New Hampshire Special Education District Report

District Name: Chester

Children with disabilities ages 3 to 5: 16
Children and Youth with disabilities ages 6 to 21: 133
Children and Youth with Disabilities: 149

The New Hampshire State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) are available online at http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/instruction/SpecialEd/OSEPreports.htm. The SPP is a five year plan to improve outcomes for children and youth with disabilities. The 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 20 indicators. The District Data Profiles Reference Sheet provides an indicator-by-indicator explanation of the profiles.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth with Disabilities</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator 2: Dropout Rate:
Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth with Disabilities</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator 3: Participation and Performance of students with disabilities on statewide assessments:

A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size meeting the State’s AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.

Did this district meet AYP objectives for disability subgroup? Yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of districts in the State that met AYP objectives for disability subgroup:</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District</td>
<td>State Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97%</td>
<td>96.18%</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District</td>
<td>State Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34%</td>
<td>40.85%</td>
<td>29.12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Indicator 4: Rates of Suspension/Expulsion:

A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year.

Did this district have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities? No

Percent of districts in the State that had significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator 5: School Age Placement - Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:

a. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day: 59.0%
b. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day: 4.0%
c. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements: 5.3%

Indicator 6: Preschool Settings:

Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (e.g., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator 7: Preschool Performance:

Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator 8: Parent Involvement:

Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/M</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation due to Inappropriate Identification

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? No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation due to Inappropriate Identification: Specific Disability Categories

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator 11: Evaluation Timelines:

Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days (or State established timeline).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator 12: Part C to Part B Transition:

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cs</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator 13: Transition Planning:

Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/M</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator 14: Postschool Outcomes:

Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>---%</td>
<td>---%</td>
<td>---%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>