

**New Hampshire
Department of Education
Bureau of Special Education**

**SPECIAL EDUCATION COMPLIANCE
MONITORING REVIEW REPORT**

**Manchester School District
2013-2014**

**Dr. Debra Livingston, Superintendent
Karen Burkush, Assistant Superintendent for Student Services**

Chairperson of Monitoring Team
Deborah Krajcik, Education Consultant

Compliance Monitoring Visit Conducted on
October 30, November 4 & December 4, 2013

Report Date: March 3, 2014

Overview of the Special Education Monitoring Process

New Hampshire has a responsibility, under federal law, to have a system of general supervision that monitors the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) by school districts. The general supervision system is accountable for enforcing IDEA and the *New Hampshire Rules for the Education of Children with Disabilities* and for ensuring continuous improvement. As stated in section 616 of 2004 amendments to the IDEA, "The primary focus of Federal and State monitoring activities described in paragraph (1) shall be on -

- (A) Improving educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities; and
- (B) Ensuring that States meet the program requirements under this part, with a particular emphasis on those requirements that are most closely related to improving educational results for children with disabilities."

There are eight components that comprise NH's general supervision system. It is important to note that although the components are separate, the components connect, interact and articulate requirements to form a comprehensive system. The general supervision system for NH has the following components.

- State Performance Plan (SPP)
- Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation
- Data on Processes and Results
- Targeted Technical Assistance and Professional Development
- Effective Dispute Resolution
- Integrated Monitoring Activities
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives and Sanctions
- Fiscal Management

The special education compliance monitoring review is one method that the Bureau of Special Education utilizes to implement the general supervision system. The special education compliance monitoring review is comprised of:

- Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation
- Special Education Personnel
- Monitoring of Special Education Process
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives and Sanctions

The intent of the special education compliance monitoring review is to:

- Improve student outcomes for students with IEPs
- Determine compliance
- Ensure districts understand and are implementing special education requirements in accordance with the *New Hampshire Rules for Education of Children with Disabilities*
- Improve special education policies, procedures and practices

The Bureau of Special Education followed a standard process to select districts to participate in the special education compliance monitoring review. Each district was sorted into a cohort group based on the current October 1st fall enrollment. The Bureau of Special Education in conjunction with the Bureau of Data Management reviewed the previous year state assessment data for grades 3 through 8 for Reading and Math to determine the district in each cohort group that had the widest achievement gap for students without disabilities compared to students with disabilities.

Once a district was selected, the Bureau of Special Education contacted the district to discuss the special education compliance monitoring review with the school administration. The Manchester School District was selected through this process. As the only district in the cohort group of its size, the focus for the monitoring process has been on a specific level. The elementary schools were monitored during the 2012-2013 school year. The middle schools are the focus for the 2013-2014 school year. The Manchester School District is comprised of four middle schools all with a grade span of 6-8: Henry J. McLaughlin Middle School, Hillside Middle School, Middle School at Parkside, and Southside Middle School. The Bureau of Special Education also provided targeted professional development regarding the special education compliance review process and completion of the self-assessment data collection form. The district was provided with a list of 10 students with disabilities representative of each school based on grade level, disability, gender, and case manager. Students residing in the district who attended a charter school were also included in the representative sample. During the onsite visit, the monitoring team selected 8 of the 10 student files for each school to review, which included one file at each school of a student attending a charter school. There were a total of 32 files reviewed for the Manchester School District.

The monitoring visit, which was conducted on October 30, November 4 & December 4, 2013 consisted of New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) team members verifying district identified evidence for each self-assessment data collection question. The district was encouraged to invite their special education staff as well as related service providers to attend the review. Many of the district special education staff attended the review, which provided another targeted professional development opportunity. Staff members were provided the opportunity to learn about implementing IDEA and the *New Hampshire Rules for the Education of Children with Disabilities* and to engage in a professional discussion of best practices for ensuring improved outcomes for students with disabilities.

The NHDOE, Bureau of Special Education review members for this compliance monitoring review included Santina Thibedeau, State Director of Special Education, and Education Consultants: Bridget Brown, McKenzie Harrington-Bacote, Deborah Krajcik, Ruth Littlefield, and Mary Steady.

Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation

Each district must have policies, procedures, and effective implementation of practices that are aligned and support the implementation of IDEA and the *New Hampshire Rules for the Education of Children with Disabilities*. As part of the special education compliance review, the monitoring team reviewed the district's policies and procedures manual for compliance.

In addition, the Bureau of Special Education cross checked the Annual Request for Federal Special Education Funds FY 14, IDEA Part B Section 611 Assurances, and District Policies to Support Assurance Standards with the district's policy and procedures manual to ensure that document name, date adopted, and pages were valid. Districts are required to submit assurance statements with their local application for IDEA funds.

The monitoring team reviewed the district's policies and procedures manual for the following components.

- Child Find pursuant to Ed 1105
- Confidentiality of Information pursuant to Ed 1119
- Facilities, Personnel and Services pursuant to Ed 1126.01(b)(3)
- Personnel Development pursuant to Ed 1126.01(b)(4)
- Parent Involvement pursuant to Ed 1126.01(b)(5)
- Public Participation pursuant to Ed 1126.01(b)(6)
- Procedural Safeguards pursuant to Ed 1120
- Referral and Disposition of Referral pursuant to Ed 1106
- Evaluation pursuant to Ed 1107
- Determination of Eligibility for Special Education pursuant to Ed 1108
- Individualized Education Program pursuant to Ed 1109
- Placement of Children with Disabilities pursuant to Ed 1111
- State Department of Education Monitoring of Educational Services and Programs for Children with Disabilities pursuant to Ed 1126
- Participation with Other Agencies pursuant to Ed 1126.01(b)(10)
- Private School Requirements pursuant to Ed 1126.01(b)(11)
- Accessible Instructional Materials pursuant to Ed 1126.01(b)(12)
- Disciplinary Procedures for Children with Disabilities pursuant to Ed 1124
- Dispute Resolution
 - Complaint Procedures pursuant to Ed 1121
 - Alternative Dispute Resolution pursuant to Ed 1123
 - Administrative Due Process Hearing Procedures pursuant to Ed 1123
- Local Education Agency Request for Special Education Funds pursuant to Ed 1126.01

Policies and Procedures

Based on the review of the Manchester School District's policies and procedures manual, the NHDOE determined there were three findings of noncompliance.

COMPLIANCE CITATIONS	AREA OF COMPLIANCE
Ed 1105	1. Child Find
Regulatory Component	Review Status
Ed 1105.04(a)	The district policies and procedures do not address the early transition process for children exiting family centered early supports and services.
Ed 1105.04(b)	The district policies and procedures do not address the written interagency agreement between the district and the local areas agencies responsible for the provision of family centered early supports and services in the community.
Corrective Action regarding the Implementation of the Regulations: The Manchester School District must revise its policies and procedures. Provide the school board approved policies and procedures that address the early transition process and the written interagency agreement to the NHDOE by June 30, 2014.	
COMPLIANCE CITATIONS	AREA OF COMPLIANCE
Ed 1104.01	2. Pupil Evaluation to Placement
Regulatory Component	Review Status
34 CFR 300.305 Ed 1107.01(a)	Although the district policies and procedures for reevaluation state that, "One or more of the required assessments may be waived by team agreement if those previous evaluations are still considered to be valid," IDEA and the <i>New Hampshire Rules for the Education of Children with Disabilities</i> state that there must be a review of existing evaluation data and on the basis of the review and input from parents, the team identifies what additional data, if any, are needed [34 CFR 300.305(a)]. 34 CFR 300.305(d) states that if no additional data are needed, the district must notify the parents of the determination and the reasons for the determination as well as the rights of the parents to request an assessment.
Ed 1109.06	The district policies and procedures referencing monitoring and annual review of IEPs do not address Ed 1109.06(b)(c)(d).
Corrective Action regarding the Implementation of the Regulations: The Manchester School District must revise its policies and procedures. Provide the school board approved policies and procedures to align with 34 CFR 300.305, which includes a review of all data and the determination of additional data, if any, that are needed; and to address all components of monitoring and annual review of IEPs to the NHDOE by June 30, 2014.	
COMPLIANCE CITATIONS	AREA OF COMPLIANCE
Ed 1126.01(b)(12)	3. Instructional Materials in Accessible Format
Regulatory Component	Review Status
Ed 1126.01(b)(12)	The district policies and procedures do not address the component which describes the district's reasonable steps to ensure that children with disabilities who need instructional materials in accessible formats receive those materials at the same time other children receive instructional materials.
Corrective Action regarding the Implementation of the Regulations: The Manchester School District must revise its policies and procedures. Provide the school board approved policies and procedures that address accessible materials to the NHDOE by June 30, 2014.	

Effective Implementation of Practices

As part of the student file review, the Bureau of Special Education also looked for evidence that the policies and procedures were effectively being implemented. The following are specific findings of noncompliance that were apparent during the monitoring visit, which are not addressed through the special education process monitoring noted below, that must be corrected as soon as possible but no later than June 30, 2014.

Based on the review, the NHDOE determined there were no additional findings of noncompliance regarding the effective implementation of policies and procedures.

Recommendations to address problematic practices that do not represent noncompliance

During the monitoring visit, it had been revealed that the district has been engaging in some practices that have the potential to become problematic. The NHDOE has identified these practices and potential remedies to these practices. Whereas these practices do not rise to the standard of noncompliance, and therefore require no corrective actions, the NHDOE believes that the practices are noteworthy to be addressed.

- Upon review of eligibility determinations signature forms, the role and area of certification of team member participants was not clear. When signing in at the meetings, include the participants' role(s) and area(s) of certification.
- During the compliance monitoring visit, the team found evidence that all of the objectives in an IEP included begin dates that were prior to the IEP start date. Ensure that dates for objectives in the IEP are within the IEP period.

Special Education Personnel

The Bureau of Special Education has reviewed the Manchester School District special education staff certifications using the New Hampshire Educator Information System (NHEIS). The review process was for special education educators employed during 2013-2014 school year.

The data for Henry J. McLaughlin Middle School, Hillside Middle School, Middle School at Parkside, and Southside Middle School was generated and reviewed during the months of November and December of 2013. At all four middle schools each special education educator's endorsement was compared to the subject/assignment. This process was used for special educators who hold Education Intern License 4 (INT4), Beginning Educator Certification (BEC) and Experienced Educator Certification (EEC). If the endorsement was appropriate to the subject/ assignment then the renewal date of the endorsement was verified to ensure that the endorsement was current.

If there was a discrepancy between endorsement and the subject/assignment, the district was given an opportunity to verify the data. If the discrepancy could not be resolved a finding of noncompliance was made based on Personnel Standards pursuant to Ed 1113.12(a), 34 CFR 300.18, and 34 CFR 300.156.

Based on the review of the special education staff certifications, the NHDOE determined there was a finding of noncompliance.

COMPLIANCE CITATIONS	AREA OF COMPLIANCE
34 CFR 300.18; 34 CFR 300.156; Ed 1113.12(a)	Personnel Standards
Corrective Action regarding the Implementation of the Regulations: The Manchester School District must provide the NHDOE with evidence that resolves the discrepancies with the three staff members at Henry J. McLaughlin Middle School; six staff members at Hillside Middle School; one staff member at Middle School at Parkside; and four staff members at Southside Middle School to the NHDOE by June 30, 2014.	

Henry J. McLaughlin Middle School:

- A staff member has subject/assignments as Speech-Language Specialist; however the endorsement areas are for General Special Education and Specific Learning Disabilities.
- A staff member has subject/assignments as Speech-Language Specialist; however only has an endorsement for General Special Education.
- A staff member has subject/assignments in Blind and Vision Disabilities; however only has an endorsement for Physical Education and is listed on NHEIS at Henry J. McLaughlin Middle School though has subject/assignments at for Southside Middle School and Henry J. McLaughlin Middle School.

The district was notified of the concerns above for the Henry J. McLaughlin Middle School during the on-site monitoring visit on October 30, 2013. Staff specific information was provided at the on-site monitoring visit.

Hillside Middle School:

- A staff member listed on NHEIS at Henry J. McLaughlin Middle School, Hillside Middle School, and Manchester Central High School has subject/assignments at each school only for Hillside Middle School, and the Subject/Assignments is for General Special Education and Reading and Writing Specialist; however the staff member has endorsements for Reading and Writing Specialist and Elementary Education (K-8). There are no class begin or end dates entered.
- A staff member has subject/assignments in Blind and Vision Disabilities and General Special Education; however has endorsements for General Special Education, Specific Learning Disabilities, and Elementary Education (K-8).
- A staff member has subject/assignments as Speech-Language Specialist; however there are no records found for endorsement areas.
- A staff member has subject/assignments in Blind and Vision; however has endorsements for Elementary Education (K-8) and General Special Education.
- A staff member has subject/assignments as Speech-Language Specialist; however only has an endorsement for Library Media Specialist.
- A staff member has subject/assignments in Blind and Vision and General Special Education; however has endorsements for Elementary Education (K-8) and General Special Education.

The district was notified of the concerns above for the Hillside Middle School during the on-site monitoring visit on October 30 and November 4, 2013. Staff specific information was provided at the on-site monitoring visit.

Middle School at Parkside:

- A staff member has subject/assignments in Blind and Vision; however only has an endorsement for General Special Education.

The district was notified of the concerns above for the Middle School at Parkside during the on-site monitoring visit on October 30 and November 4, 2013. Staff specific information was provided at the on-site monitoring visit.

Southside Middle School:

- A staff member listed on NHEIS at Southside Middle School has subject/assignments at Manchester West High School and Middle School at Parkside, but not at Southside Middle School, and the Subject/Assignments is for Blind and Vision Disabilities (Middle School at Parkside) and Reading (Manchester West High School); however the staff member only has an endorsement for General Special Education.
- A staff member has subject/assignments in Blind and Vision Disabilities; however only has an endorsement for General Special Education.

- A staff member has subject/assignments at Manchester Memorial High School but not at Southside Middle School.
- A staff member has a General Special Education subject/assignment for grades 5-8 at Southside Middle School. Southside Middle School is grades 6-8.

The district was notified of the concerns above Southside Middle School via email on January 29, 2014. Staff specific information was included in the email.

Monitoring of Special Education Process

Districts are responsible for implementing the special education process in accordance with IDEA and the *New Hampshire Rules for the Education of Children with Disabilities*. The self-assessment data collection form highlights the district's understanding of the requirements of IDEA and the *New Hampshire Rules for the Education of Children with Disabilities* and was reviewed during the monitoring visit. Each area of compliance on the self-assessment data collection form clearly outlines whether the compliance is either a requirement of both IDEA and the *New Hampshire Rules for the Education of Children with Disabilities* or a requirement of solely the *New Hampshire Rules for the Education of Children with Disabilities*. During the monitoring visit, the monitoring team verified the evidence of compliance based on review of the student file, using the district's self-assessment as a resource.

Based on this review, the Bureau of Special Education identified findings of noncompliance with IDEA and the *New Hampshire Rules for the Education of Children with Disabilities*. The findings include the citation, the level of noncompliance, and the required corrective actions, which include timelines for demonstrating correction of noncompliance. Student specific information will not be included in the report but will be provided to the district's Special Education Director.

Compliance Summary for Manchester School District's four middle schools: Henry J. McLaughlin Middle School (HJMMS), Hillside Middle School (HMS), Middle School at Parkside (MSAP), and Southside Middle School (SMS)

For any area identified below as not meeting with compliance with rules and regulations, a finding of noncompliance is being identified. Required evidence to correct noncompliance is provided later in the document. For the Manchester School District, there are sixteen findings of noncompliance.

AREA OF COMPLIANCE	COMPLIANCE WITH RULES & REGULATIONS	INDIVIDUAL INSTANCES OF NONCOMPLIANCE			
		HJM MS	HMS	MSAP	SMS
1. Record of Access; Confidentiality Requirements	No	1	1	0	0
2. Evaluation; Determination of Eligibility for Special Education	No	9	20	15	4
3. Written Prior Notice (Determination of Eligibility)	No	9	18	13	5
4. Individualized Education Program	No	0	1	1	1
5. IEP Team; Participants in the Special Education Process	No	0	2	2	0
6. Individualized Education Program (Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance)	No	5	7	6	3
7. Procedures for Determining Eligibility and Educational Need	No	2	3	3	1
8. Consideration of Special Factors	Yes	0	0	0	0
9. Courses of Study	No	2	1	0	2
10. Measurable Annual Goals; Short-term Objectives or Benchmarks	No	4	11	7	5
11. Review and Revision of IEPs (Measuring Progress)	No	0	1	2	0
12. Accessibility of Child's IEP to Teachers and Others (General Accommodations and General Modifications)	No	4	6	4	2
13. Definition of Individualized Education Program (Special Education and Related Services, Supplementary Aids and Services, and Program Modifications or Supports for School Personnel)	No	2	6	6	5
14. Definition of Individualized Education Program (Justification for Non-Participation)	No	2	2	1	2
15. Definition of Individualized Education Program (State and District Wide Assessments)	No	1	1	0	0
16. Procedural Safeguards (Written Prior Notice for IEP)	No	7	12	17	16
17. Written Prior Notice (Placement)	No	7	12	15	14

Findings of Noncompliance

COMPLIANCE CITATIONS		AREA OF COMPLIANCE
34 CFR 300.614 Ed 1119.02(a)		1. Record of Access; Confidentiality Requirements
Self-Assessment Question Number	Regulatory Component	Review Status
1.	34 CFR 300.614 Ed 1119.02(a)	30 out of 32 files demonstrated evidence of a record of parties that have obtained access to the education records collected, maintained or used under Part B of the Act.
<p>Corrective Action of Individual Instance of Noncompliance: For <u>student files F & J</u> there was no evidence of a record of access to education records.</p> <p>Within 3 weeks of the date of this report, the district must ensure the record of access has been placed in the file. The NHDOE will verify this through a subsequent on-site review.</p> <p>Corrective Action regarding the Implementation of the Regulations: The district policy states that authorized employees do not need to sign the record of access; however there was no evidence regarding which employees are authorized. Within 3 weeks of the date of this report, the district must establish procedures identifying which employees are authorized to review education records for students with IEPs.</p> <p>The NHDOE will select 4 new files (2 at HJMMS, 2 at HMS) for updated data demonstrating compliance with this requirement and will verify that this procedure has been developed through a subsequent on-site review.</p>		
COMPLIANCE CITATIONS		AREA OF COMPLIANCE
34 CFR 300.15 Ed 1107; Ed 1108		2. Evaluation; Determination of Eligibility for Special Education
Self-Assessment Question Number	Regulatory Component	Review Status <i>(Thirty-two files were reviewed for this area as the most current determination of eligibility for all monitored student files was completed at the Manchester School District.)</i>
2.	34 CFR 300.306(a)(1) Ed 1108.01(a)	Upon completion of assessments, 22 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that a group of qualified professionals and the parent of the child determined whether the child is a child with a disability.
3.	Ed 1108.01(b)(1)	For determination of eligibility, 24 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the composition of the IEP team also included a teacher certified in each area of suspected disability.
4.	Ed 1108.01(b)(2)	For determination of eligibility, 26 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the composition of the IEP team also included an individual knowledgeable about the child as a result of having had personal contact with the child in the school or, if the child is below school age, at another setting.
5.	Ed 1107.04(b)	24 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that qualified examiners for specific disabilities as set forth in Table 1100.1 completed the required assessments.
6.	34 CFR 300.306(c)(1)(i) Ed 1108.01(a)	26 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the team drew upon, carefully considered and documented information from a variety of sources, including aptitude and achievement tests, parent input, and teacher recommendations, as well as information about the child's

		physical condition, social or cultural background, and adaptive behavior.
7.	Ed 1107.02(b)	For students identified with a specific learning disability, 6 out of 11 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the determination was based on the district's specific learning disability policy.
8.	34 CFR 300.304(c)(6) Ed 1108.01(a)	27 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the evaluation was sufficiently comprehensive to identify all of the child's special education and related services needs, whether or not commonly linked to the disability category in which the child has been classified.
*	34 CFR 300.300(c)(1)(i) Ed 1120.04(a)(6) Ed 1120.04(c)	Student W was given an assessment without parental consent as part of the student's reevaluation.
* During the monitoring visit, the NHDOE also found the above area of noncompliance.		
<p>Corrective Action of Individual Instance of Noncompliance: For <u>student files B, D, G, J, O, P, U, V, X & AB</u>, there was no evidence that a group of qualified professionals and the parent of the child determined whether the child is a child with a disability. For <u>student files C, G, J, K, O, U, V & AB</u>, there was no evidence that the composition of the IEP team to determine eligibility also included a teacher certified in each area of suspected disability. For <u>student files B, J, O, P, U & V</u>, there was no evidence that the composition of the IEP team also included an individual knowledgeable about the child as a result of having had personal contact with the child in the school or, if the child is below school age, at another setting. For <u>student files B, N, O, P, U, V, AA & AB</u>, there was no evidence that qualified examiners for specific disabilities as set forth in Table 1100.1 completed the required assessments. For <u>student files B, J, O, P, U & V</u>, there was no evidence that the team drew upon, carefully considered and documented information from a variety of sources, including aptitude and achievement tests, parent input, and teacher recommendations, as well as information about the child's physical condition, social or cultural background, and adaptive behavior. For <u>student files F, K, O, Q & U</u>, there was no evidence that the determination of a specific learning disability was based on the district's specific learning disability policy. For <u>student files N, O, P, U & V</u>, there was no evidence that the evaluation was sufficiently comprehensive to identify all of the child's special education and related services needs, whether or not commonly linked to the disability category in which the child has been classified. For <u>student file W</u>, there was no evidence of parental consent for an assessment.</p>		
<p>Within 45 days of the date of this report, the district must convene the IEP teams to review the identification of eligibility and include: a group of qualified professionals and the parent, a teacher certified in each area of suspected disability, and an individual knowledgeable about the child. Required assessments completed by qualified examiners, documented information from a variety of sources, and sufficiently comprehensive evaluations must be reviewed. For students identified with a specific learning disability, there must be evidence that the determination was based on the district's specific learning disability policy. The NHDOE will verify this through a subsequent on-site review.</p>		
<p>Corrective Action regarding the Implementation of the Regulations: Develop a procedure and provide training to appropriate staff to ensure that eligibility is determined by a group of qualified professionals and the parent of the child, a teacher certified in each area of suspected disability, and an individual knowledgeable about the child; that required assessments completed by qualified examiners and documented information from a variety of sources are included in the evaluation process; that for students identified with a specific learning disability, the determination is based on the district's specific learning disability policy; that the evaluations are sufficiently comprehensive; and that there is documented parental consent for each evaluation. Provide a brief description of the trainings including the dates of the trainings and lists of staff in attendance to the NHDOE by June 30, 2014.</p>		
<p>The NHDOE will select 8 new student files (2 at HJMMS, 2 at HMS, 2 at MSAP, 2 at SMS) for updated data demonstrating compliance with this requirement and will verify that the composition of the IEP teams for determination of eligibility include a group of qualified professionals and the parent, a teacher certified in each area of suspected disability, and an individual knowledgeable about the child through a subsequent on-site review. The NHDOE will select 8 additional new student files (2 at HJMMS, 2 at HMS, 2 at MSAP, 2 at SMS) for updated data demonstrating compliance with this</p>		

requirement and will verify that required assessments completed by qualified examiners, documented information from a variety of sources, and sufficiently comprehensive evaluations are reviewed through a subsequent on-site review. The NHDOE will select 6 additional new student files (2 at HJMMS, 2 at HMS, 2 at MSAP) for updated data demonstrating compliance with this requirement and will verify that for students identified with a specific learning disability, there is evidence that the determination was based on the district's specific learning disability policy through a subsequent on-site review. The NHDOE will select 2 additional new student files (2 at MSAP) for updated data demonstrating compliance with this requirement and will verify that that there is evidence of parental consent for each evaluation through a subsequent on-site review.

COMPLIANCE CITATIONS		AREA OF COMPLIANCE
34 CFR 300.503 Ed 1120.03		3. Written Prior Notice (Determination of Eligibility)
Self-Assessment Question Number	Regulatory Component	Review Status
		<i>(Thirty-two files were reviewed for this area as the most current determination of eligibility for all monitored student files was completed at the Manchester School District.)</i>
9.	Ed 1120.03(a)	25 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the parent(s) of a child with a disability were notified in writing within a reasonable time, but not less than 14 days, before the LEA proposed to initiate or change, or refused to initiate or change, the referral, evaluation, determination of eligibility, IEP, or educational placement of the child or the provision of FAPE to the child.
10.	34 CFR 300.503(b)(1) Ed 1120.03(b)	27 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the notice given to the parents of a child with a disability included a description of the action proposed or refused by the agency.
11.	34 CFR 300.503(b)(2) Ed 1120.03(b)	27 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the notice given to the parents of a child with a disability included an explanation of why the agency proposed or refused to take the action.
12.	34 CFR 300.503(b)(3) Ed 1120.03(b)	25 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the notice given to the parents of a child with a disability included a description of each evaluation procedure, assessment, record, or report the agency used as a basis for the proposed or refused action.
13.	34 CFR 300.503(b)(4) Ed 1120.03(b)	29 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the notice given to the parents of a child with a disability included a statement that says the parents of a child with a disability have protection under the procedural safeguards.
14.	34 CFR 300.503(b)(4) Ed 1120.03(b)	For notices not for an initial referral for evaluation, 29 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the LEA notified the parents of a means by which a copy of the procedural safeguards can be obtained. <i>(No student files were of students with initial evaluations.)</i>
15.	34 CFR 300.503(b)(5) Ed 1120.03(b)	30 out of 32 IEP files lacked evidence that the notice given to the parents of a child with a disability included sources for the parents to contact to obtain assistance in understanding the provisions of the notice.
16.	34 CFR 300.503(b)(6) Ed 1120.03(b)	29 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the notice given to the parents of a child with a disability included a description of other options that the IEP team considered and the reasons why those options were rejected.
17.	34 CFR 300.503(b)(7) Ed 1120.03(b)	24 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the notice given to the parents of a child with a disability included a description of other

		factors that were relevant to the LEA's proposal or refusal.
18.	34 CFR 300.503(c)(1)(i) Ed 1120.03(b)	31 out of 32 IEP files lacked evidence that the notice given to the parents of a child with a disability was written in language understandable to the general public.
19.	34 CFR 300.503(c)(1)(ii) Ed 1120.03(b)	31 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the notice given to the parents of a child with a disability was provided in the native language of the parent or other mode of communication used by the parent, unless it was clearly not feasible to do so.
Corrective Action regarding the Implementation of the Regulations: Ensure that the notification contains all elements required by regulations. Develop a procedure that identifies for parent(s) the reasonable time (not less than 14 days) to receive notification in writing of the district's action, as well as a procedure to address the other requirements of the written prior notice components. Provide training to staff on completing the written prior notice in order for staff to appropriately document each component. (Please note that parental consent cannot be obtained without the requisite prior written notice.) Provide a brief description of the trainings including the dates of the trainings and lists of staff in attendance to the NHDOE by June 30, 2014.		
The NHDOE will select 10 new student files (2 at HJMMS, 3 at HMS, 3 at MSAP, 2 at SMS) for updated data demonstrating compliance with this requirement and will verify that the procedure for identifying for parents(s) the reasonable time to receive notification has been developed and that the written prior notices are complete through a subsequent on-site review.		
COMPLIANCE CITATIONS		AREA OF COMPLIANCE
34 CFR 300.323 Ed 1109		4. Individualized Education Program
Self-Assessment Question Number	Regulatory Component	Review Status
20.	Ed 1109.01(a)(5)	32 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence of the signature of the parent or, where appropriate, student, and a representative of the LEA indicating approval of the provisions of the IEP.
21.	Ed 1109.04(a)	29 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that a copy of the IEP has been provided to each teacher and service provider listed as having responsibilities for implementing the IEP.
22.	34 CFR 300.323(c)(1) Ed 1109.03(a)	For an initial IEP, 0 out of 0 IEP files demonstrated evidence that there was a meeting to develop an IEP for the student conducted within 30 days of a determination that the child needs special education and related services. (<i>Thirty-two student files were not of students with initial IEPs.</i>)
23.	34 CFR 300.323(a) Ed 1109.03(1)	32 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that an IEP was in place at the beginning of the school year.
24.	Ed 1109.03(d)	32 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the IEP was reviewed annually. (<i>No student files were of students with initial IEPs.</i>)
Corrective Action of Individual Instance of Noncompliance: For student file P, X & AD, there was no evidence that a copy of the IEP has been provided to each teacher and service provider listed as having responsibilities for implementing the IEP.		
Within 45 days of the date of this report, the district must convene the IEP teams to review the IEPs and show evidence of parent and LEA approval of the provisions of the IEP. Within 3 weeks of the date of this report, the district must ensure that copies of the IEP have been provided to each teacher and service provider. The NHDOE will verify this through a subsequent on-site review.		
Corrective Action regarding the Implementation of the Regulations: Develop procedures and provide trainings to		

appropriate staff for ensuring that the signature of the parent or, where appropriate, student, and a representative of the LEA are obtained indicating approval of the provisions of the IEP and for ensuring that copies of IEPs are provided to each teacher and service provider listed as having responsibilities for implementing the IEP. Provide a brief description of the trainings including the dates of the trainings and lists of staff in attendance to the NHDOE by June 30, 2014.

The NHDOE will select 8 additional new student files (2 at HJMMS, 2 at HMS, 2 at MSAP, 2 at SMS) for updated data demonstrating compliance with this requirement and will verify evidence that copies of IEPs are provided to each teacher and service provider listed as having responsibilities for implementing the IEP through a subsequent on-site review.

COMPLIANCE CITATIONS		AREA OF COMPLIANCE
34 CFR 300.321(a) Ed 1103.01		5. IEP Team; Participants in the Special Education Process
Self-Assessment Question Number	Regulatory Component	Review Status
25.	34 CFR 300.321(a)(1) Ed 1103.01(a)	29 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the IEP Team included the parents of the child.
26.	34 CFR 300.321(a)(2) Ed 1103.01(a)	32 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the IEP Team included at least one regular education teacher of the child.
27.	34 CFR 300.321(a)(3) Ed 1103.01(a)	31 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the IEP Team included at least one special education teacher of the child, (or where appropriate), at least one special education provider of the child.
28.	34 CFR 300.321(a)(4) Ed 1103.01(a)	32 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the IEP Team included an LEA representative.
29.	Ed 1103.01(c)	When vocational education was being considered, 0 out of 0 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the IEP team membership included an individual knowledgeable about the vocational education program being considered.
30.	Ed 1103.02(a)	30 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that at least a 10 day notice was given to the parent before an IEP meeting, which included the purpose, time, location and identification of the participants. 2 out of 2 of those IEP files demonstrated evidence of the written consent of the parent that the notice requirement shall be waived [Ed 1103.02(b)].
Corrective Action of Individual Instance of Noncompliance: For <u>student files J, O & U</u> , there was no evidence that the IEP Team included the parents of the child. For <u>student file V</u> , there was no evidence that the IEP Team included at least one special education teacher of the child, (or where appropriate), at least one special education provider of the child.		
Within 45 days of the date of this report, the district must convene the IEP teams to review the IEPs and show evidence that the IEP Teams included the parents of the child; at least one regular education teacher of the child; at least one special education teacher of the child, (or where appropriate), at least one special education provider of the child; and an LEA representative. The NHDOE will verify this through a subsequent on-site review.		
Corrective Action regarding the Implementation of the Regulations: Develop procedures and provide trainings to appropriate staff for ensuring that the IEP Team includes the parents of the child; at least one regular education teacher of the child; at least one special education teacher of the child, (or where appropriate), at least one special education provider of the child; and an LEA representative. Develop procedures and provide trainings to appropriate staff for ensuring that 10 day notice is given to the parent before an IEP meeting, which includes the purpose, time, location and identification of the participants and for those circumstances when less than 10 days' notice is given, that prior to a meeting continuing, the notice requirements are waived through the written consent of the parent. Provide a brief description of the trainings including the dates of the trainings and lists of staff in attendance to the NHDOE by June 30, 2014.		

The NHDOE will select 4 new student files (2 at HMS, 2 at MSAP) for updated data demonstrating compliance with this requirement and will verify evidence of appropriate IEP Team participants through a subsequent on-site review.
--

COMPLIANCE CITATIONS		AREA OF COMPLIANCE
34 CFR 300.320(a); 34 CFR 300.324(a)(1) Ed 1109.01(a)(1); Ed 1109.03(h)		6. Individualized Education Program (Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance)
Self-Assessment Question Number	Regulatory Component	Review Status
31.	34 CFR 300.324(a)(1)(i) Ed 1109.03(h)	32 out of 32 IEPs demonstrated evidence of a statement of the child's strengths.
32.	34 CFR 300.324(a)(1)(iv) Ed 1109.03(h)	25 out of 32 IEPs demonstrated evidence of a statement of the child's academic, developmental, and functional needs.
33.	34 CFR 300.324(a)(1)(ii) Ed 1109.03(h)	30 out of 32 IEPs demonstrated evidence of a statement of the parent's concerns for improving the student's education in the IEP.
34.	34 CFR 300.324(a)(1)(iii) Ed 1109.03(h)	24 out of 32 IEPs demonstrated evidence that the results of initial or most recent evaluations of the child were included in the IEP.
35.	34 CFR 300.320(a)(1)(i) Ed 1109.01(a)(1)	31 out of 32 IEPs demonstrated evidence of a statement in the IEP that describes how the student's disability affects the student's involvement and progress in the general education curriculum.
36.	34 CFR 300.320(a)(4)(ii) Ed 1109.01(a)(1)	29 out of 32 IEPs demonstrated evidence of a statement that describes how the student's disability affects non-academic areas.
37.	34 CFR 300.320(a)(1)(ii) Ed 1109.01(a)(1)	For preschool children, as appropriate, 0 out of 0 IEPs demonstrated evidence of a statement in the IEP that describes how the disability affects the child's participation in appropriate activities.

Corrective Action of Individual Instance of Noncompliance: For student files A, B, J, O, S, Z & AD, there was no evidence of a statement of the child's academic, developmental, and functional needs. For student files M & T, there was no evidence of a statement of the parent's concerns for improving the student's education in the IEP. For student files D, G, J, P, T, U, V & AB, there was no evidence that the results of initial or most recent evaluations of the child were included in the IEP. For student file U, there was no evidence of a statement in the IEP that describes how the student's disability affects the student's involvement and progress in the general education curriculum. For student files A, N & O, there was no evidence of a statement that describes how the student's disability affects non-academic areas.

Within 45 days of the date of this report, the district must amend the IEPs to include all required components of the present levels of academic achievement and functional performance. The NHDOE will verify this through a subsequent on-site review.

Corrective Action regarding the Implementation of the Regulations: Develop a procedure and provide training to appropriate staff to include a statement of the child's strengths; academic, developmental, and functional needs; parent's concerns; the results of initial or most recent evaluations; and a statement in the IEP that describes how the student's disability affects the student's involvement and progress in the general education curriculum in IEPs and how the student's disability affects non-academic areas. Provide a brief description of the trainings including the dates of the trainings and lists of staff in attendance to the NHDOE by June 30, 2014.

The NHDOE will select 10 new student files (2 at HJMMS, 2 at HMS, 2 at MSAP, 2 at SMS) for updated data demonstrating compliance with this requirement and will verify the evidence through a subsequent on-site review.

COMPLIANCE CITATIONS	AREA OF COMPLIANCE
34 CFR 300.306(c)(1)(i)	7. Procedures for Determining Eligibility and Educational Need

Ed 1108.01(a)		
Self-Assessment Question Number	Regulatory Component	Review Status
38.	34 CFR 300.306(c)(1)(i) Ed 1108.01(a)	23 out of 32 IEPs demonstrated evidence that a variety of sources were used for decision-making when developing the IEP including aptitude and achievement tests, parent input, and teacher recommendations, as well as information about the child's physical condition, social or cultural background, and adaptive behavior.
Corrective Action of Individual Instance of Noncompliance: For student files D, G, N, O, P, S, T, V & AB, there was no evidence that a variety of sources were used for decision-making when developing the IEP including aptitude and achievement tests, parent input, and teacher recommendations, as well as information about the child's physical condition, social or cultural background, and adaptive behavior.		
Within 45 days of the date of this report, the district must amend the IEPs to include evidence that a variety of sources were used for decision-making when developing the IEP. The NHDOE will verify this through a subsequent on-site review.		
Corrective Action regarding the Implementation of the Regulations: Develop a procedure and provide training to appropriate staff to include a variety of sources for decision-making when developing the IEP including aptitude and achievement tests, parent input, and teacher recommendations, as well as information about the child's physical condition, social or cultural background, and adaptive behavior. Provide a brief description of the trainings including the dates of the trainings and lists of staff in attendance to the NHDOE by June 30, 2014.		
The NHDOE will select 8 new student files (2 at HJMMS, 2 at HMS, 2 at MSAP, 2 at SMS) for updated data demonstrating compliance with this requirement and will verify the evidence through a subsequent on-site review.		
COMPLIANCE CITATIONS		AREA OF COMPLIANCE
34 CFR 300.324(a)(2) Ed 1109.03(h)		8. Consideration of Special Factors
Self-Assessment Question Number	Regulatory Component	Review Status
39.	34 CFR 300.324(a)(2)(i) Ed 1109.03(h)	When a child's behavior impedes the child's learning or that of others, 17 out of 17 IEPs demonstrated evidence that the IEP team considered the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and other strategies, to address that behavior. <i>(From the files reviewed, the IEP Team determined that the behavior of 15 children does not impede learning.)</i>
40.	34 CFR 300.324(a)(2)(ii) Ed 1109.03(h)	When a child demonstrates limited English proficiency, 2 out of 2 IEPs demonstrated evidence that the IEP Team considered the language needs of the child as those needs relate to the child's IEP. <i>(Thirty children did not demonstrate limited English proficiency from the files reviewed.)</i>
41.	34 CFR 300.324(a)(2)(iii) Ed 1109.03(h)	When a child is blind or visually impaired, 3 out of 3 IEPs demonstrated evidence that the IEP Team provided for instruction in Braille and the use of Braille unless the IEP Team determined, after an evaluation of the child's reading and writing skills, needs, and appropriate reading and writing media (including an evaluation of the child's future needs for instruction in Braille or the use of Braille), that instruction in Braille or the use of Braille was not appropriate for the child. <i>(Twenty-nine children were not blind or visually impaired from the files reviewed.)</i>
42.	34 CFR 300.324(a)(2)(iv)	32 out of 32 IEPs demonstrated evidence that the IEP Team considered the communication needs of the child.

	Ed 1109.03(h)	
43.	34 CFR 300.324(a)(2)(iv) Ed 1109.03(h)	When a child is deaf or hard of hearing, 0 out of 0 IEPs demonstrated evidence that the IEP Team considered the child's language and communication needs, opportunities for direct communications with peers and professional personnel in the child's language and communication mode, academic level, and full range of needs, including opportunities for direct instruction in the child's language and communication mode. (<i>Thirty-two children were not deaf or hard of hearing from the files reviewed.</i>)
44.	34 CFR 300.324(a)(2)(v) Ed 1109.03(h)	32 out of 32 IEPs demonstrated evidence that the IEP Team considered whether the child needed assistive technology devices and services.
COMPLIANCE CITATIONS		AREA OF COMPLIANCE
Ed 1109.01(a)(10)		9. Courses of Study
Self-Assessment Question Number	Regulatory Component	Review Status
45.	Ed 1109.01(a)(10)	For each student with a disability beginning at age 14 or younger, if determined appropriate by the IEP team, 7 out of 12 IEPs demonstrated evidence of a statement of the transition service needs of the student under the applicable components of the student's IEP that focuses on the student's courses of study such as participation in advanced-placement courses or a vocational education.
<p>Corrective Action of Individual Instance of Noncompliance: For <u>student files D, G, O, AE & AF</u>, there was no evidence that, for each student with a disability beginning at age 14 or younger, if determined appropriate by the IEP team, of a statement of the transition service needs of the student under the applicable components of the student's IEP that focuses on the student's courses of study such as participation in advanced-placement courses or a vocational education.</p> <p>Within 45 days of the date of this report, the district must amend the IEPs to include evidence of a statement of the transition service needs of the student under the applicable components of the student's IEP that focuses on the student's courses of study such as participation in advanced-placement courses or a vocational education. The NHDOE will verify this through a subsequent on-site review.</p> <p>Corrective Action regarding the Implementation of the Regulations: Develop a procedure and provide training to appropriate staff to include a statement of the transition service needs of the student under the applicable components of the student's IEP that focuses on the student's courses of study such as participation in advanced-placement courses or a vocational education for each student with a disability beginning at age 14 or younger, if determined appropriate by the IEP team. Provide a brief description of the training including the dates of the trainings and lists of staff in attendance to the NHDOE by June 30, 2014.</p> <p>The NHDOE will select 6 new student files (2 at HJMMS, 2 at HMS, 2 at SMS) for updated data demonstrating compliance with this requirement and will verify the evidence through a subsequent on-site review.</p>		
COMPLIANCE CITATIONS		AREA OF COMPLIANCE
34 CFR 300.320(a)(2)(i) Ed 1109.01(a)		10. Measurable Annual Goals; Short-term Objectives or Benchmarks
Self-Assessment Question Number	Regulatory Component	Review Status
46.	34 CFR 300.320(a)(2)(i) Ed 1109.01(a)(1)	13 out of 32 IEPs demonstrated evidence of a statement of measurable annual goals, including academic and functional goals.
47.	34 CFR 300.320(a)(2)(i)(A)	27 out of 32 IEPs demonstrated evidence that the measurable annual goals meet the child's needs that result from the child's disability to

	Ed 1109.01(a)(1)	enable the child to be involved in and make progress in the general education curriculum.
48.	34 CFR 300.320(a)(2)(i)(B) Ed 1109.01(a)(1)	If there are other educational needs that result from the child's disability, 19 out of 22 IEPs demonstrated evidence that the measurable annual goals meet each of the child's other educational needs.
49.	Ed 1109.01(a)(6)	32 out of 32 IEPs demonstrated evidence of short-term objectives or benchmarks for all children unless the parent determines them unnecessary for all or some of the child's annual goals.
Corrective Action of Individual Instance of Noncompliance: For student files B, D, F, G, I, J, K, M, N, O, R, S, T, V, Z, AA, AB, AC & AE, there was no evidence of a statement of measurable annual goals. For student files J, M, P, S & V, there was no evidence that the measurable annual goals meet the child's needs that result from the child's disability to enable the child to be involved in and make progress in the general education curriculum. For student files J, P & V, there was no evidence that the measurable annual goals meet each of the child's other educational needs.		
Within 45 days of the date of this report, the district must amend the IEPs to include measurable annual goals and measurable goals that meet the child's needs that result from the child's disability and the child's other educational needs. The NHDOE will verify this through a subsequent on-site review.		
Corrective Action regarding the Implementation of the Regulations: Develop a procedure and provide training to appropriate staff in writing measurable annual goals and in including measurable annual goals that meet the child's needs that result from the child's disability and the child's other educational needs. Provide a brief description of the trainings including the dates of the trainings and lists of staff in attendance to the NHDOE by June 30, 2014.		
The NHDOE will select 10 new student files (2 at HJMMS, 3 at HMS, 2 at MSAP, 3 at SMS) for updated data demonstrating compliance with this requirement and will verify the evidence of a statement of measurable annual goals through a subsequent on-site review. The NHDOE will select 5 additional new student files (3 at HMS, 2 at MSAP) for updated data demonstrating compliance with this requirement and will verify the evidence that the measurable annual goals meet the child's needs that result from the child's disability to enable the child to be involved in and make progress in the general education curriculum and will verify the evidence that the measurable annual goals meet each of the child's other educational needs through a subsequent on-site review.		
COMPLIANCE CITATIONS		AREA OF COMPLIANCE
34 CFR 300.324(b)(1)(ii) Ed 1109.01(a); Ed 1109.03(h)		11. Review and Revision of IEPs (Measuring Progress)
Self-Assessment Question Number	Regulatory Component	Review Status
50.	Ed 1109.01(a)(9)	32 out of 32 IEPs demonstrated evidence that the IEP includes a statement of how the child's progress toward meeting the annual goals will be measured.
51.	Ed 1109.01(a)(9)	29 out of 32 IEPs demonstrated evidence that the IEP includes a statement whether progress is sufficient to achieve the annual goals by the end of the school year.
52.	Ed 1109.01(a)(8)	32 out of 32 IEPs demonstrated evidence that the IEP includes a statement of how the child's progress toward meeting the annual goals shall be provided to the parents.
53.	34 CFR 300.324(b)(1)(ii) Ed 1109.03(h)	15 out of 15 IEPs demonstrated evidence that the IEP has been reviewed and revised, as appropriate. (For seventeen student files, review and revision of the IEP was not determined appropriate.)
Corrective Action of Individual Instance of Noncompliance: For student files J, S & V, there was no evidence that the IEP included a statement whether progress is sufficient to achieve the annual goals by the end of the school year. A statement indicating that each goal will be met by the end of the school year or by the end of the IEP period was not		

included.

Within 45 days of the date of this report, the district must amend the IEPs to include a statement whether progress is sufficient to achieve the annual goals by the end of the school year. The NHDOE will verify this through a subsequent on-site review.

Corrective Action regarding the Implementation of the Regulations: Develop a procedure and provide training to appropriate staff to include statements in IEPs of whether progress is sufficient to achieve the annual goals by the end of the school year. Provide a brief description of the trainings including the dates of the trainings and lists of staff in attendance to the NHDOE by June 30, 2014.

The NHDOE will select 4 new student files (2 at HMS, 2 at MSAP) for updated data demonstrating compliance with this requirement and will verify the evidence that IEPs include statements whether progress is sufficient to achieve the annual goals by the end of the school year through a subsequent on-site review.

COMPLIANCE CITATIONS		AREA OF COMPLIANCE
34 CFR 300.323(d)(2)(ii) Ed 1102; Ed 1109.03(a)		12. Accessibility of Child's IEP to Teachers and Others (General Accommodations and General Modifications)
Self-Assessment Question Number	Regulatory Component	Review Status
54.	34 CFR 300.323(d)(2)(ii) Ed 1109.03(a)	29 out of 32 IEPs demonstrated evidence that each teacher and provider has been informed of the specific accommodations, modifications, and supports that must be provided for the child in accordance with the IEP.
55.	Ed 1102.01(b)	When accommodations are included, 29 out of 32 IEPs demonstrated evidence that the accommodations are changes in instruction or evaluation determined necessary by the IEP team that do not impact the rigor and/or validity of the subject matter being taught or assessed.
56.	Ed 1102.03(v)	When modifications are included, 10 out of 20 IEPs demonstrated evidence that the modifications are changes 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. (<i>For twelve student files, modifications were not included in the IEP.</i>)

Corrective Action of Individual Instance of Noncompliance: For student files P, X & AD, there was no evidence that each teacher and provider had been informed of the specific accommodations, modifications, and supports that must be provided for the child in accordance with the IEP. For student files F, J & AC, the accommodations included in the IEP were not changes in instruction or evaluation determined necessary by the IEP team that do not impact the rigor and/or validity of the subject matter being taught or assessed. For student files B, D, G, I, J, K, L, T, V & W, the modifications included in the IEP were not changes in instruction or evaluation that impact the rigor and validity or rigor or validity, of the subject matter being taught or assessed.

Within 3 weeks of the date of this report, the district must ensure that there is evidence that each teacher and provider has been informed of the specific accommodations, modifications, and supports in accordance with the IEP. Within 45 days of the date of this report, the district must amend the IEPs to ensure that the accommodations included in the IEP are changes in instruction or evaluation determined necessary by the IEP team that do not impact the rigor and/or validity of the subject matter being taught or assessed and that the modifications included are changes in instruction or evaluation that impact the rigor and validity or rigor or validity, of the subject matter being taught or assessed. The NHDOE will verify this through a subsequent on-site review.

Corrective Action regarding the Implementation of the Regulations: Develop a procedure and provide training to appropriate staff for ensuring that each teacher and provider has been informed of the specific accommodations,

modifications, and supports that must be provided for the child in accordance with the IEP. Develop a procedure and provide training to appropriate staff in writing accommodations that are changes in instruction or evaluation that do not impact the rigor and/or validity of the subject matter being taught or assessed and in writing modifications that are changes in instruction or evaluation that impact the rigor and validity or rigor or validity, of the subject matter being taught or assessed. Provide a brief description of the trainings including the dates of the trainings and lists of staff in attendance to the NHDOE by June 30, 2014.

The NHDOE will select 8 new student files (2 at HJMMS, 2 at HMS, 2 at MSAP, 2 at SMS) for updated data demonstrating compliance with this requirement and will verify the evidence that each teacher and provider had been informed of the specific accommodations, modifications, and supports that must be provided for the child in accordance with the IEP through a subsequent on-site review. The NHDOE will select 8 new student files (2 at HJMMS, 2 at HMS, 2 at MSAP, 2 at SMS) for updated data demonstrating compliance with this requirement and will verify the evidence that the accommodations included in the IEP are changes in instruction or evaluation that do not impact the rigor and/or validity of the subject matter being taught or assessed through a subsequent on-site review. The NHDOE will select 6 new student files (2 at HJMMS, 2 at HMS, 2 at MSAP) for updated data demonstrating compliance with this requirement and will verify the evidence that the modifications included are changes in instruction or evaluation that impact the rigor and validity or rigor or validity, of the subject matter being taught or assessed through a subsequent on-site review.

COMPLIANCE CITATIONS		AREA OF COMPLIANCE
34 CFR 300.320(a) Ed 1109.01(a)(1); 1109.04(b)		13. Definition of Individualized Education Program (Special Education and Related Services, Supplementary Aids and Services, and Program Modifications or Supports for School Personnel)
Self-Assessment Question Number	Regulatory Component	Review Status
57(a).	34 CFR 300.320(a)(4) Ed 1109.01(a)(1)	32 out of 32 IEPs demonstrated evidence of a statement of special education.
57(b).	34 CFR 300.320(a)(4) Ed 1109.01(a)(1)	20 out of 21 IEPs demonstrated evidence of a statement of related services. (<i>Eleven student files were of students where the IEP Team did not determine that related services were necessary.</i>)
57(c).	34 CFR 300.320(a)(4) Ed 1109.01(a)(1)	7 out of 9 IEPs demonstrated evidence of a statement of supplementary aids and services. (<i>Twenty-three student files were of students where the IEP Team did not determine that supplementary aids and services were necessary.</i>)
57(d).	34 CFR 300.320(a)(4) Ed 1109.01(a)(1)	9 out of 11 IEPs demonstrated evidence of a statement of the program modifications or supports for school personnel. (<i>Twenty-one student files were of students where the IEP Team did not determine that program modifications or supports for school personnel were necessary.</i>)
58.	34 CFR 300.320(a)(7) Ed 1109.01(a)(1)	32 out of 32 IEPs demonstrated evidence of a projected date for the beginning of the services and modifications described in the supports and services section of the IEP.
59.	34 CFR 300.320(a)(7) Ed 1109.01(a)(1)	32 out of 32 IEPs demonstrated evidence of the anticipated frequency, location, and duration of those services and modifications described in the supports and services section of the IEP.
60.	Ed 1109.04(b)(1)	28 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated written evidence documenting implementation of the IEP with regards to all special education and related services provided.
61.	Ed 1109.04(b)(2)	6 out of 8 IEP files demonstrated written evidence documenting implementation of the IEP with regards to any supplementary aids and services provided. (<i>Twenty-four files were not applicable in this area.</i>)
62.	Ed 1109.04(b)(3)	11 out of 16 IEP files demonstrated written evidence documenting

		implementation of the IEP with regards to program modifications made. <i>(Sixteen files were not applicable in this area.)</i>
63.	Ed 1109.04(b)(4)	7 out of 10 IEP files demonstrated written evidence documenting implementation of the IEP with regards to supports provided for school personnel implementing the IEP. <i>(Twenty-two files were not applicable in this area.)</i>
Corrective Action of Individual Instance of Noncompliance: For <u>student file W</u> , there was no evidence of a statement of related services. For <u>student files L & W</u> , there was no evidence of a statement of supplementary aids and services. For <u>student files L & W</u> , there was no evidence of a statement of the program modifications or supports for school personnel. For <u>student files A, J, Z & AC</u> , there was no written evidence documenting implementation of the IEP with regards to all special education and related services provided. For <u>student files E & N</u> , there was no written evidence documenting implementation of the IEP with regards to any supplementary aids and services provided. For <u>student files J, T, W, AA & AC</u> , there was no written evidence documenting implementation of the IEP with regards to program modifications made. For <u>student files J, T & Z</u> , there was no written evidence documenting implementation of the IEP with regards to supports provided for school personnel implementing the IEP.		
Within 45 days of the date of this report, the district must amend the IEPs to include a statement of related services and supplementary aids and services, based on peer-reviewed research to the extent practicable, to be provided to the child, or on behalf of the child, and a statement of the program modifications or supports for school personnel. The NHDOE will verify this through a subsequent on-site review. Within 45 days of the date of this report, the district must ensure that there is written evidence documenting implementation of the IEPs with regards to all special education and related services provided; any supplementary aids and services provided; program modifications made; and supports provided for school personnel implementing the IEP. The NHDOE will verify this through a subsequent on-site review.		
Corrective Action regarding the Implementation of the Regulations: Develop a procedure and provide training to appropriate staff to include a statement of the special education and related services and supplementary aids and services, based on peer-reviewed research to the extent practicable, to be provided to the child, or on behalf of the child, and a statement of the program modifications or supports for school personnel. Develop a procedure and provide training to appropriate staff for ensuring that there is written evidence documenting implementation of the IEP with regards to all special education and related services provided; any supplementary aids and services provided; program modifications made; and supports provided for school personnel implementing the IEP. Provide a brief description of the trainings including the dates of the trainings and lists of staff in attendance to the NHDOE by June 30, 2014.		
The NHDOE will select 4 student files (2 at HMS, 2 at MSAP) for updated data demonstrating compliance with evidence of a statement of special education and related services and supplementary aids and services, based on peer-reviewed research to the extent practicable, to be provided to the child, or on behalf of the child, and a statement of the program modifications or supports for school personnel. The NHDOE will select 9 additional student files (2 at HJMMS, 2 at HMS, 2 at MSAP, 3 at SMS) for updated data ensuring that there is written evidence documenting implementation of the IEP with regards to all special education and related services provided; any supplementary aids and services provided; program modifications made; and supports provided for school personnel implementing the IEP.		
COMPLIANCE CITATIONS		AREA OF COMPLIANCE
34 CFR 300.320(a)(5) Ed 1109.01(a)(1)		14. Definition of Individualized Education Program (Justification for Non-Participation)
Self-Assessment Question Number	Regulatory Component	Review Status
64.	34 CFR 300.320(a)(5) Ed 1109.01(a)(1)	23 out of 30 IEP demonstrated evidence of an explanation of the extent, if any, to which the child will not participate with nondisabled children in the regular class and in the activities described in the supports and services section of the IEP. <i>(For three student files, the students participate with nondisabled children in regular class and in the activities</i>

	<i>(described in the supports and services.)</i>	
Corrective Action of Individual Instance of Noncompliance: For student files B, D, H, K, M, T, Z & AE, there was no evidence of an explanation of the extent, if any, to which the child did not participate with nondisabled children in the regular class and in the activities described in the supports and services section of the IEP.		
Within 45 days of the date of this report, the district must amend the IEPs to include the explanation. The NHDOE will verify this through a subsequent on-site review.		
Corrective Action regarding the Implementation of the Regulations: Develop a procedure and provide training to appropriate staff to address this area. Provide a brief description of the trainings including the dates of the trainings and lists of staff in attendance to the NHDOE by June 30, 2014.		
The NHDOE will select 8 student files (2 at HJMMS, 2 at HMS, 2 at MSAP, 2 at SMS) for updated data demonstrating compliance with this requirement and will verify the evidence through a subsequent on-site review.		
COMPLIANCE CITATIONS	AREA OF COMPLIANCE	
34 CFR 300.320(a)(6) Ed 1109.01(a)(1)	15. Definition of Individualized Education Program (State and District Wide Assessments)	
Self-Assessment Question Number	Regulatory Component	Review Status
65.	34 CFR 300.320(a)(6)(i) Ed 1109.01(a)(1)	30 out of 32 IEPs demonstrated evidence of a statement of any individual appropriate accommodations that are necessary to measure the academic achievement and functional performance of the child on State and district wide assessments.
66.	34 CFR 300.320(a)(6)(ii)(A) Ed 1109.01(a)(1)	When the IEP Team determines that the child must take an alternate assessment instead of a particular regular State or district wide assessment of student achievement, 5 out of 5 IEPs demonstrated evidence of a statement of why the child cannot participate in the regular assessment.
67.	34 CFR 300.320(a)(6)(ii)(B) Ed 1109.01(a)(1)	When the child is taking an alternate assessment, 5 out of 5 IEPs demonstrated evidence describing why the particular alternate assessment selected is appropriate for the child.
Corrective Action of Individual Instance of Noncompliance: For student files G & J, there was no evidence of a statement of any individual appropriate accommodations that are necessary to measure the academic achievement and functional performance of the child on State and district wide assessments.		
Within 45 days of the date of this report, the district must amend the IEPs to include a statement of any individual appropriate accommodations that are necessary to measure the academic achievement and functional performance of the child on State and district wide assessments. The NHDOE will verify this through a subsequent on-site review.		
Corrective Action regarding the Implementation of the Regulations: Develop a procedure and provide training to appropriate staff to include a statement of any individual appropriate accommodations that are necessary to measure the academic achievement and functional performance of the child on State and district wide assessments in IEPs. Provide a brief description of the trainings including the dates of the trainings and lists of staff in attendance to the NHDOE by June 30, 2014.		
The NHDOE will select 4 student files (2 at HJMMS, 2 at HMS) for updated data demonstrating compliance with this requirement and will verify the evidence of the statement of any individual appropriate accommodations that are necessary to measure the academic achievement and functional performance of the child on State and district wide assessments through a subsequent on-site review.		
COMPLIANCE CITATIONS	AREA OF COMPLIANCE	

34 CFR 300.121 Ed 1120.03		16. Procedural Safeguards (Written Prior Notice for IEP)
Self-Assessment Question Number	Regulatory Component	Review Status
68.	Ed 1120.03(a)	25 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the parent(s) of a child with a disability were notified in writing within a reasonable time, but not less than 14 days, before the LEA proposed to initiate or change, or refused to initiate or change, the referral, evaluation, determination of eligibility, IEP, or educational placement of the child or the provision of FAPE to the child.
69.	34 CFR 300.503(b)(1) Ed 1120.03(b)	20 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the notice given to the parents of a child with a disability included a description of the action proposed or refused by the agency.
70.	34 CFR 300.503(b)(2) Ed 1120.03(b)	21 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the notice given to the parents of a child with a disability included an explanation of why the agency proposed or refused to take the action.
71.	34 CFR 300.503(b)(3) Ed 1120.03(b)	28 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the notice given to the parents of a child with a disability included a description of each evaluation procedure, assessment, record, or report the agency used as a basis for the proposed or refused action.
72.	34 CFR 300.503(b)(4) Ed 1120.03(b)	32 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the notice given to the parents of a child with a disability included a statement that says the parents of a child with a disability have protection under the procedural safeguards.
73.	34 CFR 300.503(b)(4) Ed 1120.03(b);	For notices not for an initial referral for evaluation, 32 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the LEA notified the parents of a means by which a copy of the procedural safeguards can be obtained.
74.	34 CFR 300.503(b)(5) Ed 1120.03(b)	32 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the notice given to the parents of a child with a disability included sources for the parents to contact to obtain assistance in understanding the provisions of the notice.
75.	34 CFR 300.503(b)(6) Ed 1120.03(b)	25 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the notice given to the parents of a child with a disability included a description of other options that the IEP team considered and the reasons why those options were rejected.
76.	34 CFR 300.503(b)(7) Ed 1120.03(b)	21 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the notice given to the parents of a child with a disability included a description of other factors that were relevant to the LEA's proposal or refusal
77.	34 CFR 300.503(c)(1)(i) Ed 1120.03(b)	32 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the notice given to the parents of a child with a disability was written in language understandable to the general public.
78.	34 CFR 300.503(c)(1)(ii) Ed 1120.03(b)	32 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the notice given to the parents of a child with a disability was provided in the native language of the parent or other mode of communication used by the parent, unless it was clearly not feasible to do so.
79.	34 CFR 300.504(a) Ed 1120.03(b)	32 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that a copy of the procedural safeguards, available to the parents of a child with a disability, was given to the parent one time in the school year.
Corrective Action regarding the Implementation of the Regulations: Develop a procedure that identifies for parent(s) the reasonable time (not less than 14 days) to receive notification in writing of the district's action, and provide training		

to appropriate staff. (Please note that parental consent cannot be obtained without the requisite prior written notice.) Provide training to staff on completing the written prior notice in order for staff to appropriately document each component. Provide a brief description of the trainings including the dates of the trainings and lists of staff in attendance to the NHDOE by June 30, 2014.

The NHDOE will select 11 student files (2 at HJMMS, 3 at HMS, 3 at MSAP, 3 at SMS) for updated data demonstrating compliance with this requirement and will verify that the procedure for identifying for parents(s) the reasonable time to receive notification has been developed and that the written prior notices are complete including a description of the action proposed or refused by the agency; an explanation of why the agency proposed or refused to take the action; a description of each evaluation procedure, assessment, record, or report the agency used as a basis for the proposed or refused action; and a description of other options and other factors through a subsequent on-site review.

COMPLIANCE CITATIONS		AREA OF COMPLIANCE
34 CFR 300.503 Ed 1120.03		17. Written Prior Notice (Placement)
Self-Assessment Question Number	Regulatory Component	Review Status
80.	Ed 1120.03(a)	25 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the parent(s) of a child with a disability were notified in writing within a reasonable time, but not less than 14 days, before the LEA proposed to initiate or change, or refused to initiate or change, the referral, evaluation, determination of eligibility, IEP, or educational placement of the child or the provision of FAPE to the child.
81.	34 CFR 300.503(b)(1) Ed 1120.03(b)	24 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the notice given to the parents of a child with a disability included a description of the action proposed or refused by the agency.
82.	34 CFR 300.503(b)(2) Ed 1120.03(b)	22 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the notice given to the parents of a child with a disability included an explanation of why the agency proposed or refused to take the action.
83.	34 CFR 300.503(b)(3) Ed 1120.03(b)	30 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the notice given to the parents of a child with a disability included a description of each evaluation procedure, assessment, record, or report the agency used as a basis for the proposed or refused action.
84.	34 CFR 300.503(b)(4) Ed 1120.03(b)	32 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the notice given to the parents of a child with a disability included a statement that says the parents of a child with a disability have protection under the procedural safeguards.
85.	34 CFR 300.503(b)(4) Ed 1120.03(b)	For notices not for an initial referral for evaluation, 32 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the LEA notified the parents of a means by which a copy of the procedural safeguards can be obtained.
86.	34 CFR 300.503(b)(5) Ed 1120.03(b)	32 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the notice given to the parents of a child with a disability included sources for the parents to contact to obtain assistance in understanding the provisions of the notice.
87.	34 CFR 300.503(b)(6) Ed 1120.03(b)	24 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the notice given to the parents of a child with a disability included a description of other options that the IEP team considered and the reasons why those options were rejected.
88.	34 CFR 300.503(b)(7) Ed 1120.03(b)	18 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the notice given to the parents of a child with a disability included a description of other

		factors that were relevant to the LEA's proposal or refusal.
89.	34 CFR 300.503(c)(1)(i) Ed 1120.03(b)	32 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the notice given to the parents of a child with a disability was written in language understandable to the general public.
90.	34 CFR 300.503(c)(1)(ii) Ed 1120.03(b)	32 out of 32 IEP files demonstrated evidence that the notice given to the parents of a child with a disability was provided in the native language of the parent or other mode of communication used by the parent, unless it was clearly not feasible to do so.
Corrective Action regarding the Implementation of the Regulations: Develop a procedure that identifies for parent(s) the reasonable time (not less than 14 days) to receive notification in writing of the district's action, and provide training to appropriate staff. (Please note that parental consent cannot be obtained without the requisite prior written notice.) Provide training to staff on completing the prior written notice. Provide a brief description of the trainings including the dates of the trainings and lists of staff in attendance to the NHDOE by June 30, 2014.		
The NHDOE will select 11 student files (2 at HJMMS, 3 at HMS, 3 at MSAP, 3 at SMS) for updated data demonstrating compliance with this requirement and will verify that the procedure for identifying for parents(s) the reasonable time to receive notification has been developed and that the written prior notices are complete including a description of the action proposed or refused by the agency; an explanation of why the agency proposed or refused to take the action; a description of each evaluation procedure, assessment, record, or report the agency used as a basis for the proposed or refused action; and a description of other options and other factors through a subsequent on-site review.		