District Name: Waterville Valley

Grade Span: PS-12 School(s): K-8

Children with Disabilities ages 3 to 5: 0
Children and Youth with Disabilities ages 6 to 21: 2
Children and Youth with Disabilities: 2

The State Performance Plan (SPP) is a multi-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 20 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: 2009-2010

<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>75%</td>
<td>71.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator 2: Dropout Rate: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school: 2009-2010

<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>3.3%</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator 3: Participation and Performance of students with disabilities on statewide assessments: October 2010 NECAP and 2009-2010 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 AYP targets for the 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>47%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Indicator 3 (continued):

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District (Elem)</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>District (Elem)</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District (HS)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District (Elem)</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>District (Elem)</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>70.40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>69.19%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District (HS)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>70.40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>69.19%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator 4: Rates of Suspension/Expulsion: 2009-2010

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.

Did this district have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days for children with IEPs? District State Target | State
NO | 2.87% | 3.45%

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.

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 of positive Interventions and supports and procedural safeguards? District State Target | State
NO | 0% | 0%
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Indicator 5: School Age Placement – Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:
December 1, 2010

<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>100.00%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>72.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. In separate schools, residential facilities or homebound/hospital placements:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Indicator 7: Preschool Performance:

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

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 (66.3% Baseline).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited the program (71.3% Baseline).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>68.4%</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.

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 (67.1% Baseline.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they exited the program (53.4% Baseline).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Grade Span: PS-12  
School(s): K-8

Indicator 7: Preschool Performance (continued):

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

1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectation in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program (68.5% Baseline).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they exited the program (63.1% Baseline).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator 8: Parent Involvement: 2010-2011

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>50%</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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation due to Inappropriate Identification: Specific Disability Categories: 2010-2011

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator 11: Evaluation Timeliness: 2010-2011

Percent of children who were evaluated within 45 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or within 60 days with a time extension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator 12: Early Intervention to Preschool Special Education Transition: 2010-2011

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>NT</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition Planning:

Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals 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>District</th>
<th>State Target</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
District Name: Waterville Valley  
Grade Span: PS-12  
School(s): K-8

**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><strong>A:</strong> 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>43.2%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B:</strong> 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>70.2%</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C:</strong> 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>82.6%</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>