

**NEW HAMPSHIRE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAM APPROVAL VISITATION
CASE STUDY COMPLIANCE REVIEW**

**GRANITE HILL SCHOOL
SUMMARY REPORT**

**Mark Bissell, Ph.D., Chief Executive Officer
Danielle Paranto, B.S., M.Ed., Principal, Executive Director
Nancy Pierce, B.A., Special Education Coordinator**

Chairperson(s), Visiting Team:
Kathryn Skoglund, Education Consultant
Joseph Miller, Education Consultant

Site Visit Conducted on November 4-5, 2014
Date of Report: March 2, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Team Members
- II. Introduction
- III. Purpose and Design of The Case Study Compliance Review Process
- IV. Status of Previous Program Approval Report and Corrective Actions
- V. November 4-5, 2014 Case Study Compliance Review Results
 - Local Education Agency (LEA) Survey
 - Parent Participation
 - Summary of Findings from the Three Focus Areas
 - Commendations
 - Issues of Significance
 - Findings of Noncompliance
 - Suggestions for Program Improvement
- VI. Building Level Summary Report

I. TEAM MEMBERS

Visiting Team Members:

NAME	PROFESSIONAL ROLE
Kathryn Skoglund, Chairperson	Education Consultant
Joseph Miller, Chairperson	Education Consultant
David Parker	Private School Director
Meg Beauchamp	Director, Special Instructional Services
Nash Reddy	Director of Student Services
Isaac Sargent	Curriculum Coordinator
Mary Lane	NHDOE Consultant
Bridgette Brown	NHDOE Consultant

Building Level Team Members from Granite Hill School:

NAME	PROFESSIONAL ROLE
Danielle Paranto	Principal, Executive Director
Nancy Pierce	Special Education Coordinator
Nicole Galloway	Special Education Teacher
Bob D'Errico	Transition Coordinator
Nina Albano	School Therapist
Jeff Hardstedt	English Teacher
Sarah Attwood	Behavior Specialist
Harry Jones	Special Education Teacher
Kate Sargent	Classroom Teacher (K-8)
Beth Sebring	Classroom teacher (K-8 Science)
Breanna Davis	Reading Specialist
Karen Cook	Paraprofessional
Megan Leo	Classroom Teacher (English)
Tim Goggin	Special Education Teacher

II. INTRODUCTION

Granite Hill School (GHS) in Newport, New Hampshire is a private school that accepts boys and girls ages 11 through 21, grades 6-12. Granite Hill is approved by the New Hampshire Department of Education, Bureau of Special Education, to provide services to students who have been diagnosed with one or more of the following educational disabilities: Autism, Emotional Disturbance, Other Health Impairment, and Specific Learning Disabilities. Most students have been unsuccessful in public school settings due to disruptive behaviors, under developed social skills, or difficulty in mastering core academic skills. Currently Granite Hill School serves approximately 30 students and is approved for 35 students. In addition to the day program, the school offers work study options and afternoon and evening classes to meet the varied needs of their students. These course offerings provided outside of the typical school day are the same classes taught during the school day and are instructed by the certified staff at GHS. The school has non-public school approval from the NHDOE Bureau of School Approval and is able to grant a high school diploma based on the New Hampshire required 20 credits.

The work study and vocational opportunities, supervised by a vocational trainer, are based on a model of experiential education and participatory learning in approved settings. The tiered approach to providing these opportunities includes: community service, volunteering, employment training, job shadowing, internships and part-time employment. Students advance in the program based upon established criteria and on-going evaluation.

Social skills, education and behavior regulation skills are the foundation of the mission and vision of Granite Hill School. As a mission, Granite Hill School would like to expand the academic and social skills of each student. They strive to provide a quality, individualized educational program, and to develop the methodology and practices of an educational institution of the highest quality. As a vision, Granite Hill School would like to become a recognized leader in the field of private, social skills education.

The Granite Hill School philosophy:

At Granite Hill School, we believe that educational success depends largely on the development of social skills, personal responsibility, social problem solving and the desire to better ones self. Without social skills, students cannot participate in the educational process in a meaningful way.

Our model is not deficit based—in other words, we do not view the student as disabled or emotionally troubled. Instead, we use a contextual model (or, as some call it, a Strength-based model), creating an environment whose social context is right for individual prosperity and student success.

Future success also depends largely on an ability to interact successfully in a wide variety of social situations. Thus, the development of pro-social skills and social problem solving skills are an essential cornerstone of our educational philosophy. Likewise, educational and life success is highly dependent on the content of one's character.

At Granite Hill School, we strive to develop the R.I.G.H.T. (Respect, Integrity, Good citizenship, Honesty, and Tolerance) character for each student we serve.

School Demographics:

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS	2013-2014	2014-2015
Total Student Enrollment as of October 1	32	33
Special Education Student Enrollment as of October 1	32	32
Do you accept out-of-state students? If so, list number from each state in 2014-15	Yes Vermont 2	
Number and Names of Sending New Hampshire LEAs (as of October 1, 2014)	SAU6 Claremont; SAU43 Newport; SAU38 Monadnock; SAU29 Keene; SAU71 Goshen- Lempster; SAU34 Hillsborough-Deering; SAU24 Stoddard; SAU88 Lebanon; SAU65 Kearsarge	
# of Identified Students Suspended One or More Times	4	1
Average Length of Stay for Students	20	20
<u>STAFF DEMOGRAPHICS</u>		
Student/Teacher Ratio (as of October 1, 2014)	3:1	3:1
# of Certified Administrators	2	2
# of Certified Teachers	10	10
# of Current Teachers with Certification through Alt 4	0	0
# of Related Service Providers	1	1
# of Paraprofessionals	5	5
# of Professional Days Made Available to Staff	10	10
SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM DATA <i>(please put NA if not approved for the disability)</i>		
<u>Primary Disability Types:</u>	2013-2014	2014-2015
Autism	5	0
Deaf / Blindness	N/A	N/A
Deafness	N/A	N/A
Developmental Delay	N/A	N/A
Emotional Disturbance	20	21
Hearing Impairment	N/A	N/A
Intellectual Disability	N/A	N/A
Multiple Disabilities	N/A	N/A
Orthopedic Impairment	N/A	N/A
Other Health Impairment	6	5
Specific Learning Disabilities	1	6
Speech-Language Impairment	N/A	N/A
Traumatic Brain Injury	N/A	N/A
Visual Impairment	N/A	N/A

III. PURPOSE AND DESIGN OF THE CASE STUDY COMPLIANCE REVIEW PROCESS

The New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) conducted a Special Education Program Approval Visit to Granite Hill School on November 4-5, 2014 for the purpose of reviewing the present

status of programs and services made available to children and youth with educational disabilities. Program Approval Visits are conducted using a Case Study Model that is a focused review. This focused review permits the NHDOE to leverage its impact for change and improvement within private special education schools statewide, by focusing the attention of all educators on the following three areas of critical importance in the provision of FAPE for students with disabilities.

- Access to the General Curriculum
- Transition
- Behavior Strategies and Discipline

As part of this compliance review, students were randomly selected by the NHDOE prior to the visit, and staff was asked to present these students' case studies at the visit to determine compliance with state and federal special education rules and regulations.

Other activities related to this NHDOE Case Study Compliance Visit included the review of:

- All application materials submitted
- Status of corrective actions since the last NHDOE Special Education Program Approval Visit
- Personnel credentials for special education staff (verified by NHDOE)
- Program descriptions
- All data collected during the visit

The New Hampshire Department of Education provided a visiting team of professional educators to work collaboratively with staff in each of the schools in conducting the Case Study Compliance Review and the varied data collection activities. Throughout the entire review process, the visiting team worked in collaboration with the staff of Granite Hill School. Their professionalism, active involvement in the process and cooperation were greatly appreciated and well recognized.

Evidence of the work conducted and results related to student outcomes were gathered throughout the process, guided by the materials and templates provided by the NHDOE, Bureau of Special Education. Examples of evidence included student individual education programs (IEPs), progress reports, samples of student work, grades, extracurricular involvement, permanent records, curriculum, etc. Input was gathered from key constituents, including interviews with professional staff, parents, administrators, and in some cases the students. In addition, classroom observations were conducted for each of the case studies being reviewed. The collective data were summarized by the visiting and building level teams. The summaries, included in the following pages, outline identified areas of strength and areas needing improvement for each school reviewed.

IV. STATUS OF PREVIOUS NHDOE SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM APPROVAL REPORT AND CORRECTIVE ACTIONS

Based on review of the December 11, 2009, NHDOE Special Education Program Approval Report, the following patterns were identified as needing improvement:

Findings of Noncompliance	Status as of April 7, 2010	Status as of November 4-5, 2014
Ed 1102m CFR 300.43 Transition Services Ed 1109.01 a1, CFR 300.32b Finding; Post-Secondary	MET	MET; professional development was provided to all staff and the writing of post-secondary goals has continued to be monitored by

goals were not written in measurable terms.		the special education coordinator.
---	--	------------------------------------

V. NOVEMBER 4-5, 2014 CASE STUDY COMPLIANCE REVIEW RESULTS

Data collection is an important part of the NHDOE Special Education Case Study Compliance Review Process. In order to monitor whether or not special education programs are in compliance in the three focus areas, and determine any root causes of problems that may be identified through the case study process, it is essential that each case study team look deeply into the data that surrounds the three primary aspects of the Case Study Review. This process takes time, and the entire team working with the child being reviewed must be involved in collecting and analyzing the data, as well as presenting and summarizing the data with the visiting team. As such, NHDOE works with private schools to determine the number and type of case studies to be prepared and presented, and to ensure that building teams are not inundated with more data than can be fully analyzed, allowing them to reflect upon and generalize their newly found knowledge of their programs, practices, policies and procedures.

Three students were randomly selected for the case studies to be presented by the Granite Hill School staff. Each of the students was from a different sending district and represented different grade levels, disability and gender. The case studies included two males (grade 7, age 13 and grade 9, age 14) and one female (grade 10, age 15) and reflected the following disabilities: Emotional Disturbance and Other Health Impaired. All three of these students have come to Granite Hill School with significant histories of negative behaviors interfering with their educational progress.

LEA SURVEYS

Private schools provide necessary options to New Hampshire students with educational disabilities. Effective partnerships with LEAs are an important part of establishing and implementing successful private special education programs that improve student outcomes. By surveying LEA perceptions of current program(s), private schools can self assess these relationships and determine if there are areas in need of improvement. To this end, Granite Hill School distributed the LEA Survey to the contact people in all LEAs that have students currently enrolled in the school. They received an 89% response from the LEAs.

Analysis of LEA Response by Granite Hill School:

The data collected from these surveys validated the quality work of the GHS team. It was excellent to see that all responsive parties agreed that GHS meets or exceeds their expectations and that the LEA's would continue to use GHS as a quality educational school program for special education students. Lastly, the Granite Hill School could benefit from providing more feedback regarding student work as it is aligned with the curriculum.

SUMMARY REPORT OF SENDING LEAs

INSTRUCTIONS: PLEASE TYPE TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES IN EACH BOX.
SCALE 4 STRONGLY AGREE 3 AGREE 2 DISAGREE 1 STRONGLY DISAGREE

	4	3	2	1	No Answer
1. The private school has a curriculum fully aligned to NH Curriculum Frameworks/Common Core State Standards.	6	2			
2. I am satisfied the student has made progress in the educational curriculum at the above school.	7	1			

Name of Private School: The Granite Hill School		
Total number of surveys sent: 9	Total # of completed surveys received:8	Percent of response:89%
Number of students placed by: LEA: All	Court:	Parent:

3. There is evidence of effective instruction aligned with fidelity to the curriculum.	5	3			
4. The school consistently follows special education rules and regulations.	7	1			
5. The school has developed and implemented effective policies and procedures for management of student behavior including the use of aversives.	8				
6. The school has an effective behavioral management program.	8				
7. I am satisfied with the special education, related and other supplementary aids and services provided by the school.	6	2			
8. The school implements all parts of students' IEPs including accommodations and modifications in both instruction and assessment.	7	1			
9. The school effectively uses data to measure academic growth and to inform instruction.	7	1			
10. The school uses data to measure behavioral growth and to inform instruction.	7	1			
11. A mid-year review and annual evaluation of the child's progress relative to the IEP are conducted.	7	1			
12. The school has a comprehensive progress monitoring system that is communicated and provided to LEA and parents at least as often as the sending district (minimum 3 times per year).	8				
13. The progress monitoring reports describe the child's progress toward meeting the IEP goals, include a record of attendance, and are written in terminology understandable to the parent.	6	2			
14. I am satisfied with the way the school communicates students' progress to the parents and the LEA.	8				
15. The school actively plans for future transition to a less restrictive environment.	8				
16. The school implements all aspects of the transition services needs for students turning 14 during the IEP service period and Transition Services as outlined in Indicator 13 (16 years).	8				
17. If the school finds it necessary to change or terminate placement, they notify the LEA by convening the IEP team to: review the concerns, review/revise the IEP, discuss the placement and determine if the facility can fully implement the IEP and provide FAPE.	7	1			
18. The school team sets meeting times that are convenient for both parents and the LEA.	8				
19. I would enroll other students at the school.	8				

PARENT PARTICIPATION

One of the defining features of effective schools is strong parent/community relations and open communication. Having parents as active stakeholders in the NHDOE Special Education Program Approval Process ensures broader perspectives and brings forth new ideas. In addition, including the parent perspective enhances and strengthens the teams' case study presentations, and makes for stronger school/parent relationships. As such, parent participation and input is a required part of the NHDOE Special Education Program Approval Process. In order to ensure parent participation and feedback, the NHDOE, Bureau of Special Education involves parents in a variety of aspects of the Special Education Program Approval Process. First, parents are encouraged to be active participants in the case study presentations; second, parents of the children presented in the case study process are formally interviewed; and third, the school is required to send all parents of students with disabilities a written survey with a request to respond. Below is a summary of the results of the parent survey, along with a summary of the comments/feedback provided to the visiting team during this Case Study Compliance Review.

SUMMARY OF PARENT SURVEY DATA

Name of Private School: The Granite Hill School		
Total number of surveys sent: 30	Total # of completed surveys received: 19	Percent of response: 63%

INSTRUCTIONS FOR SCHOOL:

PLEASE FILL IN ACTUAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES (NOT PERCENT) IN EACH BOX.

SCALE 3 = COMPLETELY 2 = PARTIALLY 1 = NOT AT ALL

ACCESS TO THE GENERAL CURRICULUM:	3	2	1	No Answer
1. I am satisfied that my child has access to the general education curriculum (Academic IEP goals and school curriculum aligned with Common Core State Standards /NH Curriculum Frameworks).	17	1	1	
2. My child has opportunities to interact with non-disabled peers on a regular basis unless the IEP team has determined that the interaction is not appropriate/reasonable.	16	2		1
3. I am informed on a regular basis and with clear evidence of my child's progress in the general education curriculum.	15	3		1
4. I understand that a variety of information (observations, test scores, results of evaluations, school work samples, behavioral data, etc.) was considered in developing my child's IEP for this placement.	16	3		
5. I am satisfied that there is a direct connection between my child's needs and the components of his/her IEP and the supports and services ("reasonably calculated to provide educational benefit").	5		1	13
6. I am satisfied that the sending school district has fully considered the Least Restrictive Environment in recommending this placement for my child (to the maximum extent appropriate, my child is educated with non-disabled peers).	5			14
7. I know whom to contact if I have questions about my child's placement or progress in this program.	6			13
8. I am satisfied that the staff of this placement worked collaboratively with my school district in developing my child's current IEP.	5	1		13
9. I have been involved in the development of my child's IEP.	6			13
10. I am satisfied that my child is making progress toward his/her IEP goals.	16	2		1
FOR PARENTS OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS ONLY:				
11. My child earns credits toward a regular high school diploma in all of his/her classes.	15	1		3
12. My student will graduate with a high school diploma	5			14

TRANSITION:				
13. I am satisfied with the planning and support provided for my child as he/she moves from grade to grade, school to school, public school to private school.	15		1	3
14. All of the people who are important to my child's transition were part of the planning (grade appropriate).	17	1		1
15. All of the people/agencies who are required to be part of transition planning for my child were part of the transition process.	5	1		13
16. FOR PARENTS OF STUDENTS AGE 16 OR OLDER ONLY: I am satisfied that my child's IEP meets all the requirements of Secondary Transition: measureable post-secondary goals, necessary supports and services, age-appropriate transition assessments, specific invitation to the Transition meeting, etc. (DOE Indicator #13)	13	2		4
17. I am satisfied that the post-secondary Transition Goals for my child are reviewed on a regular basis, have the necessary supports and services to be accomplished, are connected to annual IEP goals, and can lead my child to productive participation/activities post-graduation or post-21 years as appropriate.	4	2		13
BEHAVIOR STRATEGIES AND DISCIPLINE:				
18. My child's classroom behaviors affect his/her ability to learn. <i>If the answer is yes, please answer the next two questions. If no, skip to OTHER.</i>	YES		NO	
	3	2	1	No Answer
19. I have been involved in the development of behavior interventions, strategies and supports for my child.	12	3	1	3
20. I am satisfied with the way the school is supporting my child's behavioral, social and developmental needs.	15		1	3
OTHER:				
21. I fully participate in special education decisions regarding my child.	16			3
22. I have been provided with a copy of the procedural safeguards (parental rights) at least once a year.	18			1

Analysis of Parent Survey Responses by Granite Hill School:

Surveys showed 85% satisfaction with their child having access to the general curriculum. Parents were also satisfied with our transitional services with ratings of 85%. Lastly, regarding behavior and strategies, parents viewed us equally as strong with ratings of 86%.

Areas that GHS could benefit from focusing on include explaining in more detail how their child is moving through the general curriculum and working with students more closely on transitioning out of high school. For an Action Plan, Granite Hill School believes it would be beneficial to have more contact in person with parents regarding what the class is working on and how their child is progressing i.e. teacher conferences and open house.

SUMMARY FROM THE THREE FOCUS AREAS OF THE CASE STUDY COMPLIANCE REVIEW

Access to the General Curriculum

Implementation of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs)

Provision of Non-Academic Services

Full Access to the District's Curriculum

Equal Education Opportunity

The Program Approval chairperson reviewed the GHS curriculum and found that evidence of “Full Access to the General Curriculum” is clear at Granite Hill School. Subject-specific curriculum has been developed and comprises the standards of College and Career Ready Standards and is inclusive of essential questions, materials/resources, scope and sequence, and assessments. Lesson plans were readily available for our review and are clearly linked to the CCRS standards. Lesson goals and student learning objectives are posted in classrooms and students were able to articulate them. Teachers are certified (and/or certified consultants are available as required) and skilled in pedagogical strategies necessary to implement the IEPs of students with the learning needs in evidence at GHS. IEP binders are in use for each student and contain not only the current IEP, but samples of student work, assessment and behavior data, required accommodations, behavioral data, observations, information from student conferences, etc. Either universal design for learning techniques and/or differentiated instruction was evident through the classroom observations conducted by the visiting team. Community experiences and work opportunities are available for all students and integrate student learning objectives. Granite Hill School offers a high school diploma.

GHS has designed a Staff Development Master Plan that is very supportive of its staff and provides focus on teaching and learning strategies, instructional options, assisting students with transitions, managing student behaviors, helping student develop coping mechanisms. Finally, GHS offers a teacher induction and mentoring program that provides targeted support to increase the capacity of its staff to meet the needs of their students.

Transition

Transition Planning

Process: Provision of Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE)

Transition Services

The visiting team was able to confirm thorough and deliberate planning with regard to transitions by its review of documents and team meeting minutes. Careful attention is given to communication with sending school districts and other agencies engaged in the IEP Team discussions (DCYF, Vocational Rehabilitation, district courts and JPPO's) during the placement process. It was evident that GHS had adequate and up to date information in advance of placement decisions. Although there were situations where planning with parents was difficult (parents unavailable due to incarceration or other legal issues), GHS continues to strive to engage all parents in their children's transitions. Due to the age of GHS's population and the need to prepare students to leave (graduate from) high school, pre-vocational and vocational training is a strong emphasis. A variety of tools are used to assess student interests and aptitudes for employment or higher education. GHS provides a wide range of training, volunteer and employment opportunities for students who are able to manage these activities. GHS

maintains cooperative arrangements with area employers which allow students to obtain on the job experience in their career path. Some of these experiences also allow GHS students to have contact with typical peers in their age group.

Behavior Strategies and Discipline

Behavior and discipline are areas of focus for Granite Hill School as many of their students have had behavioral challenges that have impeded their ability to be successful in public schools. GHS staff offers support to these students and helps them identify what purpose inappropriate behaviors serve for that child. Once identified, students are supported in replacing that behavior with a more appropriate response that helps to get their needs met. Behavior management and discipline are integrated into the school program: all staff members are trained in this approach and counsel students on an as needed basis. The overarching driver for this process is the “RIGHT Program: Respect, Integrity, Good citizenship, Honesty, and Tolerance. Day-to-day support and training in regulating behaviors helps students attain appropriate social skills thereby helping them be more accessible to education. Procedures and practices for behavior management are posted in each classroom; students are aware of the expectations and understand how to access help when they need it. This provides a comprehensive, tiered positive intervention model supportive of all GHS students and results in improved academic achievement.

SPECIAL EDUCATION POLICIES/ NHDOE BUREAU OF SCHOOL APPROVAL NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL APPLICATION MATERIALS

In addition to the above noted focus areas for the case study presentations, material submitted as part of the application for program approval included: Health/Fire Facility Inspection Reports, the Private School Self Study, Special Education Policies and Procedures, Administrative Policy and Procedures, Current Program Information, Personnel and Consultant Rosters, and the Professional Development Master Plan. Review and verification of these documents found the Granite Hill School to be in compliance with all applicable New Hampshire Rules and the Education of Students with Disabilities and requirements for Non-Public Approval.

COMMENDATIONS

The following observations were made by the visiting team during the two days spent at Granite Hill School:

1. Although the majority of students at Granite Hill School are placed there due to severe behavioral issues, the focus on academic rigor is clear. Behavioral issues are minimized through the consistent behavior management practices in operation at GHS. Lesson plans and student learning objectives are linked to the general curriculum (College and Career Ready Standards). Observations of classes during the visit showed students engaged in learning while teachers asked probing questions and consistently checked for understanding.
2. Granite Hill School boasts a faculty with diverse backgrounds and instructional skills in many content areas.
3. Administration and leadership at GHS consistently hold staff accountable for good educational practices, reinforcing and supporting instructional and assessment strategies that are most appropriate

for the student population. The result is a staff committed to the school, their students, communication both within and without the school, and sustaining best practices.

**Number of Cases Reviewed During the GRANITE HILL SCHOOL NOVEMBER 4-5, 2014
NHDOE Compliance Visitation**

Preschool	0
Elementary School	0
Middle School	1
High School, Age Below 16	2
High School, Age 16 or Above	0
Total Number of Case Studies Reviewed	3

**FINDINGS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IDENTIFIED AS A RESULT OF THE
NOVEMBER 4-5, 2014 CASE STUDY COMPLIANCE REVIEW**

Findings of noncompliance are defined as deficiencies that have been identified through the Case Study Compliance Review Process, which are in violation of state and federal special education rules and regulations. Findings of noncompliance may result from review of policies and procedures and related application materials, case study presentations, review of student records or any other program approval activity related to the visit. **It is important to note that all findings of noncompliance listed below must be addressed in a corrective action plan and resolved within one year of this report. A template and instructions for such planning will be provided.**

Child Specific Findings of Noncompliance to be Addressed by Both the LEA and Private School Setting: *Please Note: The NH Department of Education, Bureau of Special Education requires that Child Specific Findings of Noncompliance be addressed and resolved within 45 days of notification.*

Ed 1109.01(a)(1) Elements of an Individualized Education Program

34CFR 300.320(a)(2)(i) Definition of an Individualized Education Program

One out of three IEPs reviewed during the case study process did not contain annual measurable goals.

Systemic Findings of Noncompliance to Be Addressed by the Private School Setting

Please Note: *The NH Department of Education, Bureau of Special Education requires that Systemic Findings of Noncompliance be addressed in a corrective action plan and met within one year of the date of the report; a template and instructions for such planning will be provided.*

There were no Systemic Findings of Noncompliance.

SUGGESTIONS FOR PROGRAM-WIDE IMPROVEMENT

Suggestions for improvement, simply stated, are recommendations provided by the visiting team that are intended to strengthen and enhance programs, services, instruction and professional development, and the NHDOE strongly encourages that serious consideration be given to the suggestions. However, discretion may be used in this area; suggestions for improvement are not considered to be required corrective actions and you may determine which suggestions most warrant follow up and address those in your corrective action plan. **System wide suggestions for improvement are listed below.** It should be noted that, in the Building Level Data Summary Report on the following pages, any suggestion made by a visiting team member that is actually a finding of noncompliance, has an asterisk (*) before it, and it is also listed above with the findings of noncompliance.

1. Continue to enhance through professional development or on-site consultation faculty skills in support of students on the Autism spectrum so staff can expand their repertoire of responses for students and parents.
2. Consider developing a broader array of program components that will help to prepare students for their eventual return to a less restrictive environment. Several pre-vocational and vocational opportunities exist, but GHS would like to explore more alternatives.
3. Assure that the language in IEPs is understandable and free of GHS “jargon” and abbreviations.

VI. BUILDING LEVEL SUMMARY REPORTS

USING COMPLIANCE DATA FOR CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

BUILDING LEVEL CASE STUDY DATA SUMMARY

NEW HAMPSHIRE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM APPROVAL AND IMPROVEMENT PROCESS

School: Granite Hill School	Date: 11-5-14	
Programs: Middle and High School	Number of Cases Reviewed: 3	
Recorder/Summarizer: J Miller, K Skoglund	Number of students reviewed age 16+: 0	Number of students age 16+ cited for Indicator 13: 0

CLEARLY PRINT NAMES OF ALL COLLABORATIVE TEAM MEMBERS

Name: Nash Reddy	Position: Director	Visiting
Name: Dave Parker	Position: Director	Visiting
Name: Isaac Sargent	Position: Teacher	Visiting
Name: Kathy Skoglund	Position: SERESC	Visiting
Name: Meg Beauchamp	Position: Director	Visiting
Name: Bridgette Brown (Day #2)	Position: NHDOE	Visiting
Name: Joseph Miller	Position: SERESC	Visiting
Name: Mary Lane (Day #1)	Position: NHDOE	Visiting
Name: Nancy Pierce	Position: Curriculum Coordinator	Building Level
Name: Danielle Paranto	Position: Principal, Executive Director	Building Level
Name: Nicole Gallow	Position: Special Education Teacher	Building Level
Name: Bob D'Errico	Position: Transition Coordinator	Building Level
Name: Nina Albano	Position School Therapist	Building Level
Name: Jeff Hardstedt	Position English Teacher	Building Level
Name: Sarah Attwood	Position Behavior Specialist	Building Level
Name: Harry Jones	Position Special Education Teacher	Building Level
Name: Kate Sargent	Position Classroom Teacher (K-8)	Building Level
Name: Beth Sebring	Position Classroom teacher (K-8 Science)	Building Level
Name: Breanna Davis	Position Reading Specialist	Building Level
Name: Karen Cook	Position Paraprofessional	Building Level
Name: Megan Leo	Position Classroom Teacher (English)	Building Level
Name: Tim Goggin	Position Special Education Teacher	Building Level

Based on data collected from the Data Collection Forms, Interview Forms, Classroom Observations, etc. the following summary is intended to provide a “snapshot” of the quality of services and programs in the school in the areas of: **Access to the General Curriculum, Transition and Behavior Strategies and Discipline.**

SUMMARIZE YOUR BUILDING LEVEL DATA

ACCESS TO THE GENERAL CURRICULUM STATEMENTS

Fill in the combined <u>number</u> of times a statement is marked on all Data Collection Forms for this school or building.			
	YES	NO	N/A
1. There is evidence that when developing the IEP the IEP Team considers: the strengths of the child; (ii) The concerns of the parents for enhancing the education of their child; (iii) The results of the initial or most recent evaluation of the child; and (iv) The academic, developmental, and functional needs of the child ¹ .	3		
2. There is evidence of a system among <i>all</i> staff members who provide direct services for the child, including instructional and residential, of their participation in the process of planning for that child and knowing the contents of the IEP and all other reports and evaluations, as appropriate to their roles and responsibilities ² .	3		
3. There is evidence that the Team uses multiple measures to design, implement and monitor the student's program ^{3,4} .	3		
4. All IEP goals are written in measurable terms ⁵ .	2	1	
5. Student's IEP has at least one functional goal (as applicable) ⁶ .	3		
6. There is evidence that the student has made progress in IEP Goals over the past three years ^{7, 8} .	3		

¹ Ed 1109.03 When an IEP Is in Effect; IEP Meetings; Development, Review, and Revision of an IEP; Transition Services; 34 CFR 300.324 Development, review, and revision of IEP

² Ed 1114.05(h) Program Requirements

³ Ed 1109.01 (a)(1) Elements of an Individualized Program; 34 CFR 300.320 (a) Definition of IEP

⁴ Ed. 1109.01 Elements of an Individualized Program; 34 CFR 300.320 (3)(i)(ii); Definition of IEP

⁵ Ed. 1109.01 Elements of an IEP; 34 CFR 300.320 Content of IEP

⁶ Ed 1102.01(u) Definitions Functional Goal *Functional goal* means a measurable outcome that is developed by the IEP team to address a need detailed in the analysis of the student's functional performance

⁷ Ed 1109.01 Elements of an IEP

⁸ Ed 1109.03 When an IEP Is in Effect; IEP Meetings; Development, Review, and Revision of an IEP; Transition Services; 34 CFR 300.324 Development, review, and revision of IEP

7. There is evidence that the special education, supplementary aids and/or related services described in the IEP have been delivered ⁹ .	3		
8. There is evidence that NH Minimum Standards for required subjects (credits) are met and provided to the student ¹⁰ .	3		
9. There is evidence the student <u>has access to, is participating and progressing in</u> the general education curriculum (aligned with NH Curriculum Frameworks/CCSS) ¹¹ .	3		
10. There is evidence that the accommodations ¹² and/or modifications ¹³ , as described in the IEP allows the student to access, participate and show progress in the general curriculum ¹⁴ .	3		
11. There is evidence in the IEP of individual accommodations necessary to measure academic achievement or functional performance in state, school-wide or classroom assessments ^{15, 16} .	3		
12. There is evidence that supports and accommodations are provided to this student to allow participation in extracurricular and other non-academic activities ¹⁷ .	3		
13. There is evidence that the IEP team made the placement decision based on Free and Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) ¹⁸ .	3		
14. There is evidence the student's IEP is reasonably calculated to result in educational benefit.	3		
For High School Students:			
Student is earning credits toward a regular high school diploma ¹⁹ .	2		
IF YES: within 4 years?	2		
Student will earn an IEP diploma or a certificate of completion ¹⁹ .			

⁹ Ed 1109.04 (b) Copies of the IEP and evidence of implementation

¹⁰ Ed 1114.05 (g) Program Requirements 34 CFR 300.320 Content of IEP

¹¹ Ed 1113.08 Curricula; Ed. 1109.01 Elements of an IEP; 34 CFR 300.320 Content of IEP

¹² "Accommodation" means any change in instruction or evaluation determined necessary by the IEP team that does not impact the rigor and/or validity of the subject matter being taught or assessed.

¹³ "Modification" means any change in instruction or evaluation determined necessary by the IEP team that impacts the rigor and validity or rigor or validity, of the subject matter being taught or assessed.

¹⁴ Ed 1113.08 Curricula; Ed. 1109.01 Elements of an IEP; 34 CFR 300.320 Content of IEP

¹⁵ Ed 1109.01 Elements of an IEP; 34 CFR 300.320 Content of IEP

¹⁶ Ed 1109.01 Elements of an IEP; 34 CFR 300.320 (6)(i) Definition of Individualized Education Program

¹⁷ Ed 1113.08 Curricula; Ed 1109.01 Elements of an IEP; 34 CFR 300.320 Content of IEP

¹⁸ Ed 1111.02 Placement Decisions; 34 CFR 300.116 Placements

¹⁹ Ed 1113.13 Diplomas (a)(b)(c); 34 CFR 300.102 Limitation-Exception to FAPE for certain ages

IF YES: within 4 years?			
Does this school have a clear policy for earning a high school diploma ²⁰ ?	2		

²⁰ Ed 1114.05 Program Requirements (a)(b)

Access Strengths	Access Suggestions for Improvement
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Full curriculum is in evidence and in consistent use by teaching staff. Lesson plans and Student Learning Objectives are linked to curriculum. Academic rigor is apparent. 2. Classes observed by the visiting team showed students engaged in learning; students are aware of the goals of the lessons, teachers ask probing questions and consistently check for understanding. 3. Faculties (and consultants) are skilled in their areas of expertise; student lessons have breadth and depth. 4. The leadership at GHS has longevity and is consistent and true to the longstanding values and practices of the school. Staff is held accountable for these values. The result is clear, consistent language and expectations for students who benefit from this consistency. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enhance skills and knowledge of faculty regarding student on the Autism spectrum to assist them in supporting those students placed at GHS and their families. 2. Assure that language used in writing IEPs is free from jargon and abbreviations. 3. Assure that the parent input into the IEP development is clearly represented in the document. Encourage the use of alternative strategies to engage parents who are difficult to reach.

TRANSITION STATEMENTS²¹

Fill in the combined <u>number</u> of times a statement is marked on all Data Collection Forms for this school or building.		
	YES	NO
1. There is evidence that at the time of transition the evaluation summary and other related documents were received in a timely manner ²² .	3	
2. There is evidence and documentation that special education, supplementary aids and/or related services described in the IEP were delivered at the time of transition ²³ .	3	
3. There is evidence that the information on this student has been shared between each transition including school to school, grade to grade and teacher to teacher including academic and behavior ²⁴ .	3	
4. There is evidence that the placement decision is made at least annually by the IEP team with consideration that the student is placed in the least restrictive environment ²⁵ .	3	
5. There is evidence that there is collaboration between the LEA and the non-public school in the development, review and revision of the IEP ²⁶ .	3	
6. There is evidence of a collaboration process between general and special education staff in the development, review and revision of IEPs, including transition planning for this student ²⁷ .	3	
7. There is evidence that the student and parents have been involved in transition discussions and activities ²⁸ .	3	
8. If the student turned 14 during the IEP period (or younger if determined by the IEP team), there is evidence that the IEP includes a statement of transition service needs that focuses on the students courses of study ²⁹ .	3	

²¹ This includes movement from (a) Early Supports and Services (ESS) to preschool, b) preschool to elementary school, or (c) age 16 or older, as well as from grade to grade and school to school.

²² 34 CFR 300.323(g) Transmittal of records

²³ Ed 1114.06 Responsibilities of Private Providers of Special Education or Other Non- LEA Programs in the Implementation of IEPs.

²⁴ Ed 1114.05 Program Requirements

²⁵ Ed 1111.02 Placement Decisions; 34 CFR 300.116 Placements

²⁶ Ed 1109.05 IEPs for Children Placed in Private Providers of Special Education or other non-LEA Programs by Public Agencies; 34 CFR 300.325 Private school placements by public agencies

²⁷ Ed 1103.01 IEP Team; 34 CFR 300.321 IEP Team

²⁸ Ed 1103.01 IEP Team; 34 CFR 300.321 IEP Team

²⁹ Ed 1109.01 (10) Elements of the individualized education program

9. If the student turned 16 during the IEP period, there is evidence that the transition plan is designed within a results-oriented process focused on improving academic and functional improvement to facilitate his or her movement from school to post-school goals and activities ³⁰ .	N/A	
10. There is evidence that outside agencies who are involved with this student's transition have participated in transition planning (e.g. DCYF, DJJS, and Area Agency) ³¹ .	1 2 N/A	

TRANSITION STATEMENTS	YES	NO
(Transition questions must be answered Yes or No, not N/A)		
For a student who will turn age 14 during the IEP service period (or younger if determined appropriate by the IEP team): The IEP includes a statement of the transition service needs that focuses on the student's course of study, such as participation in advanced-placement courses or a vocational education program	2	
For students under age 16, answer only the first 4 statements above. Then skip to the next page. If the student is age 16 or older during the course of the IEP, answer all statements on this page. (required data for federal statistics purposes) NOTE: Although Transition Plans were not required by age for any of the students reviewed, the IEP team had determined that one student would benefit from a Transition Plan. That is the Plan the visiting team reviewed.		
1. Is there an appropriate measurable postsecondary goal or goals that covers education OR training AND employment, and, as needed, independent living? <i>Can the goal(s) be counted? Will the goal(s) occur after the student graduates from school? Based on the information available about this student, does (do) the postsecondary goal(s) seem appropriate for this student? • If yes to all three, then check Y OR if a postsecondary goal(s) is (are) not stated, check N.</i>	1	
2. Is (are) the postsecondary goal(s) updated annually? <i>Was (were) the postsecondary goal(s) addressed/ updated in conjunction with the development of the current IEP? • If yes, then check Y OR If the postsecondary goal(s) was (were) not updated with the current IEP, check N.</i>	1	
3. Is there evidence that the measurable postsecondary goal(s) were based on age appropriate transition assessment? <i>Is the use of transition assessment(s) for the postsecondary goal(s) mentioned in the IEP or evident in the student's file? • If yes, then check Y OR if no, then check N.</i>	1	
4. Are there transition services in the IEP that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goal(s)?	1	

³⁰ Ed 1109.01 (a)(10) Elements of an IEP; 34 CFR 300.320 Definition of an IEP (b); 34 CFR 300.43 Transition Services (a)(1)

³¹ Ed 1103.01 IEP Team; 34 CFR 300.321 IEP Team

<p><i>Is a type of instruction, related service, community experience, or development of employment and other post-school adult living objectives, and if appropriate, acquisition of daily living skills, and provision of a functional vocational evaluation listed in association with meeting the post-secondary goal(s)?</i></p> <p>• If yes, then check Y OR if no, then check N.</p>			
<p>5. Do the transition services include courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goal(s)?</p>	1		
<p><i>Do the transition services include courses of study that align with the student's postsecondary goal(s)?</i></p> <p>• If yes, then check Y OR if no, then check N.</p>			
<p>6. Is (are) there annual IEP goal(s) related to the student's transition services needs?</p>	1		
<p><i>Is (are) an annual goal(s) included in the IEP that is/are related to the student's transition services needs?</i></p> <p>• If yes, then check Y OR if no, then check N.</p>			
<p>7. Is there evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services were discussed?</p>	1		
<p>8. <i>For the current year, is there documented evidence in the IEP or cumulative folder that the student was invited to attend the IEP Team meeting?</i></p> <p>• If yes, then check Y OR if no, then check N.</p>			
<p>Only the following statement may be answered N/A if appropriate. <u>All statements above must be answered Yes or No.</u></p>	YES	NO	N/A
<p>9. If appropriate, is there evidence that 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?</p>			X
<p>10. <i>For the current year, is there evidence in the IEP that representatives of any of the following agencies/services were invited to participate in the IEP development including but not limited to: postsecondary education, vocational education, integrated employment (including supported employment), continuing and adult education, adult services, independent living or community participation for this post-secondary goal?</i></p> <p><i>Was consent obtained from the parent (or student, for a student the age of majority)?</i></p> <p>• If yes to both, then check Y.</p> <p>• If no invitation is evident and a participating agency is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services and there was consent to invite them to the IEP meeting, then check N.</p> <p>• If it is too early to determine if the student will need outside agency involvement, or no agency is likely to provide or pay for transition services, check NA.</p> <p>• If parent or individual student consent (when appropriate) was not provided, check NA.</p>			
<p>11. Student is informed prior to age 17 of his/her rights under IDEA³². Note: no students reviewed were 17 or older</p>			X
<p>12. Does the IEP meet the requirements of Indicator 13? (Check one) Yes (all Ys or NAs for each item (1 – 10) on the Checklist or No (one or more Ns checked)</p>	1		

³² Ed 1120.01 Applicability; Transfer of Rights 34 CFR 300.320 (c) Transfer of Rights at age of majority

13. There is evidence of the summary of the student's academic achievement and functional performance , which includes recommendations on how to assist the student in meeting his or her post-secondary goals ³³ .			
---	--	--	--

³³ Ed 1109.04 Copies of the IEP and Evidence of Implementation (c) 34 CFR 300.305 (e)(2)

Transition Strengths	Transition Suggestions for Improvement
<p>1. Work site opportunities are numerous and authentic. Students are engaged in their work and maintain good work habits. Student learning objectives are carried over from the classroom to the worksites.</p>	<p>1. Develop a wider array of program elements to assist students as they prepare to return to a less restrictive environment.</p>

BEHAVIOR STRATEGIES AND DISCIPLINE

Fill in the combined <u>number</u> of times a statement is marked on all Data Collection Forms for this school or building		
	YES	NO
1. There is evidence that, where it has been determined that a child's behavior impedes learning, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and other strategies to address that behavior have been implemented ³⁴ .	3	
2. There is evidence that data are used to determine impact of student behavior on his/her learning.	3	
3. There is evidence that the IEP team conducted a functional behavior assessment of the student's behavior ³⁵ .	2 1 N/A	
4. If appropriate, there is evidence that the IEP team developed a behavior intervention plan that described strategies and supports ³⁶ .	3	
5. There is evidence that the interventions, strategies and supports have been developed to address the student's behavior ³⁷ .	3	
6. There is evidence that positive interventions, strategies and supports been communicated to the student, parents and key school personnel ³⁸ .	3	
7. There is evidence that professional development, and specialized training has been provided to staff, parents, providers and others as appropriate to support the implementation of the behavior plan and strategies ³⁹ .	3	
8. If aversive behavioral interventions were used, there is evidence that they were authorized in writing by a physician, and the IEP team, and included in the student's IEP ^{40,41} .	3	
9. There is evidence that that the team uses data to demonstrate the results of the behavioral interventions, strategies and supports ⁴² .	3	
10. A school-wide behavior intervention model exists.	3	

³⁴ Ed 1114.07 Behavioral Interventions; Ed 1109.01 Elements of an IEP; 34 CFR 300.320 Content of IEP

³⁵ Ed 1124.01 (f)(1)(i)(ii) Disciplinary Procedures; 34 CFR 300.530 Authority of school personnel

³⁶ Ed 1102.01 Definitions (n)

³⁷ Ed 1114.07 Behavioral Interventions

³⁸ Ed 1114.05 Program Requirements

³⁹ Ed 1114.10 Qualifications and Requirements for Instructional, Administrative, and Support Personnel

⁴⁰ Ed 1113.06 (a)(b) Use of Aversive Behavioral Interventions "Aversive Behavioral Interventions" mean (1) A non-medical mechanical restraint that physically restricts student's movement; and (2) physical restraint, not in response to a threat of imminent, serious, physical harm.

⁴¹ Ed 1114.09 Use of Aversive Behavioral Interventions

⁴² Ed 1114.07 (a) Behavioral Interventions

Behavior Strategy Strengths	Behavior Strategy Suggestions for Improvement
<p>1. Student behavioral issues are minimized by the consistent management practices and expectation embedded in the GHS philosophy. This allows students to fully participate in their learning and not distract others. Staff provides frequent positive reinforcement.</p>	