34: Overall Impact on EC Behavior and Literacy

What impact did the professional development(e.g., action planning, technical assistance, coaching) provided by NH RESPONDS have on:	2009-10 Average (N=9-11)	2010-11 Average (N=12)
Improving behavior for all children in your center/program?	3.00	3.42
Improving behavior for children with disabilities in your center/program?	3.00	3.42
Improving literacy outcomes for all children in your center/program?	3.67	3.33
Improving literacy outcomes for children with disabilities in your center/program?	3.56	3.33
Average	3.31	3.38

1 = No Impact, 2 = Little Impact, 3 = Medium Impact, 4 = Large Impact, 5 = Very Large Impact

Program-wide Response to Intervention for Behavior and Early Literacy in Early Childhood Programs

In this section, process and fidelity data are provided for four preschool programs that received professional development related to Response to Intervention for Program-wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (RTI for PW-PBIS) and early literacy in Tier I, Primary Prevention. Tier I consists of core instruction in building positive relationships with children and families and establishing high quality, supportive learning environments. This includes data from the (a) Early Childhood Collaborative Team Checklist (EC CTC), (b) Preschool Leadership Team Checklist (PreLTC), (c) Pre-School-Wide Evaluation Tool (Pre-SET), and (d) Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS).

The Early Childhood Collaborative Team Checklist (EC CTC) is a 14 item process and action planning checklist that measures how well an early childhood team perceives itself to be functioning. The checklist focuses on team membership, mission, team roles, meeting processes (agenda, ground rules, decision making processes, note taking, etc), and action planning. The checklist was administered twice per year in each preschool’s initial year, and at least once a year thereafter. Early childhood leadership teams are considered to be functioning with fidelity when the EC CTC score is 80% or higher. As shown in Table 35, all participating early childhood program-wide leadership teams have been functioning near or above fidelity since the winter 2009-10 administration.

Table 35: Early Childhood Collaborative Team Checklist Data

	Fall 2009	Winter 2009-10	Spring 2010	Fall 2010
ECE-Conway	29%	71%	100%	100%
ECE-Newport	43%	86%	86%	93%
ECE-Timberlane Learning Center	0%	93%	100%	100%
ECE-Somersworth	36%	86%	86%	93%

The Preschool Leadership Team Checklist (Versions 2.0; 3.0) is a 42 item process measure and action planning tool that indicates the degree to which the Early Childhood Leadership Team perceives specific criteria necessary for the implementation of behavior and literacy supports to be in place and prioritizes criteria to work on. The checklist is administered twice per year in each preschool. The original instrument, the Preschool Team Leadership Checklist 2.0 (Pre LTC) was modified slightly in 2010. A score of 80% on the Pre LTC indicates that the literacy and behavior supports are implemented with fidelity. The data in Table 36 show that Conway is implementing with fidelity as of the fall 2010 administration. Each program has increased its fidelity score with each subsequent Pre LTC administration. Administration of the Pre LTC in the four preschool programs is scheduled for May 2011.

Table 36: Preschool Leadership Team Checklist 3.0

	First Administration Fall 2009	Second Administration Spring 2010	Third Administration Fall 2010
ECE-Conway	36%*	80%	86%
ECE-Newport	39%*	45%	53%
ECE-Somersworth	27%*	52%	60%
ECE-Timberlane Learning Center	30%*	41%	40%

* Preschool Team Leadership Checklist 2.0

The PreSchool-wide Evaluation Tool (Pre-SET) was administered at all four participating early childhood programs in the fall of 2009 by an external evaluator that is not employed by the program. The Pre-SET is designed to assess the fidelity of implementation of Tier I features of Program-wide Positive Behavior Support in early childhood settings. A preschool is implementing program-wide PBIS with fidelity if programs score 80% or better on Feature B, Behavior Expectations Taught, and 80% on the average of features score. None of the early childhood programs implemented with fidelity in 2009 (See Table 37); the scores reported reflect pre-implementation scores. The average score across the four early childhood settings was 50.7%. A second administration will occur in May 2011.

The Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) was administered to all participating early childhood settings in fall 2009. The purpose of the CLASS is to assess the degree of universal implementation of early literacy practices. The goal is for 80% of settings achieve at least a 50%. The second administration of the CLASS will occur in May 2011.

Table 37: PreSET and CLASS Results

School	Fall 2009 PRESET Scores	Fall 2009 CLASS Scores
ECE-Conway	55.8%	48.0%
ECE-Newport	68.5%	45.0%
ECE-Somersworth	26.8%	49.0%
ECE-Timberlane Learning Center	51.5%	46.3%
Average	50.7%	47.1%

Objective 1.7: To build statewide capacity by increasing the knowledge and skills of 400 K-12 special and general education teachers, related service personnel and school administrators and 40 family members

To address this objective, a two-day training series was offered to NH public school teams ready to begin work on Tier 3 RTI for behavior support or literacy. Participants selected to attend either the behavior or literacy strand for both days of the training series (March 14, 2011 and May 18, 2011). Registration for the two days was limited to 125 people. School teams consist of a minimum of three team members and a maximum of ten team members and must include a school administrator. The evaluation report for the March 14, 2011 event is in Appendix C. The quantitative and qualitative evaluation data are being utilized to inform the May 18, 2011 training and future statewide training efforts. NH RESPONDS staff members have provided a two –day statewide RTI training series each year covering Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3. These trainings have been attended by 50 different schools from 28 SAUs over the three years. Of these 50 schools, five schools have attended all three tiers of training and another six schools have attended at least two tiers of training. School teams have ranged in size from a minimum of three team members to a maximum of 12 team members.

Objective 1.8: To build statewide capacity to provide individualized, self-directed school-to-career transition services to youth with emotional and behavioral challenges by increasing the capacity of school personnel and community-based providers in the use of RENEW strategies and supports.

NH RESPONDS Leadership Team members are active in the IDEA Partnership-supported NH Transition Community of Practice (CoP). The NH Transition CoP Coordinating Group is currently comprised of approximately 50 individuals from across state, local and community levels throughout New Hampshire who represent a wide array of experience and expertise. The Coordinating Group meets bi-monthly to share resources, problem solve barriers and issues, and works together to improve transition services and supports for NH’s youth using the community of practice strategy. The CoP Coordinating Group activities have included: hosting an annual Transition Summit, developing and supporting local and regional communities of practice throughout the state, sharing resources/ information toward the development of best practices, events, trainings, job fairs, toolkits, and posting materials, resources and discussions on <http://www.sharedwork.org/>.

NH RESPONDS leaders have facilitated the development of a NH Transition CoP focused on professional development, “Secondary Transition CoP Professional Development group.” This group identifies secondary transition PD needs and, through collaborative efforts, works to provide training in identified areas. Members of the PD CoP assisted with:

- Identification of secondary transition topics and presenters for the NH RESPONDS annual 5-Part Transition Series trainings.
- Assisted the NH Department of Education in their development of the *Guidance Document – Understanding Indicator 13 for the State Performance Plan* (<http://tinyurl.com/Indicator-13>) and

the training of a cadre of transition experts to help conduct the required district Indicator 13 compliance reviews.

- Development and delivery of two webinars March/April 2011 on specific Indicator 13 transition planning components: **Webinar #1- Developing Measurable Post Secondary Goals and Age Appropriate Transition Assessments** and **Webinar #2- Developing Courses of Study and Transition Services**. The webinars were recorded and will be posted on the website and accessible through the sharedwork.org site under the NH Transition CoP.

The group is also collaborating with university partners and the Strafford Learning Center to facilitate the above two webinars and to deliver a training series in best practices in School-to-Career Transition services at Keene State College (to address grant Goal 2 Objective 2.3). Also to address grant objectives, the Institute on Disability (NH's UCEDD) included transition best practice tools and practices in its "Introduction to Exceptionality" course for spring 2011. Keene State College this year posted its video-taped snippets of questions and answers with Ed O'Leary from our August 2009 training and made them available on their Transition Planning Resources website at Keene State College. The *IEP Transition Resource* is a multimedia training and reference tool designed to increase understanding about IEP transition requirements and indicator 13. This is a series of 18 short videos and a listing of resources on transition services and Indicator 13 (<http://tinyurl.com/IEP-Transition-Resource>).

Finally, the Institute on Disability RESPONDS staff members provided a two-part training session on the RENEW secondary transition model to staff members in Somersworth High School and six other high schools during this grant year, and continues to coach and mentor trained staff. Over twenty teachers, special educators, school counselors and paraeducators, were trained in October- November 2010, and two technical assistance follow up visits allow trainees to initiate and sustain the practice.

Evaluation data were collected for the 5 –Part Transition Series, the APEX Summer Institute and the RENEW training described above. The professional development was rated on quality, relevance and usefulness. Ratings for all areas were high, yielding means of 77% for overall quality, 85% for relevance and 85% for usefulness (rating scale of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale).

Family Engagement in NH RESPONDS

The NH Parent Information Center (PIC) has a designated member who participates in the NH RESPONDS Leadership Team meetings. The focus of this year was 1) collect baseline information on family engagement in all NH RESPONDS Demonstration sites 2) offer targeted technical assistance to identified schools (three 2nd year elementary schools and work with one ECE program) and 3) continue statewide training. To accomplish these goals, the following activities took place.

- NH RESPONDS Evaluator and NH PIC (with input from the NH RESPONDS Leadership Team) created the *Indicators of Family Engagement Survey* based on the Louisiana State Improvement Grant Family Engagement Survey. The survey was distributed to all NH RESPONDS Demonstration sites 166 NH RESPONDS School Universal Team members were asked to complete the survey and 68 Universal Team members (41%) completed the survey. Here are a few highlights from the survey results:

- The NH RESPONDS Universal Team members were asked to rate the degree to which their school encourages family engagement. A five-point agreement scale was used with 1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree. The highest rated items were:
 - A variety of methods were used to communicate with families in their schools (4.63)
 - An inviting and welcome environment exists for all families (4.37)
 - Policies and practices exist in their schools that recognize the importance of family engagement (4.18).

The lowest rated items were:

- Families are offered a variety of ways to give feedback to the school/program about the RtI system (2.96)
- Families are provided opportunities to participate in professional development about RtI (2.68)
- Families are provided parent leadership training/other support opportunities (2.54)
- Families are engaged in the development and/or implementation of the school/program's RtI system (2.54).

Universal Team members were also asked if at least one parent who is not an employee of the school district/program participated on their school/program's Universal Team. Twenty-one respondents (31%) reported that their school did have family representation on their school's Universal Team, while 34 respondents (50%) stated their schools did not. Thirteen or 19% of the respondents were unsure.

- A NH PIC representative facilitates the SAU 9 (Conway ECE Team) Family Engagement Subcommittee. *This subcommittee is charged with accomplishing* the following: help the team develop and document their two-way communication with families about the district's RtI system. The team is focused on creating a template for talking to families about screening/screening results which can then be used for other child care in the Conway area
- A NH PIC representative with a member of NH's RTI Professional Learning Community presented "Response to Intervention: Families and Schools Working Together for Student Success" at PIC's 4th Annual Partnerships for Education Conference (March 2011).
- Two NH PIC representatives co-presented within the literacy and behavior sessions of the Day 1 Tier 3 Statewide Training (March 2011). The co-presenters focused on participation and design of the Oversight Team (the infrastructure) and family engagement with the Tier 3 Implementation Team. The second day of the Statewide Training (May 2011) will focus on more specific strategies on developing meaningful two-way communication about the RtI system.
- A NH PIC representative co-presented "Results-Orientated Transition Planning: Compliance combined with Good Planning Practices" (December 2010) emphasizing the importance of parent/family involvement in the development of a students' transition IEP.
- NH PIC continues to disseminate copies of their "NH Family Guide to RTI" (developed under SIG II) to school teams and parents. This guide is currently being translated in to Spanish by the NH Department of Education.

Goal 2: Highly Qualified Professionals and Institutes of Higher Education

To improve strategies for recruiting, hiring, and retaining highly qualified early childhood and K-12 special and general education teachers, related service personnel and school administrators who can design, implement with fidelity and sustain scientifically-based RtI systems of PBIS and LI and tertiary STS for students with EBD.

Objective 2.1: To work with the NHDOE Professional Standards Board (PSB) to reform and improve state standards for certification and endorsement programs for PBIS, LI, and STS for students with EBD.

Objective 2.2: To recommend revisions to educator preparation programs to include competencies in RtI systems for PBIS, Literacy Instruction, & STS for students with EBD.

Objective 2.3 Develop and engage at least one IHE in the development of at least one undergraduate or graduate-level course or training series in best practices in School-to-Career Transition (StCT) services.

The NH RESPONDS IHE Consortium includes NH RESPONDS Leadership Team members, administrators and professors representing the University of New Hampshire, Keene State College, and River College, as well as members of the Department of Education Bureau of Licensure and Certification. The IHE Consortium has met three times this year and will be meeting again in late April 2011.

During this reporting period IHE personnel have utilized NH RESPONDS matrices to compare the NH RESPONDS general RTI competencies against their selected teacher preparation programs and courses linked to literacy, behavior and secondary transition. Three of the four IHEs have already identified the courses for which each competency is addressed under and are working to document the evidence they would collect to demonstrate competence. The fourth IHE is currently identifying the programs for which they will complete curriculum mapping before they initiate the above process. As a result of their NH RESPONDS work, Keene State College added an RTI component to the Action Research Project completed during the student teaching placement for each Elementary Education and Elementary/Special Education student.

Next steps for the IHE Consortium include: 1) finalizing the comparison of the NH RESPONDS competencies against the respective IHE courses, with the goal to embed the competencies in the IHE curriculum, 2) identifying NH certifications coming up for review that may be impacted by the NH RESPONDS competencies, and 3) sharing information and work with the Department of Education subcommittees for proposed certification reform.

In addition to the above IHE Consortium work, NH RESPONDS Leadership Team members were active on the NH RTI Taskforce. The NH RTI Taskforce completed its' assigned tasks in Summer 2010 and now has transformed into a NH RTI Professional Learning Community (PLC). The NH RTI PLC will carry out the developed NH RTI strategic plan for 2009-2013 that provides a map for the design and

implementation of a systematic state and district RTI framework including alignment with key initiatives of the NH Department of Education, inclusive of NH RESPONDS. One of the goals of this strategic plan is focused on the development of effective teachers and leaders (in-service and pre-service). In February 2011, the NH RTI PLC invited representatives from various NH IHEs with teacher preparation programs to participate in a NH RTI PLC meeting for discussion on how to incorporate RTI into their respective pre-service teacher preparation programs. The NHRESPONDS IHEs were invited to attend this meeting to share their thoughts.

The NH RTI PLC is planning to have another meeting in April 2011 with the NH IHEs in which the NHRESPONDS staff and IHEs have been asked to share their work thus far to incorporate RTI into their teacher preparation programs. NH RESPONDS Leadership Team members will continue to be active in the work of the NH RTI PLC to ensure infusion of NH RESPONDS concepts, principles and practices into the larger state efforts.

Activities addressing Objective 2.3 are addressed in the Secondary Transition Supports section (Objective 1.8) of the report (please see pages 35 - 36).

Appendix A

NH RESPONDS Data Collection Matrix

Table NH RESPONDS Data Collection Matrix (March 2010)

Goal 1: Professional Development (PPS = Participating Personnel Survey; LT = Leadership Team; EEC = Evaluators)

Objective	Instrument	Frequency	Responsible Party	APR Measure
1.1. To recruit at least one SAU in the 5 regions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Log/letters of commitment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DOE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 SAUs are recruited
1.2: To recruit at least 1 EC SPED program & 2 K-12 schools from each LEA (total = 5 ECE, 10 K-12)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EC/school commitments Lists of UT, TT, IT members Roster of coaches 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 time Annually 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DOE LT liaisons 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 EC SPED program & 10 K-12 schools participate
1.3: To develop & incorporate a set of competencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comps. validated by field experts Competency assessment of participants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upon completion Annually, end of school year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LT members LT liaisons 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validated competencies are developed, implemented with fidelity, & sustained
1.4 To build SAU capacity by increasing the knowledge and skills of 5 SAU LTs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PPS instrument/interviews PD/TA log Combined PBS & NASDSE Blueprint 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annually Ongoing Annually, end of year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EEC PD providers LT liaisons 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80% of SAU personnel report they are more <u>knowledgeable</u> 80% of participating SAU personnel report they are more <u>skilled</u>
1.5 To build program/school capacity in 15 sites. (refer to Table X for school based assessments)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Post workshop eval. PPS instrument/interviews PD/TA log 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At event end Annually Ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EEC EEC PD providers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80% of school personnel report they are more knowledgeable 80% of school personnel report they are more skilled

Objective	Instrument	Frequency	Responsible Party	APR Measure
1.6: To build ECE program capacity in 5 sites.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post workshop eval. • PPS instrument/interviews • PD/TA log • RTI LT checklist 2.0 – Tier 1 • Collab. Team Checklist • Pre-SET • Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) • ELLCO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At event end • Annually • Ongoing • Ongoing for action planning • 2 x per year • 1 x per year • 1 x per year • 1 x per year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EEC • EEC • PD providers • PD providers & LT • PD providers & LT • PD providers • PD providers • PD providers & LT 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80% of school personnel report they are more <u>knowledgeable</u> • 80% of school personnel report they are more <u>skilled</u> • 80% of participating schools achieve 80/80 on the Pre- SET • 80% of EC sites achieve 50% on the EC fidelity instrument (CLASS).
1.7: To build statewide capacity of 400 K-12 educators & 40 family members.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post workshop eval. • Copies of action plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At event end • Post event 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EEC • PD providers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80% of personnel report they are more <u>knowledgeable</u> • 80% of personnel report the PD they received will help them implement Rtl systems
1.8: To build statewide capacity of school personnel & community-based providers in the use of RENEW strategies & supports.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post workshop eval. • PPS instrument/interviews • PD/TA log • Baseline student data/trend data • RENEW Integrity Tool 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At event end • Annually • Ongoing • Annually • 1 x per year per trainee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PD Providers • EEC • PD providers • LT liaisons • PD provider 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80% of HS personnel report they are more <u>knowledgeable</u> • 80% of HS personnel report they are more <u>skilled</u> • 80% of trained HS staff achieve 70% on the STS fidelity instrument.

Goal 2: IHEs

Objective	Instrument	Frequency	Responsible Party	APR Measure
4.1: To work with the NHDOE PSB to reform & improve standards for certification/endorsement for PBIS, LI, & STS for students w/ EBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agendas, minutes, rosters of participants • Recommended revisions • Documentation of revisions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annually 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LT liaisons 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reform & improve state standards for certification & endorsement programs for PBIS, LI, & STS for students with EBD
4.2: To recommend revisions to educator prep. programs to include competencies in Rtl systems for PBIS, LI, & STS for students w/ EBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended revisions • Documentation of revisions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annually 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LT liaisons 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend revisions to educator preparation programs to include competencies in Rtl systems of PBIS, LI, & STS for students with EBD

Table NH RESPONDS Objective 1.5 Data Matrix

To build program/school capacity in 10 sites K -12. (**PBIS**)

Universal/Tier 1	<p>Readiness/Fidelity Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative Team Checklist • Team Implementation Checklist (TIC) • Effective Behavior Support Survey (EBS) • Schoolwide Evaluation Tool (SET) for K-12 <p>Outcome Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Screening Results • ODRs (Trends, Reductions, Triangle) • Suspensions (ISS, OSS Reductions) • SPP # (SAU Level)
Secondary/Tier 2	<p>Readiness/Fidelity Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative Team Checklist • Tier 2 Blended Checklist <p>Outcome Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Descriptive Summary of Students Served • Success on Behavior Change, Plans • Check In/Check Out Data
Tertiary/Tier 3	TBD

To build school capacity in 10 sites (K-5). **(Literacy)**

<p>Universal/Tier 1</p>	<p>Readiness/Fidelity Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literacy Universal Team Checklist (LUnTCh) • Collaborative team checklist • PET-R <p>Outcome Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Universal screening (e.g., Dibels or Aimsweb) • NECAP proficiency ratings
<p>Secondary/Tier 2</p>	<p>Readiness/Fidelity Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative Team Checklist • Literacy Tier 2 Checklist <p>Outcome Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % students receiving Tier 2 who are returned from Tier 2 to Tier 1 • Increase in the % students receiving Tier 2 who meet NECAP proficiency
<p>Tertiary/Tier 3</p>	<p>Readiness/Fidelity Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative Team Checklist • Literacy Tier 3 Checklist <p>Outcome Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in the % students receiving Tier 3 who are returned from Tier 3 to Tier 2 or Tier 1

Appendix B

Participating Personnel Survey Qualitative Data

SAU Only Respondents

Please provide any other information that can be used to improve the professional development provided by NH RESPONDS.

Miscellaneous Comments (5)

- We just started working on the behavior pieces this year. This is why I checked N/A next to the behavior questions.
- This has been a very effective and important program for SAU 55.
- Our district has been providing professional development in literacy for the past two years. I feel that our district is ahead of the training that the NH responds is providing so we can't take full advantage of the trainings that are offered.
- PD was not targeted to work with the area of emphasis selected. My school elected to address Literacy before behavior, however, consultation at the SAU level was provided primarily by the PBS expert. The few occasions literacy support was provided at the SAU level, the philosophy of the consultant was not in line with current reading research, which emphasizes direct, systematic, explicit instruction vs. a "whole language" or "guided reading" approach and therefore was not helpful. Literacy consultation provided directly to schools, by a different consultant, was much more helpful, especially in terms of looking at data. It was also helpful to have consultation in the schools working directly with Target Teams. Statewide workshops were not as helpful.
- At the high school level, the RTI progress has been significant, but we are not as far along as the elementary level. The administrative team and selected teachers are either in the process of getting training or have been recently trained. The NH RESPONDS work at this district has been primarily with administrators. The teacher training has been through Solution Tree or other outside organizations. Future plans to bring in a nationally recognized speaker on RTI are in the works. We need some subject specific RTI PD at the high school.

School Only Respondents

Please provide any other information that can be used to improve the professional development provided by NH RESPONDS.

Not Much Involvement (4)

- I did not attend the literacy portion of the workshop.
- My role in this committee is very little; I attend meetings once a month and provide parent input but really do not have any other responsibilities, so I do not feel I can give adequate info for your survey.
- I was asked by other administration to attend some, but not all of the meetings that have been held in the past 18 months, so my participation directly correlates to the feedback provided. While behavior supports were certainly a large part of the meetings, I only attended meetings specifically related to the literacy component of the grant.
- I share my position on the RtI Leadership Team with another special educator. I have not been able to attend NH RESPONDS trainings personally, but am learning a great deal from what the other team members bring back from each session. My responses should not be considered of equal weight with those who have fully participated in training.

More Support (3)

- NH RESPONDS helped us get started with RtI and PBIS and now I feel like we don't have too much support.
- We are currently only working with NH RESPONDS on Literacy. The support we have received has been inconsistent and reactive rather than proactive.
- I am a new employee to this school and was given a quick 'history' of the PBIS plan as it relates to the incentives, etc. but I still feel 'out of the loop' as far as what the professional development has been. I'm not sure what that has consisted of this year...other than people in the building filling me in as I ask questions. I am on the committee that meets with the NHRESPONDS representative, but the meetings have been irregular at best since he has had health issues this year. I'm not sure we have had any guidance for the literacy side of this survey...was that a mistake in the survey or were we supposed to be getting help with literacy as well? Maybe other staff members are more aware of this than I am.

Training (3)

- I think it is important to set an agenda and follow up. The professional development seems intermittent.
- Kathy and Maria have been instrumental in our ability to become more effective and efficient.
- The very latest training with Amelia was excellent and will have a tremendous impact, we're hoping on our ability to prepare and interpret data as well as create a more cohesive and responsive action plan using the data.

Continue Support (2)

- We have worked with Howard Muscott from SERESC on implementing positive behavior supports at our upper elementary school. NH RESPONDS has been helpful in implementing change for our literacy program and RtI within our school. It has been particularly helpful with developing a leadership team and developing an action plan for moving forward with our RtI Literacy program.
- I wish to note that our school has been implementing school wide behavior and literacy models for a few years, and therefore, we are in a "refinement" phase- especially with literacy. RESPONDS has been a

positive presence at our leadership meetings, and school walkthroughs have helped the literacy team to adjust their focus. We are thankful for the extra "eyes" on our program, especially as we strive to raise improvement from a 70% success rate to a much higher one. Simultaneously, we are seeking support with our needier populations, so that we can help all students reach their full potential.

Miscellaneous Comments (5)

- We are still working on Tier 1; just started with Michael on Tier 2 & 3
- PBIS and literacy changed my teaching. RENEW changed my life. All positive.
- NH RESPONDS really worked with our school on the literacy implementation and outcomes. We were already a PBS school and have a strong Positive Behavior System in place so the NH RESPONDS didn't impact that as much as the literacy.
- Providing work time for schools to take the info given at the PD workshops and use it to make plans, brainstorm, etc. would be great! It is very hard to listen and take notes all day and then try to find time back at school to meet as a group again and remember all that was said.
- We have spent last year combing out our issues and this year really learning how to use data, communicate in our group and spent a LOT of time creating policy and procedures. We are only now really getting into the meat of the FBAs and referral process, so our success has yet to be tested, to be quite honest. This has been a longer process than I'd expected and FBAs are not coming too easily to me or many as yet. I have no doubt we'll get there. I'm also on our new-this-year literacy team and we are only now creating our 2-year vision statement. We've created our mission statement and are looking at data before we begin the vision statement. So...we're a little green and that is why my scores aren't higher. I know we will ultimately be successful, but it will take more time. We do not have an intensive team...everything seems to fall on our shoulders and I think that is a mistake. We have not figured out how to solve that.

SAU and School Respondents

Please provide any other information that can be used to improve the professional development provided by NH RESPONDS.

Professional Development/Training (3)

- Professional development for PBIS has been meaningful.
- LSCI training provided by Eric Mann and assistant in Rochester was fantastic.
- Tailored professional development in literacy at the building level as attendance by the assigned facilitator has been limited due to absences.

Miscellaneous (5)

- Answers were based on having PBIS training before NHResponds. Answers based on Literacy strand.
- Literacy component reflects "little impact" simply because there was a long-running and existing initiative in place at both building and district levels. Much of the foundational work addressed through RESPONDS had been developed prior to the school's and district's involvement in that program. Likewise with the behavioral piece. Universal and targeted tiers were well established, but are being refined through RESPONDS. The greatest impact has been in the area of intensive strategies in behavior.
- NH RESPONDS has been a critical support for this school in terms of building understanding and sustainable structure. Our work continues but we can already see positive student impact and better understand the continuing work ahead of us. It is hard to rate the SAU impact as much of what is moving is at the school levels and not well coordinated at the SAU level. From a school perspective, this a change model that works through long term development, support and guidance. It has made a huge positive impact on our work and I believe the sustainable structure is now in place for continued service to students.
- We really followed Mike Matteos RTI plan - the district had already formulated the RTI plan, schedule etc. Howard provided guidance as the district moved forward with a Reading Program and each school followed the district guidelines but at this time my school has no behavior plans in place but we will be working with Olweus group district wide for our training. We also have not decided as a district what progress monitoring tools we will implement in the Fall.
- I feel that the middle school is not valued at the Rtl meetings at the SAU. We are overlooked, not included. I had wanted to participate in the interview by Ms. Muller last week. I was told twice not to join the interview session when I attempted to leave the session on Title I. I am not on the Title I committee. I have been going to these meeting for years. The middle school was the first school in the district to implement positive behavior (PBIS). Last year we introduced Rtl in literacy in grade 5. We implemented Rtl in literacy in grade 6 this year. For whatever reason we are not in the loop.

Early Childhood Respondents

Please provide any other information that can be used to improve the professional development provided by NH RESPONDS.

Miscellaneous (2)

- All of the little impact responses refer directly to the team, not to NH RESPONDS. NH RESPONDS has done an excellent job informing the team. Some members of the team are slow to come on board to the ideas and plans.
- The RTI training has been excellent and the monthly meetings/trainings have helped keep us focused on improving our program (not just getting all the day to day work done). Thank you. Thank you.

Appendix C

NH RESPONDS March 14, 2011 RTI Tier 3 Training Report

NH RESPONDS

State Personnel Development Grant

School Team Training on Response to Intervention (RTI) for Behavior or Literacy: Tier 3 Prevention and Intervention

Prepared by

Carol Combs, B.S.
cgoodman@pire.org

Brent Garrett, Ph.D
bgarrett@pire.org

April 1, 2011



Evergreen Evaluation & Consulting, LLC

Introduction

There were ninety participants who responded to at least some of the evaluation questions for the March 14th “School Team Training on RTI for Behavior or Literacy: Tier 3 Prevention and Intervention” (92% response rate).

Participants Role

Participants were asked to select a response that best describes their role. The largest group of respondents identified themselves as other school staff, followed by school administrators, and general education teachers. The responses are provided in Table 1.

Table 1: Role

Other School Staff	27	Other Community Members	1
School Administrators	22	Preschool Teacher	1
General Education Teachers	21	Parent/Family	1
Special Education Teachers	17	Other	27
NH RESPONDS Staff	3		

Other: 5 School Counselors, 4 Reading Specialists, 4 Literacy Specialists, 2 School Psychologists, 2 Guidance Counselors, 2 Paraeducators, 1 of the following positions: 504 Coordinator, Classroom Teacher, NE Comprehensive Center- RTI PLC Member, Occupational Therapist, OTR/L, Psychologist, Reading Teacher, and a Special Education Coordinator

Overall Training

Participants were asked to rate various aspects of the training. The averages for each response category are provided in Table 2. The highest rated items were the relevancy, organization and logistics, and quality. The utility of the professional development scored lower, but still scored relatively high on a 1-6 scale.

Table 2: Quality, Relevance, and Utility of Training

Rate the following:	Mean (N=90)
The professional development was relevant (directly connected to a topic/issue/problem; timely).	5.44
The overall organization and logistics of the event were high quality (e.g., registration, location, room space/environment, food).	5.37
The overall event was high quality (accurate and up-to-date; evidence-based or reflects the best of what we know)	5.33
The team work/action planning was of benefit.	5.29
The professional development was useful (you can adapt and apply information and resource/material to your local system).	5.15
Average:	5.31

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Disagree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 5 = Agree, 6 = Strongly Agree.

Literacy Strand

Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement about the degree to which the literacy strand achieved its training objectives. The averages for each response category are provided in Table 3. While all items scored high, identifying goals/outcomes of a Tier 3 system and describing considerations for an efficient and effective system for the provision of Tier 3 interventions were rated the highest. Participant's ability to describe and begin to complete process assessments for Tier 3 implementation scored lower, but still scored relatively high.

Table 3: At the conclusion of the March 14th Rtl for Literacy Tier 3 workshop, I am able to...

Rate the following:	Mean (N=62)
Identify the goals/outcomes of a Tier 3 system in Response to Intervention.	5.08
Describe at least 2 considerations for an efficient and effective system for the provision of Tier 3 literacy interventions and student supports plan.	5.00
Describe at least 2 considerations for a system for assessing fidelity of implementation, student outcomes, and/or consumer satisfaction.	4.85
Describe how to develop two-way communication (between school staff and families) about your schools' RTI Framework, with attention to Tier 3.	4.75
Identify the mission, membership, role of, and efficient structure for the Tier 3 Team for Blended Behavior and Literacy Supports.	4.68
Describe and begin to complete process assessments for Tier 3 implementation.	4.64
Average:	4.83

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Disagree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 5 = Agree, 6 = Strongly Agree

Behavior Support Strand

Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement with the training outcomes that were provided during the behavior support strand. The averages for each response category are provided in Table 4 (on the next page). The highest rated item was school to mental health referral protocol and how it can support students and families in accessing needed services. The roles of Tier 3 oversight and implementation teams scored lower, but still scored relatively high.

Table 4: Degree to which your knowledge, skills and understanding increased relative to...

Rate the following:	Mean (N=24)
A school to mental health referral protocol and how it can support students and families in accessing needed services.	5.21
Escalating behavior cycle and how it can be used to reduce the likelihood of behavior escalation.	5.08
Conflict cycle and how it can be used to reduce the likelihood of behavior escalation.	5.04
Basic features of life space crisis intervention and how it can be used to reduce the likelihood of behavior escalation.	4.92
Role of a de-escalation team and how it can be used to reduce the likelihood of behavior escalation.	4.88
The roles of Tier III oversight and implementation teams.	4.71
Average:	4.97

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Disagree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 5 = Agree, 6 = Strongly Agree

How could the overall event be improved?

Discussion/Team Time (11)

- More Team Time (8)
 - More team time (3)
 - In the behavioral part, I would have liked to have had a little more team time and maybe some question/answer time with other teams.
 - I would have loved more discussion time with my school to talk about the important questions you asked.
 - More conversation about how schools choose their assessments to use for progress monitoring - Pros and cons or each that have been tried
 - Some team time centered on how to use the information would have been nice but then we wouldn't have been able to cover as much ground. I know I came away from the day with an action plan for myself.
 - I think I needed more guidance/direct teaching about Tier 3 before the triad discussions of the model and group discussion. I think we were discussing Tier 3 not really understanding it. When we opened the discussion to take down a list of Tier 3 features there seemed to be some misinformation volunteered?
- Less Team Time (2)
 - Too much interaction with peers rather than knowledge from experts.
 - Limit the group planning time.
- I loved the time to communicate with the team, it was so helpful

Content/Information (9)

- I was very surprised that the essentials of teaching reading were taught/discussed. Shouldn't teachers already know these!!! If they don't, that should be a separate training.
- It would be very helpful to have suggestions of interventions that have worked for Tier 3 kids in different areas of literacy development.

- The topic was not all about Tier 3 intervention strategies as the brochure stated. It was a lot of RTI review, and language/literacy acquisition and teaching review. I would like to have focused strictly on Tier 3 and how to structure it, as well as how to help those students that aren't succeeding. Also, have the difference/role of Tier 3 and special ed. defined.
- The information on literacy development was too basic. Some of the RTI materials were not functional/practical for a public school setting. It would have been helpful to see the model in action via videos from schools who are fully implemented, or via speakers. Our district is very well resourced, but we still found some of the planning materials to be a bit beyond the functional, practitioner-base from which public school operate.
- Could add additional best practice models.
- More information on how different districts structure this
- Focus more on suggestions for successful interventions pertaining to tier 3
- I would have liked to see more info on practical strategies how setting up and implementing Tier 3
- Our team would have benefited from more ideas on actual interventions for various literacy issues.

Use of Time (5)

- Information was a lot, really fast.
- It was too long and overwhelming to process.
- So much to cover and so little time.
- I would prefer half day but that certainly would not be cost effective so forget it....it is fine the way it is and I really liked how you modeled effective teaching strategy.
- Each system is so different that it is hard to apply all the concepts or ideas appropriately during this one day session. Looking forward to May. Thanks

Room Temperature (9)

- Room was too cold (2)
- Climate Control - too hot or too cold (2)
- It was hard to concentrate with the temperature fluctuations in the room.
- Room temperature was extreme - either too cold or too hot...mostly, too cold....hopefully May temps will be better
- Regulate the temperature in the room. Otherwise, each part of the PD was very well done and practical for those attending.
- The hot/cold/hot/cold temperatures in the room kept me awake. It was a bit uncomfortable but I did appreciate the attempts to fix it.
- A bit of a disappointment with the environment- heating control and such.

Lunch/Snacks (7)

- Chocolate wrapped candy available on breaks.
- Less lunch time, earlier release in afternoon- too long a day
- Ran out of choices for lunch. Usually SERESC get the highest marks, but disappointed this time.
- I think lunch should only be 1/2 hr to 40 min. tops.
- Food was great.... cookies were super great!
- Lunch could have been shorter so we could have gotten out earlier, but I did enjoy a longer lunch than I have at school.
- Limit lunch to 30 minutes and end the workshop at 3:00pm. We have to travel over 1 hour from the workshop to get home.

Presenters/Presentation (6)

- Michael and Stephanie did an excellent job. I liked the way Michael answered questions. Also, he added humor to the workshop which was great.
- I think it was a great balance of interactive activities and lecture!
- In terms of presentation- too many areas left wide open for interpretation. Also, I have seen Shannon and Amelia and your info somewhat contradicts some of their info. Schools need more direct guidance, examples of successful models including schedules, etc.
- We spent a good amount of time on the opening exercise and didn't care for it much. Personal preference.
- If at all possible, more time for presenters to circulate and share knowledge and suggestions.
- I really appreciate the feedback from both Eric and Howard during our team talk time - I would love more of that.

Positive (6)

- Very informative (2)
- Excellent
- It was all very good
- Really great, thanks for all that you do.
- This is driving schools to be better, and creating better learning opportunities for all students.

Logistics (3)

- The registration and other logistics were great!
- I think it was well organized and appreciated the time to share with other districts.
- Coffee continued to be offered throughout the afternoon.

Room Rotation (2)

- Less time spent circulating the room in groups of 3.
- The ending "trio" rotation was probably unnecessary and the time could have been better spent in team time or leaving a bit early

Repetitive (2)

- We seemed to spend a lot of time reviewing, not moving forward.
- Repetition of same message from Stephanie, who is wonderful, from Tier 2 conference.

Miscellaneous (3)

- Break down the tasks/information/expectations into more "do-able" chunks. It all seems so overwhelming.
- Provide more visuals/videos to demonstrate area of focus. How the areas taught could be used in real time.
- Should be a requirement that administration attends with team. Hard to plan without them. Not your fault, but a "push" would be appreciated...if they know it is mandatory...

Literacy Strand Only:

Please provide one example of how you plan to develop and document your method of two-way communication (between school staff and families) about your district's RTI process.

Meetings/Conferences (15)

- Through teacher-parent conferences (4)
- Hold a meeting with staff (2)
- Displays at teacher-parent conferences
- During parent conferences, inform parents of the process as it exists for all students.
- Child Study meetings
- MES Responds team meetings
- Parent meeting updates
- PTO presentation
- Maybe have a meeting at the beginning of the school year to explain what the process is, or have a part of the open house at the beginning of the year to explain the process.
- We do not, at this time, intend to invite parents to attend meetings or sit on committees where they will be viewing confidential student data. We know of no such vehicle where this type of information sharing would be appropriate.
- Personally, I will talk about a child's particular involvement in Tier 3 at IEP (and other parent) meetings in addition to plans that the school makes for disseminating general information.
- We have had two parent meetings during the year to address the RTI process, and we have had a lot of interest from our K-3 parents to participate in their child's education.
- Will present information about RTI at parent teacher meetings and during conferences with parents.

Newsletter (14)

- Newsletters (7)
- Include RTI information in parent newsletter
- We will put a blurb in the monthly newsletter home to parents. This will reinforce what's been said and previously presented to families.
- Hopefully through using our monthly newsletter with a continuous section featuring RTI info.
- Provide additional in school newsletter.
- Draft a parent letter with our school team to describe our Rtl system as it is now, with a vision of what it should be in the near future.
- Inclusion of definition and mission of RTI and its three tiers in our school newsletter.
- We will continue to send letters home to families explaining what skills their child is working on in Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 (or whatever Tiers are applicable to their child).

Parental Involvement (7)

- Invite parents to join our team (4)
- At this time, we have a parent member on the team and communicate regularly with the parent/teacher association.
- We plan to add a parent to our Leadership team, and then have them lead parent information meetings.
- Contact parents regarding Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions on progress monitoring

Pamphlets/Brochures (6)

- Brochure (2)
- Send home general info from PIC pamphlet
- I will start by explaining the brochures and some of the information that we were presented with today.
- We have been sitting on a parent brochure and talking about ways to get info out in multiple ways - our team(s) are still struggling so we haven't done this yet
- We talked about including written information about RTI to the parents periodically.

Planning/Beginning Stages (6)

- Our RTI team will be working on developing this; however our district does not have one process for the whole district.
- I do not know what the plan is for our team to accomplish this goal. I am a new, and willing, member of the team
- Not sure we're able to do that yet.
- We are mapping a timeline for communication with parents once a student is placed in an intervention.
- We are not there yet but are focusing on Tier 1 at this time.
- We have talked about getting feedback from parents when we have developed a process for our transition. I feel as if we are very far behind.

Presentations (5)

- Presentations
- Presentation by the Rtl committee to parents.
- Information is included in the parent handbook and reviewed during our fall curriculum night
- We thought we could also post information on the school website.
- We plan on having a parent meeting at the first Open House.

Curriculum Nights (3)

- Curriculum nights
- We are planning a literacy night, which will showcase student work, as well as offer some information sessions for our families.
- We intend to continue programs such as literacy nights

Email/Website (3)

- E-mails
- Post our Rtl philosophy on our school's website
- Info board and regular email postings

Share/Discuss (3)

- I plan to start getting all school staff familiar with the process.
- Discuss with staff the need to communicate with parents on a regular basis and ways to convey to parents that their input is welcomed and needed.
- We discussed the fact that we first needed to communicate the Rtl process to the core staff better. The leadership team is making advances in our understanding but having difficulty finding time to communicate our new learning to the core staff.

Create Information Form (2)

- With team, develop a form that teachers will use to document communications with parents regarding their child's progress/parent or teacher concerns, etc. including phone calls, in-person conferences.
- Develop a standard form to be given to parents of students receiving RTI tier supports

Handbook (2)

- Handbook
- Describe Rtl and print the mission's statement in the school handbook.

Miscellaneous (1)

- I understand the theoretical components of Tier 3 but the logistics of actual implementation seem insurmountable. I also wonder for a school that is doing well on NECAPS and has a good system in place for early intervention, what damage may be done by skewing our supports in this way and potentially impacting other support systems in place.

Appendix D

2011 Federal Performance Report



U.S. Department of Education
 Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
 Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1894-0003
 Exp. 02/28/2011

PR/Award # (11 characters): _____

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

1. Project Objective: SPDG Program Measures

1.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Measure 1.1 – Evidence-Based Practices (Personnel): The percent of personnel receiving professional development through the SPDG based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional practices.	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			80 / 100	80%		3,961 / 3,961	100%

1.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Measure 1.2 – State Performance Plan (SPP) Alignment: The percent of SPDG projects that implement personnel development/training activities that are aligned with improvement strategies identified in their SPP.	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			5 / 5	100%		5 / 5	100%

1.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Measure 2.1 – Evidence-Based Practices (Training): The percentage of professional development/training activities provided through the SPDG based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices.	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			80 / 100	80%		358 / 358	100%

1.d Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Measure 2.2 – Sustained Practices: The percentage of professional development/training activities based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices, provided through the SPDG program, that are sustained through on-going and comprehensive practices. (Long-term)	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			80 / 100	80%		332 / 358	93%

1.e Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Measure 4.1 – Scale-up Scientific- or Evidence-Based Practices: The percentage of SPDG projects that successfully replicate the use of scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practice in schools. (Long-term)	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			17 / 17	100%		15 / 17	88%

Measure 1.1 - Evidence-Based Practices (Personnel): This measure will be operationalized as the percent of personnel receiving professional development (a duplicated count) through the SPDG based on scientifically based or evidence-based instructional practices, divided by the number of participants who participate in all SPDG PD events. It was determined that all activities entered in the Professional Development Activity Log were considered to have an evidence/science base. So, 3,961 of the 3,961 (or 100%) of the personnel listed in the NH RESPONDS Professional Development Activity Log satisfy this indicator. There were 3,360 individual contacts in the last reporting period (also a duplicated count).

Measure 1.2 - SPP Alignment: Each of three primary components of NH RESPONDS is aligned with NH’s SPP indicators. Targeted indicators for these projects are aligned with the SPP/APR indicators identified below. Program evaluation will monitor trend lines for all of the indicators over the course of the grant cycle.

Part B, #7 and Part C, # 3: % of infants/toddlers & preschool children demonstrating improved positive social-emotional skills; acquisition and use of knowledge and skills; and appropriate use of behaviors.

Part B, #3: Participation and performance on statewide assessments.

Part B, #4: Reduced suspension/expulsions of youth with IEPs.

Part B, #1: Increases % of youth with IEPs graduating with regular diplomas.

Part B, #14: Increased % of youth age with IEPs who have been competitively employed or enrolled in postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving HS.

Measure 2.1- Evidence-Based Practices (Training): This measure will be operationalized as the number of PD activities based on scientific/evidence-based practices, divided by the number of all PD activities. The determination of whether or not an activity is scientific/evidence-based will be determined by project evaluators in conjunction with project staff. As with Measure 1.1, 100% of the PD activities were determined to have an evidence/science base. So, 358 of the 358 (or 100%) of the PD activities documented in the NH RESPONDS PD Activity Log satisfy this indicator. There were 324 activities during the last reporting period.

Measure 2.2 – Sustained Practices: This measure will be operationalized as the number of sustained PD activities, divided by the number of all PD activities. PD will be considered sustained if it is part of a continuous series of activities, as opposed to one-shot training events. Examples of sustained PD will include coaching/on-going technical assistance, modeling through demonstration sites, etc. 332 of the 358 (or 93%) of the PD activities documented in the NH RESPONDS PD Activity Log meet this definition. Last year, 72% of professional development activities met the sustainability definition. Last year, 81% of the professional development activities were coded as sustained.

Measure 4.1 – Scale-up Scientific- or Evidence-Based Practices: The percentage of SPDG projects that successfully replicate the use of scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practice in schools. (Long-term) This measure is operationalized as the current number of ECE programs and schools identified as demo sites, divided by the total number of demo sites scheduled for implementation over the course of the grant. Currently, RESPOND demo sites in the 5 SAUs are 9 elementary schools (1 elementary school dropped out), 2 high schools, and 4 ECE programs (a 5th ECE program recently dropped out of NH RESPONDS) for a total of 15 sites. For additional information about the status of behavior/literacy blended model in the demo sites, see the full report in Section C.

Objective 2: To recruit at least one SAU in the 5 regions of NH who shows readiness and commitment to adopting or expanding RtI systems of PBIS and Literacy (LI) and tertiary Secondary Transition Supports (STS) for students with EBD, and within the 5 SAUs recruit at least 1 Early Childhood SPED program & 2 K-12 schools from each SAU.

2.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Five SAUs are recruited to participate in NH RESPONDS and within those SAUs, 5 EC programs & 10 K-12 schools participate in NH RESPONDS.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		17	/		15	/	

Project Performance Measure 2.a: Five SAUs, geographically spread across the state, were recruited and selected. Within each selected SAU, at least two schools and one early childhood education program agreed to work toward project outcomes. Refer to Section C for additional information on status of the 10 elementary schools, 2 high schools and 4 early childhood programs engaged in NH RESPONDS.

Objective 3: To develop & incorporate a set of competencies required for (a) building administrators, (b) behavior support coaches & (c) program/school-based team members to be considered qualified to design, implement with fidelity, & sustain a 3-tiered system of PBIS, LI, and tertiary STS into all NH Responds PD efforts.

3.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Validated competencies are developed, implemented with fidelity, & sustained in all NH RESPONDS PD efforts.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/	N/A		/	N/A

Project Performance Measure 3.a: The Administrator and Coach Competencies for Universal Level Tier 1 literacy, behavior, and secondary transition reported in last year’s report were validated by NH and national content experts and finalized in January 2011. These competencies were shared with the identified NH RESPONDS IHEs to be used as a framework to assess programs of study in teacher education, administrator and related fields. These assessments can lead to the identification of gaps in programs and action plans to address those gaps.

ECE competencies for emergent literacy and behavior were reviewed by NH experts in spring 2010. Given this feedback, the emergent literacy competencies were modified to be more flexible for different levels of early childhood educator preparation programs (associate and bachelor degree). Behavior expert feedback on the ECE behavior competencies was reviewed and incorporated into a finalized version of these competencies.

At the school and district level, the competencies can be used as a framework for thinking about the roles and responsibilities, as well as the knowledge and skills, necessary to ensure an evidence-based RTI process. School and district administrators may use the competencies to determine in-service professional development

needs that are aligned with individual professional development plans or evaluate personnel. NH RESPONDS staff have requested and received copies of NH RESPONDS demonstration site job descriptions for administrators and coaches for the purpose of conducting a cross-walk between the job descriptions and the appropriate NH RESPONDS competencies. The intent of this process is to identify competencies addressed in current job descriptions and to provide suggestions of key competencies for incorporation into revised job descriptions to ensure sustainability of their SAU RTI systems.

Objective 4: To build SAU capacity by increasing the knowledge and skills of 5 SAUs LTs in designing, implementing with fidelity, assessing & sustaining RtI systems of behavior support and literacy instruction.

4.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
80% of participating SAU personnel report they are more knowledgeable of RtI systems.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			80 / 100	80%		62 / 100	62%

4.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
80% of participating SAU personnel report they are more skilled to support RtI implementation in their schools.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			80 / 100	80%		57 / 100	57%

Project Performance Measure 4.a: SAU personnel participating in NH RESPONDS were asked 13 items about the impact NH RESPONDS professional development had on their knowledge of RTI systems. This included questions about RTI for literacy and behavior, as well as working with data and providing leadership within the SAU. The average score was a 3.08, on a 1-5 scale, for an average of 62% (n=32), indicating a medium impact. The greatest impact on SAU personnel was related to improved knowledge about leadership for consensus building. SAU personnel rated the impact on their knowledge of integrating literacy instruction and PBIS as the lowest impacts of the professional development provided. SAU personnel rated each item lower in 2011 than in 2010 and 2009, reversing the trend from 2009-2010.

Project Performance Measure 4.b: SAU personnel participating in NH RESPONDS were asked 11 items about the impact NH RESPONDS professional development had on their capacity to implement RTI systems. This included questions about RTI for literacy and behavior, as well as working with data and providing leadership within the SAU. The average score was a 2.87, on a 1-5 scale, for an average of 57% (n=32), indicating a medium impact. The highest rated items by SAU personnel were supporting the implementation of Universal strategies of School-Wide Literacy Support (3.7), implementing their SAU/ school-level action plan (3.0), and increasing the collaboration among general & special education personnel at your school (3.0).SAU personnel rated all items lower in 2011 than in the previous two years.

Objective 5: To build program/school capacity by increasing the knowledge and skills of 15 participating site-based primary, secondary and tertiary teams and coaches in designing, implementing with fidelity, assessing and sustaining RtI systems of behavior support and literacy instruction.

5.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
80% of participating school personnel report they are more knowledgeable of RtI systems.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			80 / 100	80%		68 / 100	68%

5.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
80% of participating school personnel report they are more skilled to implement RtI systems.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			80 / 100	80%		67 / 100	67%

5.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
80% of participating schools achieve 80/80 on the SET (School-Wide Evaluation Tool).	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			80 / 100	80%		3 / 9	33%

5d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
80% of participating schools achieve 70% on the literacy fidelity instrument (PET-R: Planning and Evaluation Tool for Effective School-Wide Reading Programs – Revised).	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			80 / 100	80%		4 / 8	50%

Project Performance Measure 5.a: School personnel participating in NH RESPONDS were asked 13 items about the impact NH RESPONDS professional development had on their knowledge of RTI systems. This included questions about RTI for literacy and behavior, as well as working with data. The average score was a 3.39, on a 1-5 scale, for an average of 68% (n=103), indicating a medium to large impact. School personnel rated the impact of the professional development on their knowledge of RTI systems higher than SAU personnel. The greatest school-level impact was on working with student and school-level data. School personnel, like SAU personnel,

rated the impact on their knowledge of integrating literacy instruction and PBIS as the lowest impacts of the professional development provided. School personnel rated all items, except general knowledge of RTI for literacy and literacy instruction (which was the second highest rated item in 2011 at 3.74) and increased knowledge of universal strategies of school-wide literacy support, higher in 2011 than in 2010.

Project Performance Measure 5.b: School personnel participating in NH RESPONDS were asked 11 items about the impact NH RESPONDS professional development had on their capacity to implement RTI systems. This included questions about RTI for literacy and behavior, as well as working with data. The average score was a 3.34, on a 1-5 scale, for an average of 67% (n=103), indicating a medium to large impact. School personnel rated all but two items (providing leadership around RTI and supporting implementation of universal strategies of school-wide literacy instruction) higher in 2011 than in 2010.

Project Performance Measure 5.c: In the current demo site cohort, there are 9 sites engaged in RTI – Behavior work. Five of those schools have had a SET completed at least once during this grant period. As of the most recent SET administration in spring 2010, there were three schools implementing RTI for behavior with fidelity (80%). The other two schools (Chamberlain and Kennett) had temporarily ceased participation in NH RESPONDS or were not ready for the SET in 2010.

Project Performance Measure 5.d: In the current demo site cohort, there are 8 sites engaged in RTI – Literacy work. All but one school has had a PET-R completed at least once during this grant period. As of the most recent PET-R administration for each school, there were four schools implementing RTI for behavior with fidelity (79%). One school (Hilltop) had a 66% and a second school (Maple Wood) had a 68% on their last PET-R, indicating they are close to implementing with fidelity.

Objective 6: To build statewide capacity by increasing the knowledge/skills of 400 K-12 special and general educators, related service personnel and school administrators and 40 family members.

6.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
80% of participating personnel report that statewide training is of high quality, relevant and useful.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			80 / 100	100%		89 / 100	89%

6.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
80% of participating personnel report increased knowledge of RtI for literacy and behavior.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			80 / 100	100%		82 / 100	82%

Project Performance Measure 6.a: A NH RESPONDS School Team Training on RtI: Tier 3 Level, was held on and 3/14/11, with a follow up session scheduled for 5/18/11. There were a total of 90 participants who completed the post-training evaluation. The average score for the quality, relevance and usefulness of the information was a 5.31, on a 1- 6 Likert scale, or 89%.

Project Performance Measure 6.b: A NH RESPONDS School Team Training on RtI: Tier 3 Level, was held on and 3/14/11, with a follow up session scheduled for 5/18/11. There were a total of 90 participants who completed the post-training evaluation. The average score for increased knowledge of RTI – Literacy (4.83) and RTI – Behavior (4.94) was 4.89 on a 1- 6 Likert scale, or 82%. For RTI – Literacy, identifying goals/outcomes of a Tier 3 system and describing considerations for an efficient and effective system for the provision of Tier 3 interventions were rated the highest. Participant’s ability to describe and begin to complete process assessments for Tier 3 implementation scored lower, but still scored relatively high. For RTI – Behavior, the highest rated item was school to mental health referral protocol and how it can support students and families in accessing needed services.

Objective 7: To build ECE program capacity by increasing the knowledge & competency of EC and education professionals in early literacy & PBIS by providing individualized TA & support to 5 child care programs/Head Start/Early Head Start programs.

7a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
80% of participating EC personnel report they are more knowledgeable of early literacy and PBIS.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			80 / 100	80%		69 / 100	69%

7.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
80% of participating EC personnel report they are more skilled to implement early literacy and PBIS at their sites.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			80 / 100	80%		73 / 100	73%

7.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
80% of participating EC sites achieve a 70% on the Pre-SET, the EC PBIS fidelity instrument.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			80 / 100	80%		0 / 4	0%

7.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
80% of participating EC sites achieve a 50% on the CLASS, the EC early literacy fidelity instrument.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			80 / 100	80%		0 / 4	0%

Project Performance Measure 7.a: Participating early childhood personnel participating in NH RESPONDS were asked 8 items about the impact NH RESPONDS professional development had on their knowledge of ECE RTI literacy and behavior strategies, working with data, and developing action plans to guide their work. The average score was a 3.45, on a 1-5 scale, for an average of 69% (n=12), indicating a medium to large impact. The highest rated items in 2011 were developing program/center-level action plans that helped them develop consensus building for Positive Behavior Supports in their program/center (3.75) and increasing their knowledgeable of Positive Behavior Supports (3.67).

Project Performance Measure 7.b: Participating early childhood personnel participating in NH RESPONDS were asked 8 items about the impact NH RESPONDS professional development had on their knowledge of ECE RTI literacy and behavior strategies, working with data, and developing action plans to guide their work. The average score was a 3.64, on a 1-5 scale, for an average of 73% (n=12), indicating a medium to large impact. The provision of leadership (4.17), implementing the center/program action plan (4.00), and increasing the collaboration among general and special educators (4.0) were perceived to have had the largest impact on ECE implementation of RTI early literacy and behavior strategies. In a similar manner to the consensus building questions in Table 30, participants reported a large increase in the degree of collaboration among general and special educators (from 2.92 in 2010 to 4.00 in 2011).

C: No schools have achieved an 80% on the PreSET. The average PreSET score across the 4 ECE settings is 50.7%

D. C: No schools have achieved a 50% on the CLASS. The average CLASS score across the 4 ECE settings is 47.1%

Objective 8: To build statewide capacity to provide individualized, self-directed school-to-career transition services to youth with emotional & behavioral challenges by increasing the capacity of school personnel and community-based providers in the use of RENEW strategies & supports.

8a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
80% of participating high school personnel report an increased knowledge of resources, including natural supports, in-school and out-of-school resources and community resources.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			80 / 100	80%		999 / 999	

8.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
80% of participating high school personnel report there is a more developed infrastructure for the implementation of secondary transition strategies.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			80 / 100	80%		999 / 999	

8c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
80% of participating high schools achieve 70% on the Secondary Transition Supports fidelity instrument.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			70 / 100	70%		999 / 999	

Project Performance Measure 8.a & b: There was an insufficient response to the NH RESPONDS Participant Survey this year. This coupled with a low incidence set of teachers has caused us to change our method of data collection for next year. Instead of an online survey, we will conduct focus groups in 2012 in order to respond to these specific indicators, but also provide richer summative data for the final report. More information about the training provided and other RENEW-related activities can be found in the full evaluation narrative.

Project Performance Measure 8.c: Of the 28 people trained in RENEW in the fall of 2010, 20 have participated in a RENEW Fidelity check during March 2011. At the time of this report, however, the results are not available.

Objective 9: To work with the NHDOE Professional Standards Board and IHEs to reform and improve state standards for certification & endorsement programs for PBIS, LI, & STS for students with EBD.

9.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The NH DOE reforms & improves standards for certification & endorsement programs for PBIS, LI, & STS for students with EBD.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/	N/A		/	N/A

9.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Educator preparation programs are revised to reflect state standards and competencies in scientifically-based RtI systems of PBIS, LI, and STS for students with EBD.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/	N/A		/	N/A

9.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
A graduate or undergraduate course or training series in best practices in School-to Career Secondary Transition Services.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/	N/A		/	N/A

Project Performance Measure 9.a & b: The NH RESPONDS IHE Consortium includes NH RESPONDS Leadership Team members, administrators and professors representing the University of New Hampshire, Keene State College, and River College, as well as members of the Department of Education Bureau of Licensure and Certification. The IHE Consortium has met three times this year and will be meeting again in late April 2011. During this reporting period IHE personnel have utilized NH RESPONDS matrices to compare the NH RESPONDS general RTI competencies against their selected teacher preparation programs and courses linked to literacy, behavior and secondary transition. Three of the four IHEs have already identified the courses for which each competency is addressed under and are working to document the evidence they would collect to demonstrate competence. The fourth IHE is currently identifying the programs for which they will complete curriculum mapping before they initiate the above process. As a result of their NH RESPONDS work, Keene State College added an RTI component to the Action Research Project completed during the student teaching placement for each Elementary Education and Elementary/Special Education student.

Next steps for the IHE Consortium include: 1) finalizing the comparison of the NH RESPONDS competencies against the respective IHE courses, with the goal to embed the competencies in the IHE curriculum, 3) identifying NH certifications coming up for review that may be impacted by the NH RESPONDS competencies, and 3) sharing information and work with the Department of Education subcommittees for proposed certification reform.

In addition to the above IHE Consortium work, NH RESPONDS Leadership Team members were active on the NH RTI Taskforce. The NH RTI Taskforce completed its' assigned tasks in Summer 2010 and now has transformed into a NH RTI Professional Learning Community (PLC). The NH RTI PLC will carry out the developed NH RTI strategic plan for 2009-2013 that provides a map for the design and implementation of a systematic state and district RTI framework including alignment with key initiatives of the NH Department of Education, inclusive of NH RESPONDS. One of the goals of this strategic plan is focused on the development of effective teachers and leaders (in-service and pre-service). In February 2011, the NH RTI PLC invited representatives from various NH IHEs with teacher preparation programs to participate in a NH RTI PLC meeting for discussion on how to incorporate RTI into their respective pre-service teacher preparation programs. The NHRESPONDS IHEs were invited to attend this meeting to share their thoughts.

The NH RTI PLC is planning to have another meeting in April 2011 with the NH IHEs in which the NHRESPONDS staff and IHEs have been asked to share their work thus far to incorporate RTI into their teacher preparation programs. NH RESPONDS Leadership Team members will continue to be active in the work of the NH RTI PLC to ensure infusion of NH RESPONDS concepts, principles and practices into the larger state efforts.

Project Performance Measure 9.c.: The NH RESPONDS Leadership Team members is also collaborating with university partners and the Strafford Learning Center to facilitate the above two webinars and to deliver a training series in best practices in School-to-Career Transition services at Keene State College. Also to address grant objectives, the Institute on Disability (NH's UCEDD) included transition best practice tools and practices in its "Introduction to Exceptionality" course for spring 2011. Keene State College this year posted its video-taped snippets of questions and answers with Ed O'Leary from our August 2009 training and made them available on their Transition Planning Resources website at Keene State College. The *IEP Transition Resource* is a multimedia training and reference tool designed to increase understanding about IEP transition requirements and indicator 13. This is a series of 18 short videos and a listing of resources on transition services and Indicator 13 (<http://tinyurl.com/IEP-Transition-Resource>).