New Hampshire Special Education District Report
Report to Public FFY 2014 APR (July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015)

District Name: Kensington

Grade Span: PS-5 School(s): K-5

Children with Disabilities ages 3 to 5: CS
Children and Youth with Disabilities ages 6 to 21: 14
Children and Youth with Disabilities: CS

The State Performance Plan (SPP) is a six year plan to improve outcomes for children and youth with disabilities. The Annual Performance Report (APR) is the annual report of progress on the indicators of the SPP. IDEA requires that states report annually to the public on the performance of each local education agency (LEA) or district on 14 of the 17 indicators. The District Data Profiles Reference Sheet provides an indicator-by-indicator explanation of the profiles. The New Hampshire (SPP) and (APR) are available online at http://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/special_ed/spp.htm.

Indicator 1: Graduation Rate: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma: 2013-2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth with Disabilities:</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>71.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator 2: Dropout Rate: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school: 2013-2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth with Disabilities:</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicator 3: Participation and Performance of students with disabilities on statewide assessments: October 2013 NECAP and 2013-2014 NH Alternate Assessment

A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meets the State’s AMO targets for the disability subgroup.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did this district meet AMO for disability subgroup?</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of districts in the State that met AMO for disability subgroup</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicator 3A is no longer required due to the passage of Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).
B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Reading State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Math State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>91.10%</td>
<td>91.10%</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>91.14%</td>
<td>91.14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Reading State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Math State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63%</td>
<td>19.31%</td>
<td>19.31%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>13.29%</td>
<td>13.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator 4: Rates of Suspension/Expulsion: 2013-2014

A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did this district have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days for children with IEPs?</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of districts in the State that had significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities:</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did this district have a significant discrepancy in (a) by race or ethnicity in the rate of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use or positive behavioral interventions and supports and procedural safeguards?</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of districts in the State that had significant discrepancies in (a) by race or ethnicity in the rate of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use or positive behavioral interventions and supports and procedural safeguards:</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Indicator 5: School Age Placement – Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21: October 1, 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day:</td>
<td>83.93%</td>
<td>72.85%</td>
<td>72.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day:</td>
<td>6.89%</td>
<td>7.97%</td>
<td>8.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. In separate schools, residential facilities or homebound/hospital placements:</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
<td>2.61%</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program, and</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50.36%</td>
<td>56.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18.22%</td>
<td>15.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator 7: Preschool Performance:**

**A:** Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program.</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>79.50%</td>
<td>82.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited the program.</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>61.60%</td>
<td>62.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome B:** Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) and early literacy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program.</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>78.90%</td>
<td>81.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they exited the program.</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>60.90%</td>
<td>60.68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**New Hampshire Special Education District Report**

Report to Public FFY 2014 APR (July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015)

**District Name:** Kensington

**Grade Span:** PS-5  
**School(s):** K-5

**Outcome C:** Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program.</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>76.80%</td>
<td>80.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they exited the program.</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>63.20%</td>
<td>66.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator 8: Parent Involvement: 2014-2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitate parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation due to Inappropriate Identification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. Did this district have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification?</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation due to Inappropriate Identification: Specific Disability Categories: 2013-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. Did this district have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification in the disability categories of autism, emotional disturbance, mental retardation, other health impairments, specific learning disabilities or speech/language impairments?</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of children who were evaluated within 45 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or within 60 days with a time extension.</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NIE</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96.11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96.86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 13: Secondary Planning:
Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>54.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator 14: Post School Outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>39.56%</td>
<td>38.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>63.11%</td>
<td>67.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>77.78%</td>
<td>80.57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>