

**NEW HAMPSHIRE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAM APPROVAL VISITATION**

**SAU 35
SUMMARY REPORT**

**Bethlehem, Lafayette Regional, Landaff, Littleton,
Lisbon Regional and Profile Regional**

**Patrick Low, Superintendent of Schools
Kevin Eckerman, Assistant Superintendent**

Mary Anne Byrne, Education Consultant

Visit Conducted on November 7 and 8, 2006
Report Date, March 26, 2007
Report Revised, April 23, 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Participants in the NHDOE Modified Special Education Program Approval Visit
- II. Introduction (Profile of the District)
- III. Purpose and Design of The Modified Special Education Program Approval Visit
- IV. Status of Previous Program Approval Report and Corrective Actions
- V. Results of the November 7 and 8, 2006 NHDOE Modified Special Education Program Approval Visit
 - Description of the Monitoring Activities
 - Summary of Findings Based on IEP Team Presentations at Each School
 - New Special Education Programs Seeking Approval From The NHDOE
 - Commendations
 - Issues of Significance
 - Citations of Noncompliance
 - Suggestions for Program Improvement
 - Data Collection Forms
- VI. Addendum: Out of District and James O Summaries

I. TEAM MEMBERS

Visiting Team Members:

NAME	PROFESSIONAL ROLE
Chairperson: Mary Anne Byrne	Education Consultant
Jane Bergeron-Beaulieu	Education Consultant
Jennifer Dolloff	Education Consultant

Building Level Team Members:

NAME	PROFESSIONAL ROLE	NAME	PROFESSIONAL ROLE
Carol Johnson Haywood	Special Educator/Case Manager	Eric Anderson	Principal
Maureen Ferland	Kindergarten Teacher	Karen Hood	Preschool Coordinator
Tammy Reardon	School Nurse	Michelle Giarrocco	OTR/L
Carol Emerson	PT	Sheryl Moghari	SLP
June Ball	Paraprofessional	Gordon Lemke	Adaptive PE Teacher
Karen Marks	Inclusion Facilitator/Case Manager	Garret Ferguson	4 th grade Teacher
Elsbeth Richardson	1:1 Paraprofessional	Beverly Frenkiewich	Primary Special Educator
Wendy Kern	Prescriptive Teacher	Kathryn Anderson	Reading Specialist
Laurie Canuto	SLP	Gordie Johnk	Principal
Tara Landry-Mallet	Middle School Special Educator/Case Manager	Cheryl Lafond	Music Teacher
Pat Lang	Math Teacher	Emilie Smith	Assistant Principal/Special Education Coordinator
Kyla Welch	Special Education Coordinator, 7-12	Kelly Noland	Case Manager/Special Educator
Amy Burke	Social Worker	Richard Ubaldo	JPPO
Jim Snyder	Special Education Coordinator	Jennifer Opalinski	Food and Nutrition Teacher
Lori Smith	Middle School Special Educator	Mark Butterfield	High School Special Educator
Matt Kristoff	1:1 Paraprofessional	Cathy Strasses	OTR
Evelyn Blakslee	SLA		

II. INTRODUCTION

The White Mountains School Administrative Unit (SAU) 35 is comprised of 6 School Districts: Bethlehem, Lafayette Regional, Profile Regional, Landaff, Lisbon and Littleton serving the 8 towns of Bethlehem, Easton, Franconia, Sugar Hill, Landaff, Lisbon, Lyman and Littleton. As of July, 2007, Littleton will become SAU 84, separating from the remaining towns/school districts in SAU 35. The region's economy is supported through employment in the areas of: manufacturing, health care, education and tourism.

The mission of School Administrative Unit 35, in concert with its member districts and their students, families and broader communities, is to prepare all students to be responsible citizens and afford them the opportunity to acquire the skills, knowledge, and abilities necessary to make informed decisions that lead to meaningful and productive lives.

Bethlehem School District serves 182 Bethlehem students from grades K-6 in Bethlehem Elementary School. Their mission is:

- To focus on the needs of the whole student.
- To allow students to grow and learn as individuals by exploring potentials and realizing capabilities.
- To help develop an appropriate learning environment which fosters individuality and originality.
- To develop an awareness of and a responsibility for the individual's role within the community and society.
- To help students develop a foundation for future growth which will encourage an appreciation of America and the world, respect for law and order and the beauty of nature.
- To show students the need for maintaining healthy bodies and minds by both classroom instruction and example.
- To provide curricula that lead to literacy in language arts, science and mathematics necessary for entrance into seventh grade.
- To provide opportunities for development of skills in and appreciation for art and music.
- To provide social studies concepts that will lay the foundation for further study and develop a global awareness.
- To be willing to recognize needs for improvement when they arise and be willing to make changes when necessary.
- To be open to self-evaluation and dedicated to continued improvement.
- To encourage parent and community involvement and support.
- The town of Bethlehem, population 2,332*, has a median household income of \$35,547; 7.9% of the families reportedly have income below the national poverty level.**

Lafayette Regional School District/School serves 95 students in grades K-6 from the towns of Easton, Franconia and Sugar Hill. Their school mission is: "As a community we educate, nurture and challenge all students to be successful, enthusiastic, lifelong learners who creatively explore, effectively apply and share knowledge as responsible participants in an ever-changing world." Easton, population 274, has a median household income of \$49,167; 6.0% of the families reportedly have income below the national poverty level. Franconia, population 990, has a median household income of \$40,114; 7.8% of the families reportedly have income below the national poverty level. Sugar Hill, population 586, has a median household income of \$49,219; 4.3% of the families reportedly have income below the national poverty level.

Profile Regional School District serves 288 students in grades 7-12 from the towns of Bethlehem, Easton, Franconia and Sugar Hill. Their mission statement is: "We, the Profile community, continue to pursue the ideal of providing students with comprehensive educational opportunities by encouraging and preparing young people for responsible community involvement and for careers which suit their interests and skills, and by inspiring students to pursue excellence and to rise to academic, social, creative, and physical challenges. To this end, we expect that all constituencies, including the faculty, administration, school board, and other community members, will demonstrate the same commitment to the pursuit of excellence."

*populations are as of 2004

**demographic information is based on the 2000 census.

Landaff School District serves 14 students in grades K-3 in the “Blue School” and tuitions their students in grades 4-12 to the Lisbon Regional School District. Their mission is: “It is the belief of The Blue School that every child should be prepared for the 21st century, where school is a safe place to acquire learning, apply learning and connect with home and the community. Every child comes to school with a body of knowledge that is recognized, respected and nurtured. Our job as a school and community is to promote higher intellectual, physical, emotional, cultural and social well-being and to challenge ourselves to do our best and be our best. The doors are always open to parents and community members.” Landaff, population 372, has a median household income of \$41,964; 6.9% of the families reportedly have income below the national poverty level.

Lisbon Regional School District serves 362 students in grades K-12 from Lisbon, Lyman and Landaff. Lisbon, population 1,634, has a median household income of \$37,993; 3.9% of the families reportedly have income below the national poverty level. Lyman, population 515, has a median household income of \$46,607; 3.5% of the families reportedly have income below the national poverty level.

Littleton School District has 840 students served in three schools: Mildred Lakeway Elementary School, Daisy Bronson Middle School and Littleton High School. The Hugh J. Gallen Career & Technical Center and Littleton Academy are both programs of the High School. The school’s mission for Lakeway Elementary School is: “The Littleton community will provide the students of the Mildred C. Lakeway Elementary School with a safe and stimulating educational environment in which positive attitudes are cultivated, self discipline is practiced, and respect between adults and children is displayed. Students will become life-long learners and responsible individuals, ultimately reaching their fullest potential as productive citizens.” Littleton, population 6,116, has a median household income of \$35,887; 8.6% of the families reportedly have income below the national poverty level.

The preschool students with disabilities from all the towns receive their special education services in community preschools, including the early childhood program at the Hugh J. Gallen Vocational Center.

NAME OF DISTRICT: Bethlehem Elementary			
DISTRICT ENROLLMENT DATA	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
Total Student Enrollment (ages 6-21) (as of Oct 1)	162	175	182
Expenditure Per Pupil	10,594	11,065	
Cumulative Drop-Out % (grades 9-12) students with disabilities	N/A	N/A	
Cumulative Drop-Out % (grades 9-12) non-disabled students	N/A	N/A	N/A
Free/Reduced Lunch %	39%	33%	40%
Title I %	12%	13%	9%
LEP %	0	0	0
SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM DATA	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
# of Identified Students Ages 3-5 (as of Oct. 1)	2	4	1
# of Identified Students Ages 6-21 (as of Oct. 1)	23	19	19
% Identified Ages 6-21 (as of Oct. 1)	14%	11%	10%
# Out of District	0	0	0
% Out of District	0	0	0

# of Students Out of Compliance (as of Oct. 1)			1
Special Programs Total Expenditure	340,256	373,234	
Average Caseload (as of Oct. 1)	11	10	10
# Identified Students Suspended One Or More Times		0	
# of students with disabilities who are being provided home instruction (as of Dec.1)		0	N/A
# of students with disabilities who have been placed on a "shortened school day" (as of Dec. 1)		0	N/A
Special Education Staffing: (report in FTEs)	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
# of Special Educators			2.0
# of Related Service Providers			1.38
# of Paraprofessionals			8.0

NAME OF DISTRICT: Lafayette			
DISTRICT ENROLLMENT DATA	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
Total Student Enrollment (ages 6-21) (as of Oct 1)	93	86	95
Expenditure Per Pupil	13,605	16,297	
Cumulative Drop-Out % (grades 9-12) students with disabilities	N/A	N/A	
Cumulative Drop-Out % (grades 9-12) non-disabled students	N/A	N/A	N/A
Free/Reduced Lunch %	20%	16%	20%
Title I %	7.5%	7%	9%
LEP %	0	0	0
SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM DATA	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
# of Identified Students Ages 3-5 (as of Oct. 1)	2	1	0
# of Identified Students Ages 6-21 (as of Oct. 1)	17	13	11
% Identified Ages 6-21 (as of Oct. 1)	18%	15%	12%
# Out of District	0	0	0
% Out of District	0	0	0
# of Students Out of Compliance (as of Oct. 1)			0
Special Programs Total Expenditure	368,208	389,539	
Average Caseload (as of Oct. 1)	9	7	6
# Identified Students Suspended One Or More Times		0	
# of students with disabilities who are being provided home instruction (as of Dec.1)		0	N/A
# of students with disabilities who have been placed on a "shortened school day" (as of Dec. 1)		0	N/A
Special Education Staffing: (report in FTEs)	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
# of Special Educators			1.8
# of Related Service Providers			1.15
# of Paraprofessionals			7.0

NAME OF DISTRICT: Landaff			
DISTRICT ENROLLMENT DATA	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
Total Student Enrollment (ages 6-21) (as of Oct 1)	11	13	14
Expenditure Per Pupil	7,032	7,858	
Cumulative Drop-Out % (grades 9-12) students with disabilities	N/A	N/A	
Cumulative Drop-Out % (grades 9-12) non-disabled students	N/A	N/A	N/A
Free/Reduced Lunch %	36%	23%	43%
Title I %	0	0	0
LEP %	0	0	0
SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM DATA	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
# of Identified Students Ages 3-5 (as of Oct. 1)	0	1	1
# of Identified Students Ages 6-21 (as of Oct. 1)	1	3	2
% Identified Ages 6-21 (as of Oct. 1)	9%	23%	14%
# Out of District	0	0	0
% Out of District	0	0	0
# of Students Out of Compliance (as of Oct. 1)			0
Special Programs Total Expenditure	111,479	66,239	
Average Caseload (as of Oct. 1)	N/A	N/A	N/A
# Identified Students Suspended One Or More Times		0	
# of students with disabilities who are being provided home instruction (as of Dec.1)		0	N/A
# of students with disabilities who have been placed on a "shortened school day" (as of Dec. 1)		0	N/A
Special Education Staffing: (report in FTEs)	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
# of Special Educators			.2
# of Related Service Providers			.09
# of Paraprofessionals			1

NAME OF DISTRICT: Lisbon			
DISTRICT ENROLLMENT DATA	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
Total Student Enrollment (ages 6-21) (as of Oct 1)	411	402	362
Expenditure Per Pupil	8,917	9,652	
Cumulative Drop-Out % (grades 9-12) students with disabilities	7.6%	4.8%	
Cumulative Drop-Out % (grades 9-12) non-disabled students	10%	10%	N/A
Free/Reduced Lunch %	33%	35%	36%
Title I %	10%	9%	7%
LEP %	0	0	0
SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM DATA	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07

# of Identified Students Ages 3-5 (as of Oct. 1)	5	7	2
# of Identified Students Ages 6-21 (as of Oct. 1)	80	67	58
% Identified Ages 6-21 (as of Oct. 1)	19%	17%	16%
# Out of District	1	3	3
% Out of District	.2%	.7%	.8%
# of Students Out of Compliance (as of Oct. 1)			
Special Programs Total Expenditure	680,762	867,302	
Average Caseload (as of Oct. 1)	28	25	20
# Identified Students Suspended One Or More Times		10	
# of students with disabilities who are being provided home instruction (as of Dec.1)		0	N/A
# of students with disabilities who have been placed on a "shortened school day" (as of Dec. 1)		0	N/A
Special Education Staffing: (report in FTEs)	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
# of Special Educators			3.2
# of Related Service Providers			2.55
# of Paraprofessionals			9

NAME OF DISTRICT: Littleton			
DISTRICT ENROLLMENT DATA	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
Total Student Enrollment (ages 6-21) (as of Oct 1)	909	870	840
Expenditure Per Pupil	9,495	10,792	
Cumulative Drop-Out % (grades 9-12) students with disabilities	2.4%	3.6%	
Cumulative Drop-Out % (grades 9-12) non-disabled students	15.1%	7%	N/A
Free/Reduced Lunch %	36%	37%	45%
Title I %	10%	12%	17%
LEP %	1.4%	1.3%	1.8%
SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM DATA	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
# of Identified Students Ages 3-5 (as of Oct. 1)	15	14	9
# of Identified Students Ages 6-21 (as of Oct. 1)	188	162	138
% Identified Ages 6-21 (as of Oct. 1)	21%	19%	16%
# Out of District	7	6	4
% Out of District	3.4%	3.4%	2.7%
# of Students Out of Compliance (as of Oct. 1)			
Special Programs Total Expenditure	2,439,033	2,555,979	
Average Caseload (as of Oct. 1)	15.6	13.5	12.25
# Identified Students Suspended One Or More Times		6	
# of students with disabilities who are being provided home instruction (as of Dec.1)		1	N/A
# of students with disabilities who have been placed on a "shortened school day" (as of Dec. 1)		0	0
Special Education Staffing: (report in FTEs)	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07

# of Special Educators			12
# of Related Service Providers			12.25
# of Paraprofessionals			30

NAME OF DISTRICT: Profile			
DISTRICT ENROLLMENT DATA	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
Total Student Enrollment (ages 6-21) (as of Oct 1)	339	319	288
Expenditure Per Pupil	11,333	12,287	
Cumulative Drop-Out % (grades 9-12) students with disabilities	0%	0%	
Cumulative Drop-Out % (grades 9-12) non-disabled students	14%	2%	N/A
Free/Reduced Lunch %	29%	24%	22%
Title I %	7.3%	6.2%	7.3%
LEP %	.3%	.3%	0
SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM DATA	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
# of Identified Students Ages 3-5 (as of Oct. 1)	N/A	N/A	N/A
# of Identified Students Ages 6-21 (as of Oct. 1)	51	44	37
% Identified Ages 6-21 (as of Oct. 1)	15%	14%	13%
# Out of District	2	2	2
% Out of District	3.9%	4.5%	5.4%
# of Students Out of Compliance (as of Oct. 1)			
Special Programs Total Expenditure	880,136	816,020	
Average Caseload (as of Oct. 1)	17	14.7	12.3
# Identified Students Suspended One Or More Times		3	
# of students with disabilities who are being provided home instruction (as of Dec.1)		0	N/A
# of students with disabilities who have been placed on a "shortened school day" (as of Dec. 1)		1	N/A
Special Education Staffing: (report in FTEs)	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
# of Special Educators			3
# of Related Service Providers			.67
# of Paraprofessionals			11

The above entries that are blank are not available, as the information was not provided by the LEA.

III. PURPOSE AND DESIGN OF THE NHDOE MODIFIED SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM APPROVAL VISIT

The New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) conducted a Modified Special Education Program Approval Visit to SAU 35 on November 7-8, 2006 for the purpose of reviewing the present status of programs and services made available to children and youth with educational disabilities. As part of the NHDOE Special Education Program Approval Visit, IEPs and related documents were reviewed in the following schools:

- Bethlehem Elementary School, grades K-6
- Lafayette Regional, grades K-6
- Littleton Academy (grades 7-12)/Littleton High School (grades 9-12)

- Lisbon Regional, grades K-12
- Profile Regional, grades 7-12

In addition to the above schools, the schools listed below were visited on October 26 and 27, 2006 for the purpose of observing and discussing the programs for students:

- Landaff School, grades K-3
- Mildred C.Lakeway Elementary (Littleton), grades K-6
- Daisy Bronson Middle School (Littleton), grades 7-8

The New Hampshire Department of Education, Bureau of Special Education, typically conducts program approval visits using a Case Study Model that is a focused review. However, during the 2006-07 school year, because the NHDOE is transitioning to a new monitoring model, four SAUs in New Hampshire were selected to participate in a Modified Special Education Program Approval Process. This process blends some of the elements of the Case Study Compliance Review with a more traditional review of student IEPs. These IEPs were randomly selected for the purpose of verifying compliance with state and federal special education rules and regulations, and to determine student status as related to successful outcomes. In order to accomplish this Modified Program Approval Process, visits were conducted to selected schools and a combination of quantitative and qualitative data were reviewed. These include student IEPs and feedback from leadership, school board members, parents, students and staff, along with review of data submitted with the program approval application. 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 SPEDIS 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 the staff in each of the schools in this Modified Special Education Program Approval Visit and the related data collection activities. The NHDOE Special Education Program Approval Process allowed the visiting and building level team members to review student IEPs in schools in each of the SAU School Districts. The representative sampling of the special education student population with Autism, Multiple Disabilities, Speech and Language Impairment and Emotional Disabilities were in modified regular, resource room, alternative high school and/or community placements; in grades Kindergarten, 4, 7, 9 and 11.

Evidence of the work conducted in-district and results related to student IEPs were gathered throughout the process, guided by the materials and templates provided by the NHDOE, Bureau of Special Education. Examples of evidence included student individualized education programs (IEPs), progress reports, samples of student work, grades, permanent records, curriculum, etc. Input was gathered from key constituents, including interviews with professional staff, parents, administrators, and in some cases the students. The chairperson of the team summarized the collective data that resulted from the IEP presentations. This summary is included in the report that follows, and includes identified areas of strength and areas needing improvement.

Throughout the entire review process, the visiting team worked in collaboration with the staff of SAU 35. Their professionalism, active involvement in the process and cooperation were greatly appreciated and well recognized.

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

Based on review of the May 31, 2002 NHDOE Special Education Program Approval Report, the following patterns were identified as needing improvement:

The following schools were not accessible:

Littleton High School

Status November 2006: **Met**

Daisy Bronson Middle School
 Status November 2006: **Not Met**

Profile Regional School computer room
 Status November 2006: **Met**

Transition Plans were not in place
 Status November 2006: **Not Met**

V. RESULTS OF THE NOVEMBER 7 AND 8, 2006 NHDOE SPECIAL EDUCATION MODIFIED PROGRAM APPROVAL VISIT

In SAU 35 the NHDOE worked with the staff and administration in the random selection of student IEPs to ensure that there was a representative sampling of data collected from the pre-selected programs and schools located within the school district. In order to monitor whether or not special education programs are in compliance, it was essential that each IEP team be prepared to present the IEP, demonstrate evidence that the document is in compliance, and provide documentation of student success.

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' IEP 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 IEP presentations; and secondly, all parents of students with disabilities are surveyed and encouraged to reply. Below is a summary of the results of the parent survey, along with a summary of the comments/feedback provided to the visiting team during the November 7-8, 2006 NHDOE Special Education Modified Program Approval Visit in SAU 35.

Of the 281 surveys sent to parents of students with disabilities, 83 (29.5%) were returned. The SAU **did not** provide the requested analysis of results ("List areas of relative strength identified by parents in each of the three focus areas: Access to the General Curriculum, Transitions, and Behavior Strategies and Discipline, list survey results in three areas that may indicate need for improvement and the areas of focus you would target if you were developing an action plan based on this survey data.") Parent comments from the surveys were not submitted.

Analysis of the survey showed a notable overall response rate of 31%. Of those responding, 89 to 96 percent of the parents had complete or partial satisfaction with the special education programs in SAU 35. In total, 6% (5 respondents) of the parents expressed dissatisfaction with some aspects of their child's special education programs and or services. Because of this low number and the varied areas of concern, no pattern of dissatisfaction was found.

SUMMARY OF PARENT SURVEY DATA

SAU: 35 Preschool				
Total number of surveys sent: 9	Total # of completed surveys received: 2		Percent of response: 22%	
ACCESS TO THE GENERAL CURRICULUM:	3	2	1	No Answer
I am satisfied with my child's program and the supports that he/she receives.	2			
My child has opportunities to interact with non-disabled peers on a regular basis.	2			
I am adequately informed about my child's progress.	2			
My child is informed about and encouraged to participate in school activities outside of the	1	1		

school day, and is offered necessary supports.				
My child feels safe and secure in school and welcomed by staff and students.	2			
A variety of information (observations, test scores, school work, parent input) was used in developing my child's IEP.	2			
I am satisfied with the progress my child is making toward his/her IEP goals.	2			
FOR PARENTS OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS: My child earns credits toward a regular high school diploma in all of his/her classes.				2
TRANSITION:				
I am satisfied with the planning and support provided for the moves my child has made from grade to grade and school to school.	1			1
All of the people who are important to my child's transition were part of the planning.	2			
FOR PARENTS OF STUDENTS AGE 16 OR OLDER: I am satisfied with the written secondary transition plan that is in my child's IEP.				2
BEHAVIOR STRATEGIES AND DISCIPLINE:				
My child's classroom behaviors affect his/her ability to learn. <i>If yes, please answer the next two questions. If no, skip to OTHER.</i>	YES			NO 2
I have been involved in the development of behavior interventions, strategies and supports for my child.	1			1
I am satisfied with the way the school is supporting my child's behavioral, social and developmental needs.	2			
OTHER:				
I fully participate in special education decisions regarding my child.	2			
I have been provided with a copy of the procedural safeguards (parental rights) at least once a year.	2			

SAU: 35 Elementary				
Total number of surveys sent: 119	Total # of completed surveys received: 51	Percent of response: 43%		
ACCESS TO THE GENERAL CURRICULUM:	3	2	1	No Answer
I am satisfied with my child's program and the supports that he/she receives.	42	8		1
My child has opportunities to interact with non-disabled peers on a regular basis.	45	5	1	
I am adequately informed about my child's progress.	47	4		
My child is informed about and encouraged to participate in school activities outside of the school day, and is offered necessary supports.	41	8	2	
My child feels safe and secure in school and welcomed by staff and students.	44	7		
A variety of information (observations, test scores, school work, parent input) was used in developing my child's IEP.	50	1		
I am satisfied with the progress my child is making toward his/her IEP goals.	44	7		
FOR PARENTS OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS: My child earns credits toward a regular high school diploma in all of his/her classes.				51
TRANSITION:				
I am satisfied with the planning and support provided for the moves my child has made from grade to grade and school to school.	42	6	1	2
All of the people who are important to my child's transition were part of the planning.	44	4		3
FOR PARENTS OF STUDENTS AGE 16 OR OLDER: I am satisfied with the written secondary transition plan that is in my child's IEP.				51
BEHAVIOR STRATEGIES AND DISCIPLINE:				
My child's classroom behaviors affect his/her ability to learn. <i>If yes, please answer the next two questions. If no, skip to OTHER.</i>	YES 19			NO 32
I have been involved in the development of behavior interventions, strategies and supports for my child.	16	2	1	

I am satisfied with the way the school is supporting my child's behavioral, social and developmental needs.	15	4		
OTHER:				
I fully participate in special education decisions regarding my child.	49	2		
I have been provided with a copy of the procedural safeguards (parental rights) at least once a year.	51			

SAU: 35 Middle/Jr. High				
Total number of surveys sent: 50	Total # of completed surveys received: 14	Percent of response: 28%		
ACCESS TO THE GENERAL CURRICULUM:	3	2	1	No Answer
I am satisfied with my child's program and the supports that he/she receives.	8	5	1	
My child has opportunities to interact with non-disabled peers on a regular basis.	14			
I am adequately informed about my child's progress.	8	6		
My child is informed about and encouraged to participate in school activities outside of the school day, and is offered necessary supports.	8	6		
My child feels safe and secure in school and welcomed by staff and students.	12	2		
A variety of information (observations, test scores, school work, parent input) was used in developing my child's IEP.	14			
I am satisfied with the progress my child is making toward his/her IEP goals.	10	4		
FOR PARENTS OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS:				14
My child earns credits toward a regular high school diploma in all of his/her classes.				
TRANSITION:				
I am satisfied with the planning and support provided for the moves my child has made from grade to grade and school to school.	8	4	1	1
All of the people who are important to my child's transition were part of the planning.	11	2		1
FOR PARENTS OF STUDENTS AGE 16 OR OLDER:				14
I am satisfied with the written secondary transition plan that is in my child's IEP.				
BEHAVIOR STRATEGIES AND DISCIPLINE:				
My child's classroom behaviors affect his/her ability to learn. <i>If yes, please answer the next two questions. If no, skip to OTHER.</i>	5			9
I have been involved in the development of behavior interventions, strategies and supports for my child.	4	1		
I am satisfied with the way the school is supporting my child's behavioral, social and developmental needs.	4	1		
OTHER:				
I fully participate in special education decisions regarding my child.	13	1		
I have been provided with a copy of the procedural safeguards (parental rights) at least once a year.	13	1		

SAU: 35 High School				
Total number of surveys sent: 103	Total # of completed surveys received: 19	Percent of response: 18%		
ACCESS TO THE GENERAL CURRICULUM:	3	2	1	No Answer
I am satisfied with my child's program and the supports that he/she receives.	13	6		
My child has opportunities to interact with non-disabled peers on a regular basis.	15	4		
I am adequately informed about my child's progress.	15	2	2	
My child is informed about and encouraged to participate in school activities outside of the school day, and is offered necessary supports.	13	6		

My child feels safe and secure in school and welcomed by staff and students.	14	5		
A variety of information (observations, test scores, school work, parent input) was used in developing my child's IEP.	17	2		
I am satisfied with the progress my child is making toward his/her IEP goals.	9	8	2	
FOR PARENTS OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS: My child earns credits toward a regular high school diploma in all of his/her classes.	17	2		
TRANSITION:				
I am satisfied with the planning and support provided for the moves my child has made from grade to grade and school to school.	12	7		
All of the people who are important to my child's transition were part of the planning.	15	5		
FOR PARENTS OF STUDENTS AGE 16 OR OLDER: I am satisfied with the written secondary transition plan that is in my child's IEP.	18	1		
BEHAVIOR STRATEGIES AND DISCIPLINE:				
My child's classroom behaviors affect his/her ability to learn. <i>If yes, please answer the next two questions. If no, skip to OTHER.</i>	YES 8			NO 10
I have been involved in the development of behavior interventions, strategies and supports for my child.	6	1	1	
I am satisfied with the way the school is supporting my child's behavioral, social and developmental needs.	6	2		
OTHER:				
I fully participate in special education decisions regarding my child.	15	4		
I have been provided with a copy of the procedural safeguards (parental rights) at least once a year.	19			

Parents interviewed during the NHDOE Program Approval visit expressed satisfaction with most aspects of their children's experiences in special education in their respective schools.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FROM THE NHDOE SPECIAL EDUCATION MODIFIED PROGRAM APPROVAL VISIT

The staff at the various schools were well prepared to present the visitors with information regarding IEP development. The visitors found the processes and procedures for involving parents and general educators in IEP development well developed and sound. Parents, students, classroom teachers, special educators, related service providers, agency representatives and administrators joined to demonstrate the effectiveness of programs for students with disabilities. The problem solving skills of these teams were evident in the variety and extent of services. The teams readily access outside consultants when needed; a tribute to the administrative and community support available to provide quality opportunities to students with disabilities.

COMMENDATIONS

1. The school districts have dedicated, caring staff who are student centered and hard working. Teams demonstrated sophisticated, creative problem-solving skills and "can-do" attitudes that have resulted in their effectively meeting the individual needs of students.
2. Littleton High School has had an addition and renovations since the last visit. It is now accessible and provides an effective learning environment.
3. The school districts have developed effective working relationships with outside agencies/resources to support student success (e.g. Juvenile Justice, Vocational Rehabilitation, Mental Health, Common Ground, consultants).
4. The schools using the NWEA MAP testing to inform instruction (Bethlehem Elementary School, Lisbon Regional, Littleton Middle and High Schools) have the opportunity to more closely align special education instruction to the general education curriculum.

5. Transitions of students with significant needs from preschool to elementary school, elementary school to middle school and middle school to high school are thoughtfully planned and well implemented.
6. Parent survey results, interviews and observation of interactions with school staff during the visit provided evidence that there is strong school/parent/family relationships and communication.
7. Effective implementation of Positive Behavior and Intervention Strategies in Littleton High School, Daisy Bronson Middle School, Profile Regional School and Lisbon Regional School has resulted in the development of common language and behavioral expectations, systematic data analysis, and improved student behaviors.
8. Lafayette Regional School has implemented training in differentiated instruction for all staff members resulting in positive outcomes in general education classrooms for students with disabilities.
9. Littleton Academy provides highly effective programs for students in grades 7-12 with emotional/behavioral needs. Highly qualified content area and special educators work together to provide effective instruction. Students readily access the high school for classes when appropriate. Communication systems are in place to provide information and consistency between schools. Expectations for student behavior are well-articulated in a level system that students participate in and benefit from. Home, school and outside agencies work cooperatively and effectively to assure student success. Administrative leadership and visibility contribute strongly to the strength of this program.

ISSUES OF SIGNIFICANCE

Issues of significance are defined as systemic deficiencies that impact the effective delivery of services to all students, including those with educational disabilities. Examples of such may include system wide issues related to curriculum, instruction and assessment. Other examples might be concerns related to inadequate facilities, ineffective communication systems within the educational community, leadership, shared mission, vision and goals, deficiencies in policies and procedures, staff recruitment and retention, professional development or other important factors related to the learning organization.

In the wake of the separation of Littleton from SAU 35, budget considerations have led to the decision to not hire a person dedicated to the central oversight of special education in SAU 35. It is expected that the superintendent will assume these duties and that some of the responsibilities will be carried out in each building. Observations and feedback during the visits raised multiple concerns regarding this decision.

The myriad of responsibilities in the increasingly demanding and complex role of central administration of special education include, but are not limited to:

- knowledge of and assuring the implementation of federal and state special education laws and regulations;
- grant writing/application for and management of Federal funds;
- budget development and oversight; tracking costs and recovering catastrophic aid, 402 reimbursement and Medicaid funds;
- meeting the ever increasing demands for reporting to the New Hampshire Department of Education;
- knowledge of interagency agreements and key organizations and agencies and their functions;
- recruitment/hiring/retention of staff;
- staff supervision and evaluation;
- organization and execution of Childfind efforts;
- program development, evaluation and supervision;
- home/school communication;
- case management, oversight and coordination of programs for preschoolers in community preschool placements;
- case management, oversight and coordination of programs for school-aged students in out-of-district placements;
- court liaison for adjudicated students;
- implementation of requirements for students in court ordered placements;
- oversight and networking to share best practices among the school districts;
- attending regional and state meetings;
- assuring his/her ongoing professional development;
- developing and training staff in use of new initiatives such as effective transition plans, web-based IEPs and Response to Interventions (RTI)

The proposed delegation of some of these responsibilities, to be carried out by school-based personnel who currently have full-time teaching and/or administrative duties, will:

- require increased time/systems to assure communication among the five schools/districts in order to provide consistency across the SAU
- create the need for duplication of efforts, systems and resources
- necessitate increased professional development in the areas of staff and program supervision and evaluation, and special education law, procedures and requirements

The potential consequences of the proposed decentralization of special education administration are:

- an increased risk of noncompliance resulting in litigation,
- increased costs,
- and most importantly, the erosion of effective programming and instruction for students

Oversight and supervision of special education services, and coordination of the special education process, could happen in a more meaningful and consistent manner by building a single, well-integrated system that connects general, remedial and special education among the five schools/districts through common leadership and decision-making. This would require a person dedicated to this role to facilitate these processes at the SAU level.

An additional issue of significance is in the case management and implementation of requirements for students in out-of-district placements, including those students who are court involved. In reviewing the out-of-district files, the lack of required documents (e.g. current IEPs, current evaluations, meeting minutes, written prior notice, etc.) was of major concern. Requests for these documents since the file reviews have had no results. This absence of evidence of appropriate evaluations, program planning and implementation, decision making, etc. raises the question whether these students, and their parents, are being afforded their rights to FAPE.

CITATIONS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IDENTIFIED AS A RESULT OF THE NHDOE MODIFIED SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM APPROVAL VISIT

Citations of noncompliance are defined as deficiencies that have been identified through the NHDOE Special Education Program Approval Process, which are in violation of state and federal special education rules and regulations. Citations of non-compliance may result from review of policies and procedures and related application materials, IEP team presentations, review of student records or any other program approval activity related to the visit. **It is important to note that all citations of non-compliance that are included in this section of the report will need to be addressed in a corrective action plan.**

As a result of the NHDOE Modified Special Education Program Approval visit, the following citations of non-compliance were identified. Each citation 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.

This section will need to include those corrective actions listed as not resolved from the previous visit, as well as any citations noted in issues of significance, James O, Out of District, or general review of policy, procedures, personnel roster etc.

1. Ed 1119.06 Facilities

- a. In the Bethlehem Elementary School, the stage where music class is conducted is not wheelchair accessible.
- b. Profile Regional School has accessibility and space issues which will be corrected by the construction approved on November 15, 2006.
- c. Daisy Bronson Middle School is not accessible; classes are moved to allow wheelchair access when necessary.

2. Ed 1119.08 Diploma/Graduation policy:

Policies and procedures for decision making regarding the awarding of credit toward a high school diploma or the awarding of a certificate of attendance (e.g. “non-traditional”) are not in place.

3. Ed 1109.01 34 CFR 300.320(b) and (c)] Transition

Students enrolled who are 16 years or older must have transition plans that include measurable post-secondary goals, documentation that other agencies have been invited to IEP meetings, and a statement of transition services that considers all of the following: instruction, related services, community experiences, development of employment skills and development of daily living skills. Although the student at Profile High School is actively involved in effective transition activities in collaboration with outside agencies, a transition plan, measurable post-secondary goals and documentation of the results were not evident in the IEP.

4. Ed 1107.01 Evaluation and Determination of Educational Disabilities

Evaluations/re-evaluations must be completed within 45 days of parent's permission to test, or there must be a parent-signed waiver in place

5. Ed 1109.01 Elements of an Individual Education Plan (IEP)

Not all of the IEPs reviewed during the visit had annual goals written in measurable terms. Most IEP had objectives that were measurable. Teachers demonstrated awareness of this requirement and expressed their intent to write future annual goals in measurable terms.

6. Ed 1119.02 (a) Establishment of Education Programs for Children with Disabilities

Two self-contained programs, the Mildred C. Lakeway Support Center, grades 3-5 and the Lisbon High School Self-Contained class, grades 9-12, are operating without approval.

7. Ed 1119.07 Personnel Standards

Evidence that the Profile Middle School special education teacher has the required Intern's License was not submitted.

8. Ed 1129.02 LEA Policies and Procedures

The newly revised Special Education Plan contains the changes resulting from the August, 2006 Federal Regulations from the reauthorized IDEA 2004. Although appearing in the Table of Contents of the submitted Plan, the following components were missing from the documents: Childfind policies and procedures for non-school aged children, Reporting (SPEDIS), Public Participation, Definitions and Job Descriptions.

Once finalized, the newly developed Plan containing the SAU 35 Policies and Procedures should be reviewed and disseminated to those people in the SAU responsible for assuring compliance to their contents.

9. Out-Of-District Files:

Ed 1107.01 Evaluation and Determination of Educational Disabilities

In out-of-district files, one file did not contain a current evaluation. Evaluation summaries were missing and the area(s) of identification were not recorded. Documentation was missing as to who participated in the meeting/evaluation decision.

Ed 1109.01 Elements of an Individual Education Program

In out-of-district files, one file did not have annual goals written in measurable terms or a statement of the program modifications and supports for school personnel to be provided for the student. Neither file had a copy of the students' daily or weekly schedules making it difficult to ascertain access to the general education curriculum and/or to verify the status toward accomplishing graduation goals. One file did not contain the documentation that the student (over age 16) had been invited to or attended IEP meetings. One file did not have a statement that the student, at age 17, has been informed of his rights and that the rights will transfer to the student on reaching the age of 18, if appropriate.

Ed 1115.02 Placement Decisions

One file did not have evidence that a plan for transition to a less restrictive environment had been considered.

10. Ed 1130.03 & Ed 1130.04 Education of Children Placed in Homes for Children, Health Care Facilities or State Institutions

The LEA must adhere to the requirements as found in the James O. consent decree:

Ed 1107.01 Evaluation and Determination of Educational Disabilities

Current evaluation or evaluation summary, parental consent for evaluations, completion of evaluations within 45 days (or a parent-signed waiver) and evidence of parental notification of procedural safeguards were not evident in one of the two files reviewed.

Ed 1109.01 Elements of an Individual Education Program

Both files did not have current IEPs, progress reports or a copy of the students' daily or weekly schedules, making it difficult to ascertain access to the general education curriculum and/or to verify the status toward accomplishing graduation goals.

Ed 1115.02 Placement Decisions

Both files did not have evidence that a plan for transition to a less restrictive environment had been considered.

Ed 1130.03, Ed 1130.04

Both files did not contain evidence that meetings were held once the LEA was joined or when emergency placements were made.

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.**

1. Consider acquiring personnel to oversee special education once SAU 35 is reconfigured in July, 2007.
2. Institute a system to share strong program models and effective processes/practices, methods and techniques among the schools.
3. Provide professional development on differentiated instruction to general education and unified arts teachers in Lisbon Regional School, and others where necessary, in order to assure optimum success in general education for students with disabilities.

**USING COMPLIANCE DATA FOR CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT
 MODIFIED PROGRAM APPROVAL VISIT
 SAU # 35, BETHLEHEM AND LAFAYETTE REGIONAL ELEMENTARY IEP REVIEW SUMMARY FORM
 NEW HAMPSHIRE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
 SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM APPROVAL AND IMPROVEMENT PROCESS**

ACCESS TO THE GENERAL CURRICULUM STATEMENTS					YES	NO	N/A	
IEP goals are written in measurable terms.						2		
Student <u>has access to</u> the general curriculum (as outlined by the district, sending district or NH frameworks.)					2			
Student <u>participates</u> appropriately in state, district and school-wide assessments.					1		1	
Student <u>has opportunities to</u> participate in general extracurricular and other non-academic activities with necessary supports.					2			
Was the student's most recent individual evaluation (initial or reevaluation), including a written summary report and meeting, held within 45 days of parental permission to test? If not, was it due to: (check all that apply)					1	1		
Extension in Place	Lack of Qualified Personnel	Evaluation Not Completed in Time	Summary Report Not Written in Time	Meeting Not Held in Time	Other Student's multiple disabilities require extended testing time.			
YES	<input type="checkbox"/> Psychologist <input type="checkbox"/> Educator <input type="checkbox"/> Related Services <input type="checkbox"/> Other	X						
TRANSITION STATEMENTS						YES	NO	
Collaboration has occurred between general and special education staff in IEP development and in transition planning.						2		
BEHAVIOR STRATEGIES AND DISCIPLINE STATEMENTS						YES	NO	N/A
Has this student ever been suspended from school?							2	
If yes, for how many days?								
If appropriate, a functional behavior assessment has been conducted.						1		1
IEP team has addressed behaviors that are impacting student learning.						1		1
A behavior intervention plan has been written to address behaviors.						1		1

BETHLEHEM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Strengths	Suggestions for Improvement
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The team works hard to meet the needs of individual student learners. 2. Transition plan was comprehensive and went well. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Case manager from BES attended preschool meeting. ▪ Para-educator, special education teacher and nurse visited preschool numerous times. ▪ ESY held at BES to orient student; the team problem solved potential issues; previous team members given time to train new team members. 3. Access to the general curriculum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Welcoming community and expectations. ▪ Para-educator to assist. ▪ Assistive technology to communicate. 4. Progress monitoring and reporting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data collection sheets. ▪ Daily communication sheet/book. ▪ Progress reports and report cards. 5. Great team members – very dedicated and excited about working together to move kids forward! 6. Parents are very involved and truly crucial members of the teams. 7. Strong community support (financially and participatory). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inadequate space: e.g. school psychologist uses the elevator closet to test his students; PT often has to work in the halls, inadequate space for large group meetings. *2. The stage is not wheelchair accessible for music class. Consider relocating the class so that the student in a wheelchair can participate more fully. 3. Movement towards the RTI model (regular education initiative with huge impact on kids and how they think about themselves!) *4. Professional Development related to writing measurable annual goals. 5. Consider capturing student progress on video tape. 6. Continue to work on increasing time for collaboration. 7. Provide a central office coordinator next year who is dedicated to the oversight of special education for the remaining districts in SAU 35.

LAFAYETTE REGIONAL

Strengths	Suggestions for Improvement
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Skill and expertise of the veteran staff working with student.. 2. Regular collaboration and planning meetings with student’s team. 3. Access to the general curriculum and adaptive experiences when necessary. 4. Inclusion experiences with typical peers. 5. Parent support/partnership. 6. Strong community/school district support. 7. Level of communication between home and school. 8. Staff and parents work together with a creative problem solving approach to meet individual needs. 9. Team demonstrates excellent ability to adapt to student needs (flexible and structured). 10. Staff demonstrates open mindedness to listen to outside expertise and willingness to help, support and/or make requests among team members. 11. Strong culture of professionalism. 12. Supports are available for extra-curricular/non-academic opportunities. 13. Related services are directed to improving access to the general education curriculum. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> *1. IEP goals need to be written in measurable terms. 2. Modifications/accommodations need to be connected to student needs/IEP goals. 3. Work to integrate related services goals/objectives with content areas on the IEP. This will allow you to measure and document progress in the general education curriculum as it relates to supports and related services.

**USING COMPLIANCE DATA FOR CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT
MODIFIED PROGRAM APPROVAL VISIT
SAU # 35, LITTLETON ACADEMY, LISBON REGIONAL AND PROFILE MIDDLE / HIGH SCHOOL IEP REVIEW
SUMMARY FORM
NEW HAMPSHIRE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM APPROVAL AND IMPROVEMENT PROCESS**

ACCESS TO THE GENERAL CURRICULUM STATEMENTS					YES	NO	N/A
IEP goals are written in measurable terms.					1	2	
Student <u>has access to</u> the general curriculum (as outlined by the district, sending district or NH frameworks.)					3		
Student <u>participates</u> appropriately in state, district and school-wide assessments.					3		
Student <u>has opportunities to</u> participate in general extracurricular and other non-academic activities with necessary supports.					3		
Was the student's most recent individual evaluation (initial or reevaluation), including a written summary report and meeting, held within 45 days of parental permission to test? If not, was it due to: (check all that apply)					2	1	
Extension in Place	Lack of Qualified Personnel <input type="checkbox"/> Psychologist <input type="checkbox"/> Educator <input type="checkbox"/> Related Services <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Evaluation Not Completed in Time	Summary Report Not Written in Time	Meeting Not Held in Time X	Other		
TRANSITION STATEMENTS					YES	NO	
IEP team includes parents as part of transition planning.					3		
IEP team and process includes student as part of transition planning.					2		1 N/A
IEP includes current level of performance related to transition services.					2		1 N/A
There is documentation that the student has been invited to attend IEP meetings.					2		1 N/A
The statement of transition focuses on the student's course of study (e.g. vocational programming, advanced placement).					2		1 N/A
If the student is age 16 or older during the course of the IEP, <u>also</u> answer the following 2 statements:					1		
Transition plan, including student's <u>measurable</u> post-high school goals, is in place.							1
Statement of needed transition services is presented as a coordinated set of activities.							1
BEHAVIOR STRATEGIES AND DISCIPLINE STATEMENTS					YES	NO	N/A
Has this student ever been suspended from school? (1 STUDENT-LAST YEAR)					2	1	
If yes, for how many days? (2 OF THESE DAYS-LAST YEAR)					6		
If appropriate, a functional behavior assessment has been conducted.							3
IEP team has addressed behaviors that are impacting student learning.					2		1
A behavior intervention plan has been written to address behaviors.					1		2

LITTLETON ACADEMY

Strengths	Suggestions for Improvement
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. IEP annual goals written in measurable terms. 2. The use of IEP checklist ensures well written, comprehensive documents. 3. Effective use of data to inform instruction, write IEPs and measure progress. 4. Student is encouraged to participate in community activities. 5. All the adults in the student's life work well as a team. 6. Services in the community work as partners with school districts (court, mental health, etc.). 7. Availability of social worker enhances student progress. 8. PBIS has had a positive impact upon culture/system. 9. Special Education is aligned to general education curriculum. 10. Parent communication is strong. 11. Communication between the Academy and the high school/middle school is strong. 12. Students have a sense of belonging with middle/high school. 13. Students report satisfaction with program services and that the adults in the program care about them. 14. Students have access to laptops, PLATO etc. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The IEP reviewed at Littleton Academy had the annual goals written in measurable terms. Based on our discussion that writing measurable goals is an emerging skill among the Littleton staff, and the challenges presented when writing behavior goals in measurable terms, it is suggested that continued professional development in this area be provided to special educators. 2. Continue to support and provide professional development to all the staff and administration in the areas of special education, including new regulations. 3. Explore the possibility of using software in the areas of pre-vocational opportunities. *4. Evaluations, including the meeting to decide the outcome, must be held within 45 days, or a parent-signed waiver must be in place.

LISBON REGIONAL SCHOOL

Strengths	Suggestions for Improvement
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Special Education staff works closely with parents and classroom teachers. 2. Students are involved in planning their program. 3. Evaluations, such as curriculum-based assessments, standardized tests, academic achievement, intelligence, social emotional, and MAP tests are used to develop and amend IEPs. 4. Meetings are scheduled to accommodate parent's schedules in order to include them in the development and implementation of IEPs. 5. Most of the staff makes modifications and accommodations in order to include special education students in their regular classroom. 6. Special programs are developed to keep students at Lisbon rather than place them out of district. 7. Students are included in the regular classroom to access the district-adopted curriculum at their own level of understanding. Parallel curriculum and supplemental materials are used, when necessary. 8. Transitions from elementary to middle and high school are smooth as this is a small K-12 school housed in one building with some staff that work with all grade levels. 9. LRS creatively uses limited resources to provide vocational opportunities for students. 10. Students and parents are actively involved in developing their transition plan from school to work or college. 11. Guidance meets with each student individually to discuss course selections. 12. District Action Teams have developed curricula that are aligned to the NH State Frameworks. 13. Informal and formal assessments are used to inform teaching practices and implement interventions, as a proactive method to address struggling student needs prior to formal special education involvement. 14. Title I staff work with students having math and reading difficulties. 15. All students have access to the resource room for assistance. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase use of MAP test results to develop IEP goals and align them with GLEs and to report and measure students' progress. *2. Write more specific and measurable goals. 3. Need to combine meetings to use time more efficiently. 4. Send assessment results and proposed IEP to parents and staff to review prior to meetings to increase efficiency and parent involvement. 5. Use more of a variety of diagnostic assessments to inform teaching practices. 6. Increase team teaching of special educators with regular education teachers. 7. Increase use of special education staff as a resource. 8. Increase North Country vocational options. 9. Professional development for team teaching. 10. Professional development for all teachers in differentiating instruction. 11. Special education caseloads are high in comparison to the other districts in the SAU and should be considered in future staff planning and assignments.

PROFILE SCHOOL

Strengths	Suggestions for Improvement
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Team demonstrated strong knowledge and understanding of the student. 2. There is regular communication with parents and other service providers. 3. Coordination of services is strong between home/school and other agencies 4. Transition planning and support for this student is ongoing. 5. The education programs for students are flexible and are designed to meet individual needs of students. 6.. The small, caring community within the school is evident, the staff knows students and parents and there is an accepting culture in the school. 7. The Team’s talents were evident; they displayed a strong commitment to student success. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is a need to expand work exploration/experiences/career exploration assessments. *2. IEP annual goals must be written in measurable terms. 3. Work to make IEPs more global/related to the general education curriculum and less prescriptive. 4. Develop a process for formal documentation of short-term growth and progress. 5. Develop a process of documenting vocational assessments being done informally to guide transition planning. *6. Continue with professional development on the writing of transition plans to assure that required transition plans are in IEPS. *7. The lack of appropriate instructional space affects special education programs. 8. An SAU Special Education Director for next year is seen as a critical need. *9. Establish policy/procedure for earning high school credits leading to a high school diploma.

ADDENDUM

Out-of-District File Review

SAU 35

Date: October 26 and 27, 2006

Reviewer: Mary Anne Byrne

ADDENDUM Out-of-District File Review

SAU #35

Number of Files Reviewed: 2

COMMENDATIONS

The SAU has relatively few students placed out of district by the district.

CITATIONS OF NONCOMPLIANCE

Ed 1107.01 Evaluation and Determination of Educational Disabilities

One file did not contain current evaluations.

In both files the area(s) of identification were not recorded.

Neither file contained evaluation summaries or documentation as to who participated in the meeting/evaluation decision.

Ed 1109.01 Elements of an Individual Education Program

One file did not have annual goals written in measurable terms.

One file did not have a statement of the program modifications and supports for school personnel to be provided for the student.

One file did not contain the documentation that the student (over age 16) had been invited to or attended IEP meetings.

Neither file had a copy of the students' daily or weekly schedules making it difficult to ascertain access to the general education curriculum and/or to verify the status toward accomplishing graduation goals.

One file did not have a statement that the student, at age 17, had been informed of his rights and that the rights will transfer to the student on reaching the age of 18, if appropriate.

Ed 1115.02

One file did not have evidence that a plan for or transition to a less restrictive environment has been considered.

ADDENDUM

JAMES O. MONITORING PROGRAM

SAU 35

Student File Review

Case Study Document

Reimbursement Claim Form

Case Study Addendum Form

Date: October 26 and 27, 2006

Reviewer: Mary Anne Byrne

<p style="text-align: center;">ADDENDUM JAMES O. MONITORING PROGRAM</p>

SAU #35

Number of files reviewed: 2

COMMENDATIONS:

The school district has a strong working relationship with the court system.

CITATIONS OF NONCOMPLIANCE:

Ed 1107.01 Evaluation and Determination of Educational Disabilities

One file did not contain a current evaluation or evaluation summary.

One file did not contain parental consent for evaluation.

One file did not have the evaluation completed within 45 days, nor was there an extension on file.

One file did not contain evidence of parental notification of procedural safeguards.

Ed 1109.01 Elements of an Individual Education Program

Neither file had current IEPs or progress reports.

Neither file had a copy of the students' daily or weekly schedules making it difficult to ascertain access to the general education curriculum and/or to verify the status toward accomplishing graduation goals.

Ed 1115.02

Both files did not have evidence that a plan for or transition to a less restrictive environment has been considered.

Ed 1130.03, Ed 1130.04

Both files did not contain evidence that meetings were held once the LEA was joined or when emergency placements were made.