

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

**MONARCH SCHOOL OF NEW ENGLAND
SUMMARY REPORT**

**Diane Bessey, Executive Director
Kate Sisneroz, Director of Special Education**

**Chairperson, Visiting Team:
Kathryn Skoglund
Education Consultant**

**Site Visit Conducted on October 23-24, 2013
Date of Report: January 9, 2014, 2013**

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. October 23-24, 2013 Case Study Compliance Review Results
 - Local Education Agency (LEA) Survey
 - Parent Participation
 - Summary of Findings from the Three Focus Areas
 - Commendations
 - Findings of Noncompliance
 - Suggestions for Program Improvement
- VI. Building Level Summary Report

I. TEAM MEMBERS

Visiting Team Members:

NAME	PROFESSIONAL ROLE
Kathryn L. Skoglund	Chairperson, Education Consultant
Beth Setear	Pre-school/Elementary Special Education Coordinator
Karen Staines	Executive Director
Bridget Brown	NHDOE Education Consultant

Building Level Team Members from the Monarch School of New England:

NAME	PROFESSIONAL ROLE
Karen Cronin	Special Education Teacher
Kate Sisneroz	Director of Special Education
Tom Grebouski	Chief of Psychology
Amanda Martineau	Speech/Language Pathologist
Kathryn Perry	Occupational Therapist
Erica Mann	Physical Therapist
Shannon Cantara	Special Education Teacher
Carolyn Durfee	Speech/Language Pathologist
Michelle Desjardins	Occupational Therapist
Diane Bessey	Executive Director

II. INTRODUCTION

The Monarch School of New England (heretofore referred to as the Monarch School) comprises of two campuses: the Foss School (students aged 5-15) and the Williams School (students aged 14-21). At the time of the Case Study Review on October 23-24, 2013 there were approximately 27 New Hampshire students enrolled between the two sites. Students are bussed from 13 New Hampshire school districts; additional students come from Maine. Both the Williams and the Foss sites are special education day school settings and support students with a variety of physical, medical, and educational needs. Monarch School is approved for all disabilities: Autism, Deaf-Blindness, Deafness, Developmental Delay, Emotional Disturbance, Hearing Impairment, Intellectual Disability, Multiple Disabilities, Orthopedic Impairment, Other Health Impairments, Specific Learning Disability, Speech-Language Disability, Traumatic Brain Injury, and Visual Impairments. The Monarch School offers a range of innovative and effective programming that addresses cognitive, behavioral, and communication needs of their students. Components of their programming include aquatics, horticulture, and hippo-therapy. The Monarch School employs an interdisciplinary approach to the delivery of academics and the implementation of IEP supports and services. The teachers, medical, behavioral and therapeutic staff integrate “core” curriculum with developmental and therapeutic needs while providing individual supports and interventions as identified in the student’s IEP. Students who attend the Monarch School may earn a certificate of attendance.

The Williams site, located in Gonic, NH, offers academic and vocational programming designed for its students to learn a variety of skills in work/pre-vocational setting. The site boasts a well-equipped vocational center within the facility which mimics a sheltered workshop setting. The focus at the Williams Center is to integrate core curriculum with life and work skills and foster independence for students who have significant learning impairments.

Guiding Principles for the Monarch School:

“Rooted in the belief that every student deserves an environment in which they can flourish, the Monarch School designs programs based on students’ individual needs and capabilities. Students here are seen for their abilities, not for their disabilities - for their capacity to grow and learn. Our goal is to provide our students with the same opportunities as those of their peers in public schools.” (From “Program Purpose”, the Monarch School Application for Renewal of New Hampshire DOE Special Education Approval, September, 2013.

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS	2012-2013	2013-2014
Student Enrollment as of October 1	33	32
Do you accept out-of-state students? If so, list number from each state in 2013-14	Yes, 5 from Maine	
Number and Names of Sending New Hampshire LEAs (as of October 1, 2013)	(2) Chichester SAU# 53, (3) Dover SAU# 11, (1) Amherst SAU# 39, (3) Rochester, (4) Londonderry SAU# 12, (1) Hampton SAU#21 (1) North Conway SAU9, (2) Farmington SAU# 61, (3)Timberlane SAU# 55, (2) Barrington SAU# 74, (1) Pittsfield SAU# 54, (1) Raymond SAU# 33, (1) Fremont SAU#83, (1) Hopkinton SAU# 66, (1)Auburn SAU# 15	
# of Identified Students Suspended One or More Times	0	0

Average Length of Stay for Students	4.3	4.02
<u>STAFF DEMOGRAPHICS</u>		
Student/Teacher Ratio (as of October 1, 2013)	6.4	6.4
# of Certified Administrators	2	2
# of Certified Teachers	5	6
# of Current Teachers with Certification through Alt 4	0	0
# of Related Service Providers	10 (plus 2/5 vision)	10 (plus 2/5 vision)
# of Paraprofessionals	31	28
# of Professional Days Made Available to Staff	4	4

Please complete the table below, listing the number of students in each category.

SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM DATA (please put NA if not approved for the disability)		
<u>Primary</u> Disability Types:	2012-2013	2013-2014
Autism	13	15
Deaf / Blindness	0	0
Deafness	0	0
Developmental Delay	1	0
Emotional Disturbance	1	1
Hearing Impairment	0	0
Intellectual Disability	2	3
Multiple Disabilities	14	12
Orthopedic Impairment	0	0
Other Health Impairment	1	1
Specific Learning Disabilities	0	0
Speech or Language Impairment	0	0
Traumatic Brain Injury	0	0
Visual Impairment	0	0

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 Monarch School of New England on October 23-24, 2013 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 and NHSEIS verification reports
- ♦ 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 the Monarch 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 April 14, 2011 NHDOE Special Education Program Approval Report, the following patterns were identified as needing improvement:

Findings of Noncompliance	Status as of April 11, 2012	Status as of October 23-24, 2013
Ed 1109.01/34CFR300.320: lack of measurable goals	MET	MET
Ed 1114.04 Administration/Ch. Ed 500: Professional Development for all staff	MET	MET Monarch School showed evidence of the professional development opportunities made available to staff.

V. OCTOBER 23-24, 2013 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.

Two students were randomly selected for these Case Studies taking into account age, gender, sending district and disabilities. The students represented each of the two Monarch School sites. Representatives from each of the sending districts were notified and invited to participate in the Case Study process. The younger of the two students reflected a wide range of services and supports at the elementary level while the older student provided a good example of how the Monarch School prepares its students for community service and transition into the community and the adult world. The parents of each of these students were also invited to attend and participated during the Case Study visit.

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, the Monarch School distributed the LEA Survey to the contact people in all LEAs that have students currently enrolled in the school. They received a **67% response** from the LEAs.

SUMMARY REPORT OF SENDING LEAS

Name of Private School: Monarch School of New England		
Total number of surveys sent: 15	Total # of completed surveys received: 10	Percent of response: 67%
Number of students placed by: LEA: 32	Court:	Parent:

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
2. I am satisfied the student has made progress in the educational curriculum at the above school.	6	3			1

3. There is evidence of effective instruction aligned with fidelity to the curriculum.	6	3			1
4. The school consistently follows special education rules and regulations.	6	3			1
5. The school has developed and implemented effective policies and procedures for management of student behavior including the use of aversives.	9	1			
6. The school has an effective behavioral management program.	8	2			
7. I am satisfied with the special education, related and other supplementary aids and services provided by the school.	7	3			
8. The school implements all parts of students' IEPs including accommodations and modifications in both instruction and assessment.	9				1
9. The school effectively uses data to measure academic growth and to inform instruction.	7	2			1
10. The school uses data to measure behavioral growth and to inform instruction.	8	1			1
11. A mid-year review and annual evaluation of the child's progress relative to the IEP are conducted.	9				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).	9	1			
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.	8	2			
14. I am satisfied with the way the school communicates students' progress to the parents and the LEA.	8	2			
15. The school actively plans for future transition to a less restrictive environment.	3	4	2		1
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).	4	3			3
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.	3	3			4
18. The school team sets meeting times that are convenient for both parents and the LEA.	7	3			
19. I would enroll other students at the school.	7	3			

Analysis of Response by Monarch School:

Relative Strengths: Curriculum fully aligned to NH Curriculum Frameworks and Common Core State Standards, students demonstrate academic progress, effective instruction, following SPED rules and regulations, Using data to measure academic and behavioral growth and to inform instruction, quarterly reviews, Implementation of all parts of the IEP, annual review of the IEP, Progress monitoring, Communication with the LEA, setting convenient meetings times, LEAs open to enrolling another student.

Areas that may indicate need for improvement: Transition to a less restrictive environment, implementing all aspects of transition services.

Target Areas for Action Plan: Transition to a less restrictive environment: Monarch School currently works with each school to determine if it has the supports necessary to successfully transition students back to district, and assists with developing sufficient supports if they do not already exist. We have actively transitioned several students back yearly. Apparently we need to communicate even more clearly that we believe students belong in their sending communities.

Implementing all aspects of transition services: Monarch School staff are currently attending workshops on transition to adulthood to assist parents with navigating the maze of services necessary to access appropriate adult services and placement when their children turn 21. We are planning several workshops over the course of the year for parents to keep them better informed of the timeline for completion of paperwork and the array of services available.

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 (sent to NH parents only), 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: Monarch School of New England		
Total number of surveys sent: 26	Total # of completed surveys received: 14	Percent of response: 53%

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).	11	2		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.	7	5	1	1
3. I am informed on a regular basis and with clear evidence of my child's progress in the general education curriculum.	14			
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.	12	2		
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").	12	2		
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).	13			1
7. I know whom to contact if I have questions about my child's placement or progress in this program.	14			
8. I am satisfied that the staff of this placement worked collaboratively with my school district in developing my child's current IEP.	13	1		
9. I have been involved in the development of my child's IEP.	14			
10. I am satisfied that my child is making progress toward his/her IEP goals.	14			

FOR PARENTS OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS ONLY:			
11. My child earns credits toward a regular high school diploma in all of his/her classes.	4		6
12. My student will graduate with a high school diploma	4		6
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.	11		3
14. All of the people who are important to my child's transition were part of the planning (grade appropriate).	10	1	3
15. All of the people/agencies who are required to be part of transition planning for my child were part of the transition process.	10	1	3
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)	3	1	7
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	1	6
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 12		NO 2
	3	2	1 No Answer
19. I have been involved in the development of behavior interventions, strategies and supports for my child.	12		2
20. I am satisfied with the way the school is supporting my child's behavioral, social and developmental needs.	12		2
OTHER:			
21. I fully participate in special education decisions regarding my child.	14		
22. I have been provided with a copy of the procedural safeguards (parental rights) at least once a year.	14		

Analysis of Parent Surveys provided by Program Approval:

Parent responses reflect strong satisfaction with the Monarch programs. The vast majority of responses were in the highest possible category. One notable low score was in regard to the opportunity for Monarch students to engage with non-disabled peers. Monarch continually strives to create natural opportunities for interaction with non-disabled students but acknowledges it is a challenge to do so as a private school. However, many in-roads have been made toward integration through community service, work programs, volunteering, and community jobs. Parent feedback on behavior management was especially strong.

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

Access to the General Curriculum

Implementation of Individual Education Programs (IEPs) Provision of Non-Academic Services Full Access to the District's Curriculum Equal Education Opportunity

Access to the general curriculum has been and continues to be an area of strength for Monarch. The Case Study visit reflected strong evidence of not only *access* to the curriculum, but *participation* and *progress in* the curriculum. Work has been done by all teaching staff, led by the Special Education administrator, to move from NH Curriculum Frameworks to College and Career Readiness Standards ("Common Core"). The standards are integrated into daily lessons plans/units and instruction is modified to meet the needs of all learners as identified in the students' IEPs. Related services staff is also informed regarding the CCRS and actively support their students in the classroom as they work on IEP goals and objectives. CCSR standards are also carried over into community work and therapies. The result is an effective, comprehensive "wrap-around" support system for all students created by a cohesive and well-educated staff. Work on measurable goals required in the last Case Study was effectively completed; as a result Monarch IEPs are viable, working documents actively supporting the students.

Transition

Transition Planning Process: Provision of Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) Transition Services

Transitions are a point of focus for the Monarch School: transitions from public school to private school (Monarch), from Monarch back to the sending district, and within Monarch grade to grade, therapy settings to the classroom or to the community, and from the Foss site to the Williams site. Great care and deliberate attention go into each transition with student needs at the forefront. Training in Transition Services requirements have been provided to all staff, inclusive of LEA reps to assure consistency and continuity for students. The result of this foundational work is a cohesive approach to changes in services.

Behavior Strategies and Discipline

The Monarch School has a clearly defined school-wide behavior support plan. Therapeutic treatment plans are developed with the whole student in mind and are an integral part of the IEP and its implementation. The position of Chief of Psychology is fundamental in designing behavior support systems as well as in training and supporting staff in carrying them out. Data is gathered and analyzed not only on academic performance but on behavior as well. Modifications are made if plans are not proving successful and adjusted accordingly if they are working. This close collaboration among staff

and therapists is of great benefit to the students. The result is a calm, orderly environment in which students feel secure, are able to thrive, and are not disruptive of their own or others' education.

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, and Personnel Roster and Consultant Roster Review and verification of these documents found the Monarch 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

Based on observations by the visiting team during the two-day visit, the following commendations are offered:

1. Related services are an integral part of every child's program at Monarch. Services are woven into the daily educational schedule with an emphasis on communication among all staff supporting Monarch students. The result is an almost seamless system of education and related services.
2. Program development and delivery is intentional in every aspect. Very little occurs during a student's day that isn't designed to support or enhance their education plan.
3. Data collection, analysis and application are very strong aspects of Monarch's program. The use of data is consistent and used to directly inform programming and support services.
4. Access to the general curriculum is a strong emphasis at the Monarch School. The visiting team saw clear evidence of modifications and accommodations based on students' IEPs and progress in the curriculum, particularly in Math and Science.
5. There is a deliberate focus on encouraging student independence and self-determination. Staff urges students on to higher expectations and to make their own choices wherever possible.
6. Monarch administration showed evidence that adequate time is provided for pre-planning lesson units, programming devices, and developing educational materials. The result is that the classroom day moves smoothly without interruption of student support.
7. The Monarch School benefits from strong and consistent leadership. The Board of Directors is extremely knowledgeable about the operations and purpose of the school and is engaged in the public relations operations. The Executive Director, the Director of Special Education, and the Psychologist have held those positions for several years resulting in strong, consistent and informed leadership.
8. The use of technology is consistent and innovative; iPads and communication devices are readily accessible and programmed by an appropriately licensed staff, truly assisting students with access to the general curriculum.

**Number of Cases Reviewed During the Monarch School
October 23-24, 2013 NHDOE Compliance Visitation**

Preschool	
Elementary School	1
Middle School	
High School, Age Below 16	
High School, Age 16 or Above	1
Number of Noncompliance for Indicator 13	0
Total Number of Case Studies Reviewed	2

**FINDINGS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IDENTIFIED AS A RESULT OF THE
OCTOBER 23-24, 2013 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.*

There were no Child Specific Findings of Non-compliance.

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 Non-compliance.

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. State when data are taken and reported on for progress monitoring purposes in all measurable goals.
2. Multiple measures are used to develop IEPs, but need to be identified in the IEP by name of evaluation instrument and date of assessment.
3. Assure that student progress data is shared with the sending districts on a regular basis.

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: Monarch School	Date: October 23-24, 2013	
Programs: Foss School, Williams School	Number of Cases Reviewed: 2	
Recorder/Summarizer: K. Skoglund, Educational Consultant	Number of students reviewed age 16+: 1	Number of students age 16+ cited for Indicator 13: 0

CLEARLY PRINT NAMES OF ALL COLLABORATIVE TEAM MEMBERS

Name: Karen Cronin	Position: Special Ed Teacher	Building Level
Name: Kate Sisneroz	Position: Director of Special Education	Building Level
Name: Tom Grebouski	Position: Chief of Psychology	Building Level
Name: Amanda Martineau	Position: Speech/Language Pathologist	Building Level
Name: Kathryn Perry	Position: Occupational Therapist	Building Level
Name: Erica Mann	Position: Physical Therapist	Building Level
Name: Shannon Cantara	Position: Special Ed Teacher	Building Level
Name: Carolyn Durfee	Position: Speech/Language Pathologist	Building Level
Name: Michelle Desjardins	Position: Occupational Therapist	Building Level
Name: Beth Setear	Position: Elem. Spec Ed Coordinator	Visiting Team
Name: Karen Staines	Position: Executive Director	Visiting Team
Name: Bridget Brown	Position: NHDOE	Visiting Team

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 number 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 .	2	
2. There is evidence of a system among all 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 .	2		
3. There is evidence that the Team uses multiple measures to design, implement and monitor the student's program ^{3,4} .	2		
4. All IEP goals are written in measurable terms ⁵ .	2		
5. Student's IEP has at least one functional goal (as applicable) ⁶ .	2		
6. There is evidence that the student has made progress in IEP Goals over the past three years ^{7,8} .	2		
7. There is evidence that the special education, supplementary aids and/or related services described in the IEP have been delivered ⁹ .	2		
8. There is evidence that NH Minimum Standards for required subjects (credits) are met and provided to the student ¹⁰ .	2		

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

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

9. There is evidence the student has access to, is participating and progressing in the general education curriculum (aligned with NH Curriculum Frameworks/CCSS) ¹¹ .	2		
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 .	2		
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} .	2		
12. There is evidence that supports and accommodations are provided to this student to allow participation in extracurricular and other non-academic activities ¹⁷ .	2		
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 .	2		
14. There is evidence the student's IEP is reasonably calculated to result in educational benefit.	2		
For High School Students:			
Student is earning credits toward a regular high school diploma ¹⁹ .		1	
IF YES: within 4 years?		1	
Student will earn an IEP diploma or a certificate of completion ¹⁹ .	1		
IF YES: within 4 years?		1	
Does this school have a clear policy for earning a high school diploma ²⁰ ?			X

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

²⁰ Ed 1114.05 Program Requirements (a)(b)

Access Strengths	Access Suggestions for Improvement
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Integration of related services into classrooms; communication emphasized. 2. Intentional program development and delivery; each program clearly individualized and thoroughly implemented. 3. Emphasis on access to general curriculum; Common Core Standards in evidence, appropriate modifications/ accommodations, time allotted for pre-planning and review of student work. 4. Innovative use of technology; technology used as a "gateway" to curriculum. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Indicate on measurable goals when data are taken and are reported on. 2. Identify measures used to develop IEPs by name of evaluation and date of assessment. 3. Share progress data with sending districts regularly.

TRANSITION STATEMENTS²¹

Fill in the combined number 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 .	2
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 .	2	
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 .	2	
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 .	2	
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 .	2	
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 .	2	
7. There is evidence that the student and parents have been involved in transition discussions and activities ²⁸ .	2	
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 student's courses of study ²⁹ .	NA	

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

<p>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 activities³⁰.</p>	NA
<p>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.</p>	
<p>TRANSITION STATEMENTS</p>	
<p>(Transition questions must be answered Yes or No, not N/A)</p>	
<p>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</p>	
<p>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)</p>	
<p>1. Is there an appropriate measurable postsecondary goal or goals that covers education OR training AND employment, and, as needed, independent living?</p>	1
<p><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?</i> • If yes to all three, then check Y OR if a postsecondary goal(s) is (are) not stated, check N.</p>	
<p>2. Is (are) the postsecondary goal(s) updated annually?</p>	1
<p><i>Was (were) the postsecondary goal(s) addressed/ updated in conjunction with the development of the current IEP?</i> • If yes, then check Y OR if the postsecondary goal(s) was (were) not updated with the current IEP, check N.</p>	
<p>3. Is there evidence that the measurable postsecondary goal(s) were based on age appropriate transition assessment?</p>	1
<p><i>Is the use of transition assessment(s) for the postsecondary goal(s) mentioned in the IEP or evident in the student's file?</i> • If yes, then check Y OR if no, then check N.</p>	
<p>4. Are there transition services in the IEP that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goal(s)?</p>	1
<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> • If yes, then check Y OR if no, then check N.</p>	

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

5. Do the transition services include courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goal(s)?	1		
<i>Do the transition services include courses of study that align with the student's postsecondary goal(s)?</i>			
• If yes, then check Y OR if no, then check N.			
6. Is (are) there annual IEP goal(s) related to the student's transition services needs?	1		
<i>Is (are) an annual goal(s) included in the IEP that is/are related to the student's transition services needs?</i>			
• If yes, then check Y OR if no, then check N.			
7. Is there evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services were discussed?	1		
<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>			
• If yes, then check Y OR if no, then check N.			
Only the following statement may be answered N/A if appropriate. All statements above must be answered Yes or No.			
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?	1		
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>			
<i>Was consent obtained from the parent (or student, for a student the age of majority)?</i>			
• If yes to both, then check Y.			
• 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.			
• 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.			
• If parent or individual student consent (when appropriate) was not provided, check NA.			
11. Student is informed prior to age 17 of his/her rights under IDEA ³² .	X		
Parent has established guardianship.			
12. Does the IEP meet the requirements of Indicator 13? (Check one)	1		
Yes (all Ys or NAs for each item (1 - 10) on the Checklist or No (one or more Ns checked)			
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 .	1		

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

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

Transition Strengths

1. Transition issues are thoroughly addressed at all pivotal points – from LEA to private school, grade-to-grade, program to program as well as through Indicator 13. Careful attention to these area facilitates student succeed at the Monarch School.

Transition Suggestions for Improvement

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 .	2
2. There is evidence that data are used to determine impact of student behavior on his/her learning.	2	
3. There is evidence that the IEP team conducted a functional behavior assessment of the student's behavior ³⁵ .	2	
4. If appropriate, there is evidence that the IEP team developed a behavior intervention plan that described strategies and supports ³⁶ .	2	
5. There is evidence that the interventions, strategies and supports have been developed to address the student's behavior ³⁷ .	2	
6. There is evidence that positive interventions, strategies and supports been communicated to the student, parents and key school personnel ³⁸ .	2	
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 .	2	
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} .	2	
9. There is evidence that that the team uses data to demonstrate the results of the behavioral interventions, strategies and supports ⁴² .	2	
10. A school-wide behavior intervention model exists.	2	

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. Monarch School combines their resources and supports to deliberately encourage and foster student independence and self-determination. Students make deliberate and informed choices throughout their programs which helps them in meeting high expectations.</p>	